

Name	Electoral Division	Address
ALEXANDER, Keith	Roblin	Roblin, Man.
BAIZLEY, Obie	Osborne	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
BJORNSON, Oscar F.	Lac du Bonnet	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
CAMPBELL, D. L.	Lakeside	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARROLL, Hon. J.B.	The Pas	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron	Portage la Prairie	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man.
CORBETT, A. H.	Swan River	Swan River, Man.
COWAN, James, Q.C.	Winnipeg Centre	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
DESJARDINS, Laurent	St. Boniface	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
DOW, E. I.	Turtle Mountain	Boissevain, Man.
EVANS, Hon. Gurney	Fort Rouge	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORBES, Mrs. Thelma	Cypress	Rathwell, Man.
FROESE, J. M.	Rhineland	Winkler, Man.
GRAY, Morris A.	Inkster	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
GROVES, Fred	St. Vital	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
GUTTORMSON, Elman	St. George	Lundar, Man.
HAMILTON, William Homer	Dufferin	Sperling, Man.
HARRIS, Lemuel	Logan	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
HARRISON, Hon. Abram W.	Rock Lake	Holmfield, Man.
HAWRYLUK, J. M.	Burrows	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C.	Selkirk	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C.	Ethelbert Plains	Ethelbert, Man.
HUTTON, Hon. George	Rockwood-Iberville	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
INGEBRIGTSON, J. E.	Churchill	Churchill, Man.
JEANNOTTE, J. E.	Rupertsland	Meadow Portage, Man.
JOHNSON, Hon. George	Gimli	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
JOHNSON, Geo. Wm.	Assiniboia	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
KLYM, Fred T.	Springfield	Beausejour, Man.
LISSAMAN, R. O.	Brandon	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C.	Fort Garry	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MARTIN, W. G.	St. Matthews	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
McKELLAR, M. E.	Souris-Lansdowne	Nesbitt, Man.
McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C.	Dauphin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MOLGAT, Gildas	Ste. Rose	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne	Pembina	Manitou, Man.
ORLIKOW, David	St. John's	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
PAULLEY, Russell	Radisson	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
PETERS, S.	Elmwood	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
PREFONTAINE, Edmond	Carillon	St. Pierre, Man.
REID, A. J.	Kildonan	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
ROBERTS, Stan	La Verendrye	Niverville, Man.
ROBLIN, Hon. Duff	Wolseley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SCARTH, W.B., Q.C.	River Heights	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
SCHREYER, E. R.	Brokenhead	Beausejour, Man.
SEABORN, Richard	Wellington	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
SHEWMAN, Harry P.	Morris	Morris, Man.
SHOEMAKER, Nelson	Gladstone	Neepawa, Man.
SPELLIE, Robert Gordon	Birtle-Russell	Russell, Man.
STANES, D. M.	St. James	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
STRICKLAND, B. P.	Hamiota	Hamiota, Man.
TANCHAK, John P.	Emerson	Ridgeville, Man.
THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C.	Virden	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WAGNER, Peter	Fisher	Fisher Branch, Man.
WATT, J. D.	Arthur	Reston, Man.
WEIR, Walter	Minnedosa	Minnedosa, Man.
WITNEY, Hon. Charles H.	Flin Flon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WRIGHT, Arthur E.	Seven Oaks	4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 29th, 1961

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their third report: Your Committee has considered Bills No. 40, an Act to amend The Hospitals Act; No. 68, an Act to amend The Treasury Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendments. Your committee has also considered Bills No. 26, an Act to amend The Real Property Act; No. 39, an Act respecting The Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board; No. 50, an Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion  
Introduction of Bills

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): introduced Bill No. 27, an Act to amend The Insurance Act.

HON. STEWART McLEAN (Minister of Education)(Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 84, an Act to amend The Education Department Act.

MR. WM. H. HAMILTON (Dufferin) introduced Bill No. 77, An Act to amend an Act respecting the Rural Municipality of Dufferin and the Rural Municipality of Grey.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) introduced Bill No. 66, An Act to validate the 1961 Assessment Roll of the City of Brandon and to amend The Brandon Charter.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the proposed resolution standing in my name on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Election Act by providing, among other matters, (a) for the establishment for elections of special polling places at which hospital patients and mariners may vote and consequent thereupon for the appointment of and payment of remuneration from and out of the Consolidated Fund to additional election officials, and (b) for the fixing by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council of the fees to be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund to election officials.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, these two matters which arise in the resolution, which will require a further vote of monies, arise from the Special Committee on The Election Act which sat during the summer recess. They rise, of course, from the requirement and the recommendation of the Committee that special provision be now made in our Election Act for the taking of votes by persons hospitalized in Manitoba; and out of the special provisions arising by reason of the recommendation that fishermen on our lakes in Manitoba be provided with special machinery for the taking of their vote. Of course the remuneration that is required is for the extra officials that will be needed to carry out these two recommendations. The (b) portion of the resolution refers only to an administrative change actually. Formerly, the fees set for all election officials were set down in the schedule at the end of The Act, that schedule being recommended by the Committee that the schedule be repealed, and that these fees be set by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition)(Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I take it that the legislation which will follow the introduction of this resolution is practically along the lines of the report of the Special Committee on Elections.

MR. LYON: I would hope almost entirely, except with those amendments that we may have instructed the counsel to proceed with on his own.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Cypress, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 83, And Act to amend The Election Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. R. SEABORN (Wellington): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and the members of this House 35 splendid young men and women from the Clifton School, which you've probably guessed is located in the wonderful constituency of Wellington. This group is located in the gallery to the right. These visitors are from Grades V and VI and they are escorted by their teacher, Miss Irene Lambert, and I know you'll join with me in bidding them welcome and we hope that their visit will be profitable and instructive.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to call your attention to the presence in the gallery second from your left of 12 ladies from Fort Garry. They're connected with the Young Women's Christian Association and are here this afternoon viewing the proceedings of the House. You will note, Mr. Speaker, by looking at these 12 attractive young ladies that, although their age is not known we realize that they are not accompanied by a teacher, although they might well pass for high school students sitting up there as attractive as they are. I'm sure, Sir, that you would like to wish them welcome to the House this afternoon, as do we all, and hope that they will return again to view our proceedings at another time.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to reply to a question that was asked by the Honourable the Member for St. George concerning some mobile schools that were purchased. The question was asked in the original instance of the First Minister in my absence, and then later of myself. Four mobile or trailer schools were purchased and I will give the cost to the House. The school for Wanipigow, \$8,939.87, delivered at the site; Grand Rapids, there were two school rooms, each \$9,461.78, again delivered on the site; a school room for Brochet, \$9,338.50, that was delivered at The Pas and there will be some additional transportation expenses; and the teacherage, which was for Wanipigow, \$5,090. Now, Mr. Speaker, it was decided that these buildings were required and the orders were placed. As I have indicated, two of the school rooms or mobile school rooms were for Grand Rapids, one for Wanipigow and one for Brochet, and a teacherage for Wanipigow. In every case, delivery was a matter of urgency before the frost came out of the ground or break-up made delivery impossible. The schools for Brochet and Grand Rapids all had to be transported across ice, and if delivery was not made in time to cross Reindeer Lake or the Saskatchewan River, then the next date for delivery in the case of Brochet would be January, 1962; and in the case of Grand Rapids, the opening of the bridge expected next September. The Brochet and Wanipigow buildings were purchased by the Province of Manitoba through the Department of Education as special schools. In the case of Grand Rapids, the Department of Education simply serves as an agent for the Manitoba Hydro-Development Board which is paying for the schools. The Department of Education nor the Purchasing Bureau knows of no place in Manitoba where trailers of this type are built, while the Alberta Trailer Company has been building them for many years and has supplied both the Power Commission and the Manitoba Telephone System. The school for Brochet was delivered to Lynn Lake about a week ago; the Grand Rapids schools were delivered to the site last weekend and the Wanipigow school and teacherage delivered to the site on Monday, March 27th. These reasons are advanced for purchasing without tendering: there was no known supplier in Manitoba for this specific type

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . . of mobile structure; second, the Alberta firm has been in business for quite some time and its product and reputation are known and its plans approved and delivery could be guaranteed on short notice; and three, an early delivery date was absolutely essential because of the approach of spring. Some further information from the Purchasing Department-- the portable classrooms were of heavy duty construction and cannot be compared with the so-called house trailer that is marketed generally. The number of manufacturers of these industrial units is limited. Competitive bids were obtained in the past for heavy duty units and it was found that the Alberta Traller Company has made the best offer. Competitive bids were either higher in price or were inadequate or delivery was poor and it is believed that, in this instance, the best value and best delivery would be obtained from the Alberta Traller Company, and that calling for competitive bids would serve no useful purpose. These, Mr. Speaker, are the reasons for not having called for competitive bids and my information is that the prices paid are quite in line with the prices paid on previous occasions when tenders were called. I place these reasons before the members of the House to explain the reason for not calling for tenders and to express my opinion that proper value has been secured and that, in this instance, the proper course was adopted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may just while I'm on my feet, on an entirely different matter, the members of the House are quite familiar with the fact that Dauphin is the centre of learning and culture in the Province of Manitoba, and I would like you to know that we have not neglected our physical education and training. The Dauphin Hockey Team was last night successful in defeating Prince Albert to become the champions in the intermediate field for Manitoba-Saskatchewan, and they move on to meet the Thunderbay champions of Ontario.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister regarding the Manitoba Savings Bonds. There seems to be quite a bit of discussion and controversy about these bonds regarding whether they are transferable or not. I know that the Minister did explain, after six months, but I had a discussion even with some officials here within the House and some think that they are; some think that they are not. I would like this clarified please.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm trying to recall the terms of the issue, Mr. Speaker. To the best of my knowledge they are non-transferable, but I'll check that point and make sure that I'm completely right on it.

MR. TANCHAK: I have another question to direct to the Honourable Minister of Education. I would like to hear from him whether he did receive any report from the recent sitting of the Boundaries Commission at Emerson on the boundary division in my constituency.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, as I had informed the members of the House earlier, the report of the Boundaries Commission was a recommendation respecting the School District of Piney; that that school district should be declared a remote school district. That is the only report or recommendation received from the Boundaries Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. J. W. C. THOMPSON (Minister of Public Works)(Virden): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table a return to an Order of the House, No. 11, on the motion of the Honourable the Member from Ste. Rose. At the same time, if I may, I would like to lay on the table an Order of the House, No. 4, on the motion of the Honourable Member from Gladstone-Neeopawa.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Committee of the Whole House.

MR. J. COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills: Bill No. 13, An Act to amend an Act to Incorporate the Town of Tuxedo; Bill No. 18, An Act respecting the Rural Municipality of Whitewater and the Minto Cemetery Company; Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The East Kildonan Charter; Bill No. 29, An Act respecting the Town of Winkler; Bill No. 32, An Act to validate By-Law No. 766 of the Town of Rapid City; Bill No. 70, An Act to amend the Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Bills, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

Bills No. 13, 18, 21, 29, 32 and 70 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has considered the following Bills: Bills No. 13, 18, 21, 29, 32 and 70 and has directed me to report the same without amendments, and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

Bills No. 13, 18, 21, 29, 32 and 70 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 69. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 69, An Act to amend The Municipal Board Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the amendments that we are proposing to The Municipal Board Act are largely self-explanatory. One of them provides for separate sittings of the Board, now that it is reconstituted and is a five-member Board, separate sittings with a quorum of two so that it can meet at separate places at one time. Another amendment provides -- that technical amendment defining local authorities is a further amendment concerning debentures issued by local authorities is a further amendment concerning debentures issued by local authorities, saying that they shall contain a memorandum under the seal of the Board and so on. Up to the present time, the Chairman of the Board has had to sign each one of these debentures individually. Now with the work that is coming in and is expected to come in from Metro, it's just found to be too much of a mechanical procedure for him, and this amendment is put in to alleviate that problem. There is a further amendment with respect to supervision of temporary investments of funds. At the present time, the Board is authorized under the section to supervise the sale and disposal of securities and the expenditure of monies raised thereby. There's some doubt as to whether or not the supervision over expenditure is presently wide enough to include investments, and as there are times when the monies realized on a sale may lie dormant for a considerable time, it's considered desirable that there should be clear authority for investment under supervision and authorization of the Board. I mentioned the amendment concerning local authorities; and the final amendment -- the final two section in the Bill refer to Section 93 of The Municipal Board Act. It presently permits the Board to order the cancellation, in whole or in part, or alteration of registered plans; and the Board may direct registration of a plan showing a partial cancellation, amendment or alteration, or that a new plan be substituted therefore. When we were bringing into force The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act last year, provision was made that where the land affected by a plan was included in the Metropolitan Area or additional zone, an order made by the Municipal Board would be of no effect unless it was approved by by-law of the Council of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. This meant that while the application might be made to the Board with respect to plans in the Metro Area or the additional zones, the order of the Board had no force or effect until the Metro Council validated by by-law the order of the Board. The purpose, therefore, of the amendment is to provide that, prior to an application being made to the Municipal Board, approval of the application be obtained from the Metro Council. The Board is not required to hear an application unless such application is accompanied by a resolution of the Metro Council approving the application being made to the Board. The amendment therefore, permits the Council to prohibit applications for plans of sub-divisions, cancellations, in whole or in part; amendments or alterations of registered plans to be made to the Municipal Board in case of lands in the Metropolitan Zone, without having first obtained the approval of Metro Council.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee of Supply.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg 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 and after a voice vote declared the motion carried

and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Public Works. Item 1. Administration.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that the Minister didn't see fit to place the report, received last night, before this House for the information of its members. I note that the newspapers had information as to the contents of this particular report as far back as March 4th, 1961, which I believe could be attributed to the so-called Ministry of Propaganda. Now there's a wealth of information in this report and in the short few hours that I had to look at it, I'm satisfied that it completely refutes the allegations of the Minister and the publicity stunts of the government that have been used in the past two years.

I think in order to understand the road program situation in the province we should look back and see what has been done in the past. In doing so, I'll refer to the facts and figures that I find in this report. If we look on the first page of the report, in the Forward, we find the following: "Motor vehicle transportation in the years following World War II increased so rapidly that it outstripped highway facilities designed for safe, efficient and economical operations." This statement is not restricted to the Province of Manitoba alone. You will note further down on the page that the basic techniques used in Manitoba study are similar to those developed by the foundation and services provided in 27 States and the Province of Ontario during the last 14 years. This indicates that the same situation was prevalent across Canada as well as in the States. There are, no doubt, other consulting firms that have been doing the same work. If we look at page 9, and we find a set of tables there, and from these tables we can see that insofar as travel growth is concerned, it was virtually at a standstill from 1930 to 1945; and as far as vehicle growth is concerned, it also was just about stationary from 1930 to 1945. In fact, at times between 1930 and 1945 it had dropped below the level of 1930. The reason for that is given -- the reason why there were very few roads built during that period of 15 years anywhere is because there was no call for them and no need for them. And if you look back on Page 5 again, under the Forward, you find this: "Minimum construction activity during the depression and war had contributed also to the inadequacy of the highway network."

Now I took the trouble of finding out just how many licenses were issued in the Province of Manitoba for cars and trucks in 1950 as compared with 1960; and I find that in 1950, in round figures, there were 42,000 truck licenses issued as compared with 66,000 in 1960, which is approximately a 50 percent increase. In 1950 there were 66,000 passenger car licenses as compared to 213,000 in 1960 -- almost 100 percent increase. Your tourist traffic, in 1950 - 581,000 people entered Manitoba; in 1960, 1,000,260 -- more than double. It was during the fifties that the demand and the necessity for highways was created by the mushrooming of the number of people owning automobiles and trucks and the traffic on our highways.

Now I think Mr. Chairman, that if we look at Page 6 of the same report, on the top of the page we see the following: "The mileage of roads financed by the Provincial Government increased over 3,900 miles in a quarter of a century to reach a total of 5,794 miles in 1959, representing a greatly increased and continuing provincial financial burden. In the 1958-59 fiscal year, about 25 1/2 million was spent on the 3,820 miles of PTH system alone." I'd like the members of the Committee to remember that figure, 25 million, because later on I'll point out that what the government sets as a very large program and something that has not been seen in the province before, for the future 20 years is way below this figure and this level. I'd also like to remind the Committee at this time that the 1958-59 fiscal year was the year in which we made the appropriations for the 1958-59 program; that when this government took over on July 1st, 1958, contracts had already been let; and I'm going to refer to that again a little later on. The next paragraph to that one, we read as follows: "About 39 percent of the existing PTH system is paved" -- and that's back in 1958-59. Now I'd also like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that, prior to the latter years of the '40's and the early '50's, we didn't have neither the techniques nor the construction equipment to do the type of work that we're doing today. Actually, production or the construction of roads throughout Canada started at about the same time as the Campbell Administration took over. I do feel, Sir, that if we take all the facts into consideration, that the Campbell Administration's road program was equal to what this government has to offer us today when

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.).... the demands on our roads are double what they were at that time.

Now the government has taken a two-pronged attack and their publicity program goes this way. The former government failed to live up to its obligations which makes our work harder; and the second one is blowing up their own program to show that their plans are to build more and better roads. Well I think that the facts contained in this report disproves both of those points. The first one, I think, has been pretty well covered and I shall come back to it again. The second one is, what is this government planning to do?

Now if we turn to Page 8 of that report at the bottom -- cross comparisons -- we read as follows: "Expenditures on the PTH system alone in 1958-59, about 25.5 million on 3,820 miles, equalled about \$20 per capita; \$95 per motor vehicle or 1.2 cents per vehicle mile of total travel in Manitoba -- (Interjection) -- \$29 per capita, that's right. If we go to the second column at the top, here we find what this government is planning for tomorrow. "Of the \$418 million required for all capital improvements on the proposed PTH system by 1980, about 45 percent or \$190 million is needed right now to improve nearly 2,900 miles of road and 316 bridges." Now quite a bit of this was made by the Minister in his address yesterday, but let's read on. "This mileage includes 58 percent of the existing roads that failed to meet tolerable conditions which measure the minimum ability of a road system to meet today's traffic needs." In other words, 42 percent of the roads constructed by the Campbell administration do meet today's standards. -- (Interjection) -- That's quite all right. You won't "hooray" when I'm through with this. Forty-two percent, which means in mileages if my figures are correct, 1200 miles of today's roads of the roads built by the Campbell Administration stand up to the standards of today; and of course that's proved by the fact that the increased tonnage has been allowed on these roads.

Now what does that mean though if we follow that argument to its logical conclusion? That means this, that the Campbell Administration in 10 years -- forget about all the other roads that were built, the 5,000 some odd that have been mentioned previously in that report -- 1200 miles of roads in 10 years which is 120 miles per year. All right what does this government intend to do? This government has 2100 miles of new road to build and they are going to build this in a period of 20 years; and if you average it out, they are going to build 105 miles of road per year whereas the previous administration built 120 miles of up to the standards of today's demands, not the demands at the time that they were built. All right then, how does the Minister propose to do more than what the Campbell administration did? If we average out the expenditures for road programs in the Province of Manitoba for the past four years, that'll be the two years that the present government has been in power and the last two years of the Campbell administration, we'll find out that the average spent in those four years is far above what this government intends to spend annually in the next 20 years. Well if the Campbell Administration program was insufficient, how does this government hope to build the kind of roads they are promising the people of this province; the number of miles of roads they are promising the people of this province; if they are going to spend less annually than what was spent in the past. Now they say they're going to do it for \$400 million but if you look at Page 8 you'll find that the committee estimated, and I'll read this: "Over the 20-year period till 1980, it is estimated that the cost would average \$27.2 million annually for ultimate development of 5,400 miles in improved maintenance." Multiply 27.2 by 20 and you get close to 550 million and not the 500 million. In other words, they are going to be 40 percent below the standard that is recommended by this committee, because the standard that this committee represents would require 550 million, not 400 million.

Now the Minister takes objection to my remarks earlier in the Session that the road program here is nebulous. He also took objection to the Leader of the CCF Party saying it was coloured. Well I think that what I have already said shows that it is nebulous and that it is also coloured; but yesterday the Minister told us that they had built 1,000 miles of blacktop and concrete roads. Well they didn't, Mr. Chairman. I think you could use stronger language than that insofar as that statement is concerned because his 1,000 miles includes the roads that were built in the year 1958, and I say to him that in 1958, which was the last year that the former administration was in power, that there were more concrete and blacktop roads built in that year than in any year in the history of the Province of Manitoba; and he can't take

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . . credit for the work that was done that year. --(Interjection)-- The year previous to that was just as good so the election had nothing to do with it. It was just as good.

Now there is one other thing I want to do at this particular time before I sit down, and I would like the Minister to give me an answer if he has one. This article appeared in the Free Press of March 4th, 1961. Right at the very end of the article appeared this particular paragraph: "The Conservative Government in the past has paid for highways out of the Capital Account and not out of the Operating Account. The plan, in future, is reported to call for systematic payments out of the government's Operating Account for highway construction." Now we've often heard from the government, when it was sitting on this side, that we shouldn't be saddling the cost of our highways on today's taxpayer; that it should be spread out over the future; let the generations that are going to make use of those highways help to pay for them. Now I would like to know whether the government has changed its opinion about that type of finance and whether this report is correct and that they are going back to pay-as-you-go policy?

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of embarrassing the government or the Honourable Minister of Public Works, whose estimates for last year and the coming year will be approximately \$30 million for roads, and I don't recall how much since they took office. But I, too, would like to refer to the paper clipping mentioned by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains and I'd like to read a section of it, Mr. Chairman, just to stress a point. The headline: "\$400 Million Road Program - 20 year Plan. The Provincial Government within the next two weeks" -- this is March 4th -- "will lay before the House or Legislature a report that calls for the complete reconstruction of all Manitoba highways over the next 20 years at an estimated cost of \$400 million. This report was drawn up by the Automotive Safety Foundation of Washington, D. C., and has been two years in the making. It will no doubt provide the government with a basis for increase in gasoline taxes, a move that has been speculated upon for at least a year." That's the point I'd like to stress, Sir. So last night we did receive a booklet, Mr. Chairman, late in the evening, called: "Manitoba Highway Planning for Tomorrow," proposing this 20-year road program. That, Sir, I appreciate very much. Out of due respect of the press, Sir, I definitely believe that while this House is in session that such an important news item should have been announced in this House first before it was released to the press; and the government should be chastised for that, for ignoring the members in this Assembly.

True, I understand the government sets its own policy and we have no say in it except to criticize any such program but, nevertheless, such a large sum of money eventually will have to have the consent of this House. Sir, the point I'm trying to stress is this, and I have been previously accused of saying this government is creating false illusions, and to me, Sir, this is a program definitely of false illusion because it has already been publicized and that's what the public remembers; seeing such headlines and really believing that the government is going to go ahead with such a program. Well, Sir, we have definitely no assurance of that, but you can definitely rest assured that they will implement an increase in the gasoline tax to build up a reserve fund for the proposed said purposes. This, apparently, they can do without legislature as they have done in the increased tax on beer, increased hospital fees and increased other government fees, without consulting this House. Prior next election we will have no super-highway construction program but we'll have a gasoline tax which is a means to an end to try and balance their budget and deficit, and solicit of course the public on their good government and management. This is the point I'm trying to get at, Sir. Unless the Minister makes a definite statement, and until such time as this matter is actually voted on in this House, I have no alternative but to suspect this government of their ulterior motive in this publicity scheme. Now, Sir, if our roads are in such a deplorable condition generally, what has the Minister and his department been doing with the large sums of money that they have spent since taking office?

I will just give the Minister one actual piece of highway that I have observed over a period of years. Now, Sir, we'll get back from the abstract to the actual construction of highways. I would be very much interested to hear from the Minister how much money has been spent on Highway 52, on one specific section of it, two miles east of Highway 59, because

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.) . . . looking through this Annual Report for 1959-60, on Page 34, I can see where they spent an amount of money for the construction of two single span bridges over a drainage ditch. Also glancing through this other schedule we received yesterday, I can see where the Minister is going to hardtop that road, spend more money on it. To me, Sir, this would be an absolute waste of money if this particular spot I'm speaking about is not rectified. The point, Sir, I'm trying to make is that the previous government, prior to provincial election, undertook the construction of Highway 52 and this present government inherited this particular spot that I'm speaking about. It is a former creek which bisected the highway and the government, in their wisdom, planned a drainage ditch to divert this creek, but apparently there must be an artesian well in the vicinity because previous governments and the present government must have spent thousands of dollars on this particular section of road. I have reason to travel this road quite extensively and I've seen numerous efforts and endeavours of the engineers trying to rectify this condition. But what do you see now, Sir? There are permanent signs erected to tell you there's a bump on the road. Well, Sir, that bump is gone. There's a ridge now. Not only a ridge, there's a valley deep enough when the car enters, you can't even see the top of it. In fact what I would do, I'd advise the Minister of Industry and Commerce to send a couple of diamond drillers out there because the hole is so deep that probably we would find oil or strike gold and then this highway could be diverted; because Sir, the money that has been spent on that hole, it could have been spanned with golden girders and would have saved the government money. I hope, Sir -- I notice your engineers sitting up on top in the gallery there-- that they themselves study this, the engineers study the super-highways and get to work and either blast a section of road to rock bottom or span it with steel girders and stop wasting their time and the taxpayers' money.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, maybe I should say a few words with respect to this famous Highway 52 and the particular bad spot that has been mentioned by the honourable member who has just spoken. Mr. Chairman, there's about a hundred yards of a bad spot there at the Teulon creek, a spot that I've travelled over many, many times in the last 26 years. But Mr. Chairman, because of that bad spot it is no reason at all why the government should not go ahead and put the mat on this road this year. This road was reconstructed in 1958, and I have before me here the Hansard for July 20th, 1959, and at that time the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Willis, had included in this program an amount of money, not specified, but the program had this: "Highway No. 52, 13.5 miles, Steinbach to PTH No. 59 -- base course and bituminous mat." Now that job was not done in 1959 and when the estimates were presented last year by the present Minister, and when I saw that this job was not included last year I asked the Minister if this job would be postponed again or whether the money that had been appropriated in 1959 would be spent to put the mat in 1960. The Minister told me in the House that because of other projects, especially the Grand Rapids road, that he could not do this job in 1960 but he hoped it would be done next year, that is this year, and I'm very pleased to see that it is included in this year's program. Even though there is a hundred yards of bad spot, and I'm sure that the engineers are looking at that and I understand that they are going to drill holes and put cement down to some 40 or 50 feet to try and fix that hole, but even though that's not completed, I think that the rest of the mileage should be done and I am very glad to see that it is included in the program this year. I would like to thank the Minister and suggest to him that he should proceed as quickly as possible on this road. I am not unaware, Mr. Chairman, that I am not the only one who has been asking for this road. I understand that there have been delegations to the Minister and even to the First Minister, and maybe that I owe the fact that this road is included to the pressure that has been put by the man who was defeated in Carillon, the Conservative candidate in the last election. I do not care, Mr. Chairman, to whom the credit will go if this road is done. It should be done for the welfare of that part of the province. It is the link that would link Steinbach to St. Pierre, Morris and Altona. It's a very important piece of road. The traffic is very heavy on it and the construction on it should not be delayed. I do wish to thank the Minister and the First Minister for the fact that this work is going to be proceeded with this year.

I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Public Works also, the need to reconstruct the road from Morris to La Rochelle - 23 East. Now this also had been promised by the ex-Minister, Mr. Willis, in 1959. It was voted in the House. Money was voted for 23

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.).... East, 17 miles, Morris to La Rochelle corner -- grading, gravelling and structure. This will be the remaining link between the Altona-Steinbach connection. It is a trunk highway now. It is a little narrow -- it was built some while ago. There is a drainage problem there that should be fixed at the same time as the highway is built. I understand that the municipalities that interviewed Mr. Willis in 1958 and '59 were definitely told by Mr. Willis that this would be done in 1959. The money was voted; it was included in the program; and I do not see it in this year's program yet. I would like to ask the Minister to reconsider if possible, this important road from Morris to La Rochelle to 59 Highway, in view of the fact that the Department of Public Works will have to spend money on drainage this year in order to save the crops of these farmers along that highway. The highway acts as a barrier there and the drainage is very poor and there was some blowing this winter also there which has plugged up the ditch alongside the highway quite a bit, to quite an extent. This is a most important road and I would like to see it constructed this year if at all possible. So I humbly ask the Minister to look at this possibility again to see whether it could not be included in the road program.

Now I was sorry that I was not here last night. I understand that the Minister has spoken about the back-log, implying that the job done by the previous government was very poor with respect to highways. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, I think, has brought out the real fact, the truth, that the traffic in the 50's was not what it is today. We didn't have the income at that time from gasoline and from automobile licenses that your government has at the present time, and we were building roads adequate for that time. The best proof of it was the fact that when this government came into office it immediately increased the weights allowable on these highways, so that after all, times are changing from day to day and from year to year. Maybe in ten years' time the roads that the Minister is building now will not be considered adequate and maybe his successor will believe that there is a back-log of construction; and this will go on indefinitely as it has gone on in the past. We should not be too quick at throwing stones because we are all living in glass houses to a certain extent.

I think that I, before sitting down, should again thank the Minister for having decided to hard-surface this 52 Highway this year. I know that the people of Steinbach and St. Pierre and Morris and Altona will be very happy that this work is being proceeded with. I would like to thank the Minister for the road he built last year in Carillon; the St. Pierre-Grunthal-Sarto road. It's a good road; it touches my own property there in a certain spot; and it has helped in the drainage this spring and I'm very happy about that. It's helping many people down there and I hope this road will be developed too and that, in fact, this being an access road to Grunthal from St. Pierre and to Sarto, that it will not delay the project of building No. 23 Highway straight east from Morris to 59 and straight to No. 12 as soon as possible. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. M. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, a good case has already been made by those who have spoken in connection with the road situation everywhere, so I'm not going to add anything to it. I just want to record that I'm very delighted personally, and I think many people are of the same opinion, that a City Hall will be constructed or built on the same location as the present City Hall is. There is a district somewhere between Portage and the city limits north that would entirely lose not only their property but their earnings. The buildings will not be rebuilt; will not be improved; and the business as it is, it's going down -- most of it goes to Portage Avenue and they're also entitled to it -- but at the same time there are hundreds of merchants and others who have businesses, as I said between Portage and the city limits, who would be out of business in no time if the City Hall would be built either on the university site location or anywhere else. Another reason is that there are a number of buildings in that district which should have been condemned long ago, or rebuilt or remodelled. No one is going to do it. Now when the City Hall is going to be built there, not only will it improve the appearance and the district, the buildings will either be remodelled or rebuilt; the front windows will be modernized; and hundreds and hundreds of merchants, who would probably otherwise be out of business the same as they were years ago during the depression years when they couldn't even pay the rent and they were there on a percentage basis -- the landlord collected the rent on a percentage basis -- if they took in \$100, they probably got a dollar or two or three for the rent. So I don't think that anybody should be sorry for the City

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . . Hall location being taken away from here or from any other location which some of the experts recommended. I think I know the situation as good as any expert, and I'm giving the advice to the House, without any remuneration, that no one should cry over the fact that the City Hall will remain where it is. They could put up a new building; they could put up an office building and they could probably do away with the dilapidated homes or buildings down there which are old and probably some not safe. They were just waiting to remodel it; waiting for the City Council to decide definitely that the City Hall is going to remain there where it was built years and years ago. So I say, I want to record this and also the fact that I have advocated that the City Hall remain where it is, with improvements, for years and years.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I just wish that I could get up and commend the government like the Member for Carillon did. Certainly no one enjoys criticizing the government, and I would much rather commend them. Needless to say, I am very much disappointed in the program that was introduced last night to the Committee because it doesn't give any improvements to any of the highways in my constituency. I had hoped that the government would see fit to do some hard-surfacing on Highway 32. After all, it was built some three or four years ago and it's deteriorating badly. If it isn't hard-surfaced in the reasonable foreseeable future, then the whole road will have to be re-done. I was travelling over it on Monday and there were a lot of potholes; so many that you couldn't avoid hitting them going along the road. Then also I had hoped that something would be done on Highway 14A. It needs shoulders very badly. When it was constructed originally, it got a very poor job of hard-surfacing so that it's bumpy all the way from Rosenfeld Corner to Altona. After that it's a little better, but something needs to be done and it should be done as soon as possible before these roads get too much out of condition.

In looking at the road program and also taking into consideration what was allocated last year toward roads and what is being done up in the north country, naturally we are getting assistance from Ottawa toward these natural resources' roads, but still I feel that it is more important to develop the roads in the southern part of the province which is the part of the province that has been developed and where we have a density of population and where our people need better roads. Surely the people that have developed our province are entitled to better roads and should have priority to the tourists that come in and like to travel up north. Then also, in the southern part of the province, we're developing secondary industries; we're growing special crops; we've set up canneries; these industries need and require better roads so that when the season comes that the produce has to be delivered, that we have roads that we can travel on.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): May I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. CORBETT: Are you intimating that all us citizens in the northern parts are second-class citizens?

MR. FROESE: Certainly not. But right now I think the citizens in the southern portion are made second-class citizens, because that's where we have the density of population and that's where some of this money should be spent on. There's nothing going to be spent on any of the highways for capital purposes in my constituency and surely we deserve some of the work and some of the improvements.

I notice from the estimates that money is going to be made available towards the re-acquisition of the Broadway site and that money is going to be available for that. Also, that they are going to develop natural resources, that there is going to be a further program of developing the natural resources' road up north. Surely something should be diverted to the southern part of the province to improve the roads out there. I would like to ask the Minister to reconsider this request and that he might be able to see his way clear so that still something could be done towards Highway 32 at least, because I think the road, if it's left in this way, will deteriorate to such a condition that it will be much more costly to have it done if we're not doing it in a reasonably short time.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I feel that I should probably make some comment on the remarks which have been made by some of the honourable members. The statement which we heard from the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains was most interesting and I must

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.)....say, to me, quite enlightening, because I didn't think it was possible by the greatest magician or the keenest mathematician to prove that his regime spent more on highways than we have. I don't think that we can accept that as a fact.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I didn't say what you had spent, what you intend to spend; and it takes no magic to get those figures.

MR. THOMPSON: No, it takes no magic but we can read them in the book, and I will do that.

Now first of all, I want to make comment on the fact that you mentioned when quoting from Page 5 of the report: "That motor vehicle transportation in the years following World War II increased so rapidly that it outstripped highway facilities designed for safe, efficient and economical operation." Now I want to point out that that was in -- the period referred to here was commenced in 1945. That's some years ago. It is quite true, and I certainly accept the comments of the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains when he says that the depression and the years of war curtailed activity in highway construction. We accept that as a fact. But it's the period following the readjustment, and even allowing a few years following the end of the Second World War when advances and increases did take place in the use of highways and in the number of motor vehicles using the roads, it was then, that we say, that certain greater steps and more extended effort than did take place should have been launched by the former government. Now you refer to the fact that we find here, that between 1950 and 1960 the number of vehicle miles, I think it is -- I think that's what you were using -- the vehicle miles -- the use of our roads had doubled. But I want to point out that that great change didn't take place overnight. It didn't jump in a single day or a single year. It was a gradual and continuous change. From the period '50 on, there was an upward trend in the use of highways and in the demand for greater roads. Certainly while my honourable friend, and no doubt some who think like him and certainly his colleagues in the Legislature, well they may feel that the record of the former government on highway construction was adequate to meet the need, but I think we have had the decision from and the opinion of the vast majority of Manitobans who felt that that was not the case.

Now in connection with the expenditure, the highest expenditure under the former administration and the proposed expenditure in the report, I want to point out that while it calls for \$27.2 million in annual expenditure that this, of course -- I believe my honourable friend may be aware of this -- does not include the municipal grants and work on secondary roads and 100 percent roads, and highway routes in the City of Winnipeg; so that we could add to that possibly another -- well we can't estimate, but it could be at least 35, perhaps \$36 million per annum. I do want to point out on Page 33 where these figures are given, according to the investigation-- and I pointed out last night that it was quite a thorough one and I think my honourable friends would agree with that after studying the book -- the investigation says that "this exceeds" -- that is the proposed expenditure in the report on highways in the coming years -- "Exceeds the annual average amounts spent from '54 to '59 by \$8 million." That is, it exceeds the annual average amounts spent in those years by \$8 million; and from '49 to '59, that is including the five years still previous, "it exceeds the annual expenditure from '49 to '59 by \$12 million." So that is the opinion of the Planning and Design Division and of the authors of the Report, that this calls for a greater annual average expenditure by those figures than the expenditures which were made in the year previous.

Now in connection with the Honourable Member for East Kildonan, I gather that he thinks we should hurry up and complete the defective part on Highway 52, but I was amazed to hear him say that we should not be spending money on hard-surfacing that road. I felt that when he wanted us to complete the defects in the road, which is due to underground moisture, that he wants us to improve the road as an all-weather and dust-free highway; and that is certainly what we propose to do as the road program for the year which has been tabled indicates. I certainly cannot attempt to agree with him, at this stage, that we should put in steel girders or bridge this 100 feet or more where the defect in the road exists. I might say that we have had, as the Honourable Member for Carillon mentioned, we have had considerable trouble with that one small section of the highway because the water continues to rise from the underground and affects the roadbed; and the roadbed, since it was constructed, has sunk several feet, so that there is a problem there and our engineers have been making several tests and trying

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.)....several experiments and endeavouring to pipe the water up to the surface and take it away by sand pipe, if you might call it that. It's a sort of a sand filter arrangement. That is the latest effort and I will get the figure -- I don't think I have the figure with me on the actual amount of money expended on that particular location, but I certainly will get it for you. However, I think that what has been done there is certainly worthwhile and that section of the road must be corrected and improved in keeping with the rest of the highway.

I do want to say, in connection with the comments of the Honourable Member for Carillon, that as he pointed out, Highway 52, as we've mentioned, is included in the program. The road from Morris to La Rochelle has not been included and it has, I must say, suffered the fate of some of the other roads which we hoped to reach in due course, such as some roads in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fisher and in other places. In fact, I don't suppose there's a riding in the province where we haven't some new roads to build and where somebody would like those roads built, and no doubt they should be done; but this road which my honourable friend from Carillon mentions is one which is not on our program and I don't want to make any commitment. I was tripped up last night on making a promise which I believed in at the time. I felt that that would be done this year but it's not to be, and I don't want to make any promise or commitment when we might include it, but certainly it's being considered for inclusion in some program. Just when it will be done I'm not able to say.

Now the Honourable Member for Rhineland has mentioned Highway 14A and Highway 32 and has asked that we consider the correction or reconstruction or improvement of parts of those highways. I understand that there are conditions which require some improvement on those roads and I can accept his suggestion that the matter be given consideration, but here again I'm not able to make any promise on what the outcome will be and the timing of reconstruction.

Now while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, and I see the Leader of the Opposition in his place, I want to say a word or two in connection with his reference to our system of financing which he referred to last evening. I simply want to remind the House that he pointed out that when we assumed office we had monies available, and we had certain carry-overs of cash he suggested at the end of the first fiscal year in which we were in office, and he wonders to what use these carry-overs were put. Is that basically what you're referring to? I'll give my statement. I think it answers you fairly completely. I think I can say that we do not disagree to any extent with the figures which you produced last evening. There are some items, I am told, which should not have been included in the figures, which could cause some difference in the results that you might be trying to establish. The figures to which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition refers to are cash-flow figures, as shown in our Public Accounts. I think everyone will be familiar with that term. Cash-flow simply means the actual cash expenditure which has been made at a given date to any payee. That is, these are actual payments out of the funds of the government. The expenditure which my honourable friend quoted did not take into consideration money owing on contracts which were completed or under way or money committed on new work. I think he agreed to that but wanted to know how much uncommitted money there might be. At the end of March, 1959, the total of commitments against contracts respecting which there had been no cash-flow, that is no payment out, was \$5,700,000. \$1.4 million of this amount was a commitment against a \$33 million vote which was passed in the fall session of 1958. Now then, before any further monies were voted by the Legislature, that is before August of '59 because we did not have any further vote, we had awarded work during the interval from April to August to the amount of \$26,600,000. All of this work, which was committed or commenced, was financed from the \$33 million voted in the fall session of '58. Then my honourable friend went on further and referred to the year end of '59-60, a year ago, and I want to point out and remind the House that in the July session of '59 we voted an additional \$19,381,500. The actual cash paid out in the '59-60 fiscal year amounted to \$28,789,057. This left an unexpended balance authorization of \$27,903,000. Against this figure, and this is the second question which my honourable friend asked, against this figure at the end of March, 1960, we had an outstanding commitment to the value of \$11,500,000. I believe that answers the questions which my honourable friend asked.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate getting those figures on the record.

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . They are what I wanted to get and I can look them over in the Hansard at some future time. I would just like to make the point at this time to re-emphasize what I was saying before, that when we, on this side of the House had been arguing in the fall of 1958 that the \$33 million which the Minister then insisted was necessary to be voted, which we thought and I still think largely for propaganda purposes, was unnecessary because there was already enough appropriation to carry over until the spring session. That was the fact. That has turned out to be the fact. My honourable friend says, quite properly now, that some of that was used because, as a matter of fact, we didn't vote further supply to this department for trunk highways at the spring session or winter session of 1959. But my point is that we could have had a session. It could have been held. It would usually have been held -- there was the school vote of course and that was a reason that the government can quite properly give for not holding it -- but it could have been held. If it had been held at the usual time, then there was an opportunity at that time to vote further money; so that it still comes down to the fact that that \$33 million was not needed and that's the point that I'm wanting to make. You have to wait a year or two to prove these things though. We had to wait to prove this, but the figures, that my honourable friend has just put on the record now, show that that is the fact. It's true, what he says, that we didn't vote for the supply at the early 1959 session but we could have had an earlier session; we could have voted supply; consequently, that \$33 million in the fall was not needed.

Perhaps this would be a good time, Mr. Chairman, particularly because I see that the Honourable Member for Swan River is in his seat -- and he usually is in his seat, I'll say that -- as well as the Minister, this might be a good time for us to revive another discussion and that is with regard to the famous "Hundred Mile Road." -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and the auto-ski trip. Now last year when we were debating this subject, in March of last year, the Honourable Member for Swan River endeavoured to show us that that road was in good shape; it was almost done; and the Honourable the Minister came to his assistance to read onto the record the sections that were completed and the ones very nearly completed, to bolster the claim of the Honourable Member for Swan River. Now I would like to read from what the report of the department for the year ending March 31st, 1960, says about this. I suppose that's the authoritative answer when all's said and done because here's the record, and in spite of the fact that it was in March that we were talking about this last year and my two honourable friends were trying to continue the fiction that this road, if not done was almost done. Here's what the department report says. I'm not reading all of the paragraph but if anybody wishes me to I don't mind reading it back in context. I don't think this is being taken out of context. "One of the more important projects, however" -- well I'd better go back to the first of the paragraph. "Although the construction of other provincial trunk highways is more important to the population of the province as a whole, and while expenditures on these highways are by far the greatest, an examination of highway by highway would, except in a few particular cases, be unimpressive. One of the more important projects, however, was the endeavour to grade and gravel provincial trunk highway No. 10 from Mafeking to The Pas, a distance of approximately 100 miles. This 100-mile portion was divided into seven sections for construction purposes. Although only two of these sections were fully completed, a total of approximately 68 miles of the 100 were completed in spite of adverse weather conditions." So the report of the Chief Engineer, incorporated in the Annual Report of this Department, I suppose can be taken as the final word on that subject -- well maybe not the final word because my honourable friend from Swan River will likely say something -- that it can be taken as the authoritative statement, I would expect, and it says that 68 miles out of the 102 miles were completed. So the bet being what it was, it would look as though the former member for that district up there, who was rash enough to make a bet, would have to auto-ski over 18 miles because that's the amount over 50; whereas the Honourable Lieutenant-Governor would have to auto-ski over 32 miles. So whenever that event is put on, it would be interesting for the Honourable Member for Swan River to arrange for some of us to be there to witness it. And then the Honourable Member for Swan River said that he thought it could be done and would be done and he would be willing to make a small bet on it. I don't remember that he ever made it, but whatever it was we'd be glad to hear whether he paid it.

MR. CORBETT: I appreciate very much, and it's rather a compliment to me, Mr.

(Mr. Corbett, cont'd.).... Chairman, that the Leader of the Opposition considers my remarks worthy of remembering. I must say that there's a certain amount of national -- I wouldn't say national but local pride in our country, and we do not come down here with the idea of minimizing our faults. We try to magnify our merits rather than our faults. If I was guilty of some slight local patriotism and admitted that the road was not completed, but I still say the report says 68 miles of the road were completed. All the rest of it was under construction. There was a lot of work done on that road while it was not completed. It was completed this summer I'm glad to say but, in my opinion, the actual work remaining to complete it was in the neighbourhood of 15 percent, I think, as I mentioned at the time.

I must say that I listened to the Honourable Member for Rhineland today who complained rather bitterly about the noble pioneers who settled the southern part of the province. I did not get the exact boundaries or what township runs across the province where the noble southern pioneers divided from the tourist-hunting northerners, but I'm quite sure that, as I say, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will -- if I erred, it was only on the modest side in saying that there was less than 15 percent. Actually, the amount of work to be done was less than 15 percent while there were certain parts of the road that was not finished. Now don't you start growling at me.

I won't take up any more of the time of the committee beyond saying that the road is completed now and was in excellent shape for the biggest part of the summer. Whoever provides the weather -- I could not blame it on the Lord altogether -- but the weather in 1959 was not the most pleasant and suitable for road-building, which hampered us. If we had been fortunate enough to have the same season in 1959 as we had in 1960, we would have completed that road. I think this wonderful piece of road to Grand Rapids, which has been one of the features that is admired all through western Canada, they would have had probably a little difficulty in building that road if the '60 season had been as unfavourable as the 1959. I certainly appreciate that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition honours me by remembering certain haphazard words I used in the last session.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would like to say to my honourable friend from Swan River that it's no compliment at all that I'm doing him because when the matter was before the House, the then Minister of Public Works based his estimates and I suppose his bet very largely on the opinion of my honourable friend. At that time he put on the record a glowing tribute to my honourable friend saying that he was one of the best road-builders that they'd ever had in the north; and that's a tribute and a statement with which I agree. I think that the Honourable Member for Swan River deserves that tribute because I know something of his work up there, too, and I'm not trying to pay him a compliment; I'm only trying to be realistic. The fact is that he is a pioneer of the development of that country up there and I go along with the former Minister in saying that I'd value his opinion as much as any expert, on general rough and tumble getting the job done in the best and cheapest way possible. So I wasn't trying to be complimentary. It's a fact that I don't mind admitting. But the question of the weather, it was on that basis that our former friend from Flin Flon made his bet because he pointed out that this was a hazardous venture because of the fact that the weather did impede construction in this province quite frequently. However, I want to say only that I am not trying to have my tongue in my cheek at all when I say that it's no compliment that I'm paying to the Honourable Member for Swan River. He deserves a cordial thanks of former governments for the work that he did in the north country. He was one of the best on his job that I ever knew of and even if he did, in the exuberance of his enthusiasm for the great north, even if he did lead the present government and the former member a little bit astray, I'm not trying to detract from the great work that he did years ago. He's kind of got into bad company in recent years and that likely has just marred his judgment a wee bit.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, the Honourable Minister in replying to my statements drew our attention to Page 33 and pointed out that the cost of building roads, the average annual costs, would exceed eight millions the cost of '54 to '59. Well that may be true, but that's no answer to my criticism. In the first place, the increased costs per mile are considerably higher and that's to be taken into account. Also, the fact that the type of road that the traffic will demand in the next 20 years, the standard has to be improved. There's no doubt about that, and that the cost per mile will be higher there too,

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . . . so the actual spending per mile is, we could say, about the same insofar as the number of miles to be constructed. But there is another point that the Honourable Minister should have his attention drawn to, and that is that the mileage that they built in the past two years of black-top and concrete, these were built on grades that were mostly prepared by the former government. All they had to do was go and lay their blacktop on it. Then there's still another point. I had occasion to look at this little program here which was handed to us yesterday and I totalled out the miles of concrete and blacktop this government intends to do in the coming year, and if my figures are correct, the total miles are 190 miles. Well if my memory serves me right, in the last two years of the Campbell Administration, the average for the year was just around 300 miles per year. Now if this coming year's program is an indication, Mr. Chairman, of what this government intends to do in the next 20 years, they're actually going to do 40 percent less every year than we did in the last two years of our administration. Well, it's right there. It's no laughing matter; it's a serious matter. To the government in the government front benches, they think it's a laughing matter when they try to pull the wool over the public's eyes and try to get away with it. Well, they're not going to get away with it and it's not a laughing matter.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, is my honourable friend admitting that we'll be here for the next 20 years?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well, I don't know but the Honourable Minister made the statement not so very long ago that the life expectancy of the road, No. 4, between Gladstone and Neepawa was 15 years; and if that is true, at the rate that they intend to build in the coming year, in 1980 the roads will be worse than they were in 1958 insofar as the demands of the travelling public will be concerned. You're going backwards; you're not going ahead.

MR. THOMPSON: Could I correct that statement about No. 4 Highway? I remember the Honourable the First Minister quoting it earlier in the session, that is the reference to remarks made at Neepawa. The road won't have to be built in the next 15 to 20 years. It'll have to be resurfaced. There'll be no need to reconstruct the entire highway. It's simply the surface of the road which probably will have to be re-laid in that period of time.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, a matter I'd like to bring to the attention of the committee is the deplorable situation of No. 6 Highway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a whole section here on highway planning and highway design. I was wondering whether we could get rid of the administration end of it and then proceed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I would be quite prepared to do that except that, prior to the changing of the sitting from tomorrow night to tonight, I was committed to another-to be away -- so I won't be here in all likelihood for that item so I prefer to speak on it now if you don't mind.

North of St. Laurent the highway is just disintegrating because of lack of attention for the last three years. Well, the First Minister is smirking but he made a firm promise to the Stiglunes Council, in my presence three years ago, and he hasn't lived up to it. In Ashern, before the Reeve and his entire council, he promised them that the No. 6 would be fixed up the way it should be and he would take immediate action; and the entire council is there to support me because he made it in the Ashern Hotel. -- (Interjection)-- You don't? You've got a policy; you ask for it and I'll promise it. He knows very well he made the statement and he made a lot of other promises. In the campaign before the last election many of the front benchers who were up there promised faithfully to the public at all meetings that the road work on No. 6 Highway would be finished. And there isn't. . . . .

HON. G. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): I never made any such statement.

MR. ROBLIN: He just makes it up.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Makes it up! You just like to think that. The people up there will know what was said.

A MEMBER: Are you going to tell them?

MR. GUTTORMSON: They don't have to be told. They can see the road today. More than \$2 million has been spent on the road between Gypsumville and Grand Rapids; and nothing has been spent, other than for patching, south of Gypsumville. The First Minister said in his election speeches, "when we get into office there'll be no more patching." Why,

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . . this province has never seen so much patching. It looks like a patchwork quilt with the program that is underway now -- (Interjection) -- Good roads he says. -- (Interjection) -- Well maybe not, in the opinion of the Attorney-General, but a lot of people will find room to disagree with him because the engineers tell me, and I stake a lot more in what they say than in what the Attorney-General says, that the road bed on No. 6 is certainly a good one for the traffic it was designed for, but where they fall down is there's no bituminous mat on it. Well, he asked what traffic it was designed for. The committee would be interested to know that permits have been issued for 100,000 pounds on that road; and there are very few roads in the Province of Manitoba, including the ones that are being built by the present government, that will stand 100,000 pounds.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Honourable Member for St. George, wasn't that road built by the Coalition Government so that they could both be charged for the responsibility of it?

MR. CAMPBELL: Built by the Coalition Government at the time that my honourable friend's party was in office.

MR. ROBLIN: No, we weren't in office. Let me assure my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, that we are all in it together.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I must rise on that point. My group weren't in the coalition long enough to build a road.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, this coming summer with the road open to Grand Rapids the traffic will be doubled and possibly trebled on No. 6 Highway. Unless something is done, they are going to discourage people from going into the north country for all time unless immediate action is taken, because the road now is just like a cow pasture with the heavy traffic that has been going over it -- potholes all over it. North of St. Laurent the road, after it was surfaced an oil coating was put on it. For two years -- since 1950 a steady program of hard-surfacing has been continued on No. 6 Highway, but after the change of government, no hard-surfacing has been done on No. 6 at all. In the program this year promised by the First Minister, there is no mention of anything for No. 6 at all this year. There is a promise; the First Minister told the Council, "We'll do it". -- (Interjection) -- Ask the Council then, if you don't believe me.

MR. ROBLIN: I was there myself.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Obviously he says a lot and doesn't know what he's talking about.

MR. ROBLIN: That's right. I know what I said.

MR. GUTTORMSON: No you don't.

MR. ROBLIN: I certainly do. -- (Interjection) --

MR. GUTTORMSON: Truckers in the area are paying as high as \$1,400 a year for licence fees and to me it's most unfair that they have to travel on a road in the condition that No. 6 is today, so I would like to know why there's no work been done on No. 6. The program on No. 6 stopped after the change of government. We had a steady program of hard-surfacing for years. No road is going to stand up to the heavy traffic without hard surface. As I said, the loads are out of this world. We have knowledge of trucks going up with 100,000 pounds and the road is just disintegrating to nothing.

Another road, as the Member for Fisher said yesterday, is the No. 68 Highway. This road is also deteriorating very rapidly. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I haven't seen any sign of your roads either that are any good. -- (Interjection) -- And nothing has been done on this road for a number of years. When the Minister replies later on, I'd like him to answer on what conditions the contract for the road between Gypsumville and Grand Rapids call for regarding trimming? I haven't had the opportunity to travel to Grand Rapids but people who do, tell me that the trimming has not been done, and I'm wondering did the contract call for trimming along that 112 miles? Another thing I would like him to answer is, why did MacNamara pull out of the job last fall, and why did the government have to hire another contractor to go in and complete the work that was required by the MacNamara contract?

With the opening of the north, I think it's also imperative that the government give consideration to the construction of a bridge across the Narrows Ferry. As it is now, people have to rely on the ferry, and this certainly isn't satisfactory for heavy traffic and, as I say, with the opening of the north there's a lot of people in the western part of the province desirous

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . . of going north, and in the winter months there's no means at all except by travelling on the ice, and many people are rather hesitant about doing it.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I just should make a comment in connection with a statement of the honourable member. No. 6 Highway, we are advised, should not be rebuilt at the present time due to the extremely continuous flow of traffic going to Grand Rapids and the possibility of a new venture in the Gypsumville area which will require much traffic movement in that area. We realize that it will be a heavy maintenance problem this summer, but the feeling is that the economics of the situation would justify a heavy maintenance expenditure on that road until a normal condition is reached again and we can commence reconstruction of the parts that need reconstruction.

Now, when my honourable friend says we have done nothing on No. 6 Highway, we have, as he mentioned -- (Interjection) -- Oh, no hard-surfacing -- I was going to say we added 112 miles to the highway, which is quite a considerable effort. Now regarding the trimming, I would think offhand, although I'll get a definite answer, I would think that the contract would include trimming and that that will be completed. The MacNamara firm discontinued operations late last fall, I think it was, in December, because we had a difference of opinion with them on the terms of the contract regarding rock excavation, and we were negotiating for prices that the unit price set out in the contract, and they felt they had a different view on the actual terms respecting rock excavation as compared to ordinary common excavation, and we have since been negotiating and settling the matter although there's no definite settlement at the moment. However, when they pulled off the job we, of course, under the terms of the bonded contract we got in another firm to complete it, to finish the work. There was very little actually left in mileage to be completed when they left, and that work has progressed favourably since.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) - passed.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a few words. I don't think I'll offer a lot of criticism. I'll leave the work to members who are more qualified. I only criticize when I'm really prodded and I get mad a little. I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for some consideration he has given the people of my constituency, because I notice that it's his intention to construct some 14 miles of new road on the Morden-Sprague and also to improve about 14 miles on the existing road on the Morden-Sprague, also on 12, but there's still 14 miles of the Morden-Sprague from Sundown east to Piney which requires construction. In 1958 the former government promised the people in that constituency that Morden-Sprague would be completed by the end of 1961, and I had occasion to speak to the former Minister of Public Works and I drew his attention to this, and all he told me at that time, "Well," he says, "What do you expect? We're a better government. We'll do better than that." But I noticed that we'll be about 14 miles behind. And I hope that the Minister includes this last bit of the Morden-Sprague in his 1962 program because I'm sure that the people would like to have that done. I notice that there isn't any black surfacing recommended for this year in my constituency at all. I'd like to see some black surfacing in 1962. I realize it's too late for this year. Some black surfacing on the 59 to the border, from St. Malo to the border, also on the Morden-Sprague to start from Letellier east, and also there's a small section to be completed on No. 12 from South Junction to Middlebro.

I notice there's no mention made of access roads and I can't find it anywhere in the estimates. Would this be the proper time to speak about them? I have several access roads. In fact some have been promised but not constructed. Some have been surveyed. Also nothing has been done for one especially surveyed in 1958 -- everything ready but it's not been done. That's the one through Ridgeville. There's also the access road that was supposed to have been constructed last year from No. 12 into Sprague. That road is a very dangerous road right now especially at the bridge where it crosses the creek. I'd like to see that constructed. Also the road to St. Joseph; they have been clamouring for that road for four or five years. I can't say that it was promised to the people, but I think the road should be constructed. One to Wampum, Gardenton -- all these are access roads. I'd like the Minister to give us the program for this coming summer on the construction intended for 1961. We had such a program last year because we had a list from the Minister showing the roads that were to be constructed in 1960. There's no mention

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . . made of the bridge at Stuartburn; that's on the Morden-Sprague. That's within the construction area for this year. I wonder if the Minister has any information on that -- the bridge at Stuartburn on the Roseau River. One point I'd like to bring up . . . .

MR. THOMPSON: What does it say on that road? What does the item read? Have you got it?

MR. TANCHAK: Morden-Sprague.

MR. THOMPSON: What does it say?

MR. TANCHAK: On the Morden-Sprague?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. TANCHAK: 59 east on the Morden Sprague. It's 59 -- it's in miscellaneous. It says: Provincial Trunk Highway No. 59 southeast on Morden-Sprague.

MR. THOMPSON: I presume that's the one from Morden-Sprague through Stuartburn, isn't it?

MR. TANCHAK: And there's a bridge there about two miles from 59.

MR. THOMPSON: Give them the nature of the work.

MR. TANCHAK: Grading, gravelling and structure -- the bridge. I kind of thought it might include the bridge but I wasn't too sure. We know that the people in my area have been asking to have Morden-Sprague designated as a highway. The Chamber of Commerce and the Eastern Development Board, they've all asked for that. I don't happen to see any mention of that made at all. I'd like to know what the intention of the government is. Although we are about a year behind, as I said we expected to have it done by 1961; that was the promise, and also the former Minister promised me that he will do better, but I will say that even for a Conservative Government they're not too far behind, just a year behind if they have it finished in 1962. -- (Interjection) -- Not too bad, I would say, even for a Conservative Government.

I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to a promise made -- I wasn't at that meeting -- by the Honourable the First Minister to the people of St. Jean. He seemed to think that the people of St. Jean didn't have a proper access road and they were entitled to one, and the government, the new government if elected was going to give them a proper access road. They seemed to think that that promise was unfulfilled. I would like the Minister to look into that. I thank you.

..... continued on next page

MR. J.M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, mention was made by the Honourable Member for St. George regarding a heading on which I don't think the Minister gave a complete explanation and that was the fact that there was a dispute between a contractor and the province. Now the Minister just said that the contractor, MacNamara Construction Company who was obligated or had contracted to build some work or do some work on a 33-mile stretch and had backed out because of the dispute over the interpretation of the terms and specifications. Now my question is this, Sir. Can any contractor once an agreement is made with the government back out of its obligations at any time? (Interjection) They can do that? I mean is there a loophole in an agreement of that kind with a contractor that is building anything in the province can actually back out if he finds that he can't fulfill it or else he figures that he wants more money, because in this case it appears that it's going to cost the province, according to the experts in your department, for that particular road, between a half million and million dollars more. Now I'm just wondering whether this is the policy or is there a loophole in a condition of that kind where contractors can back out of an agreement made to build a certain project; because if it's so it's something I have never known that a contractor can do that in the first place; and second, is it true that this road will cost an additional half million to a hundred thousand dollars to build? The 33-mile stretch.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. Of course any contractor can back out of a contract. He'll suffer the consequences, but you can't force a man to stay on the job. (Interjection) Oh yes, there's a bond. The Bond Company had to finish the job. The Bond Company finished the job and we called on them and notified them when that firm left. But regarding increased cost, it's not necessarily because they quit, because all our bidding is done on unit prices, that is so much a cubic yard for common excavation, so much for rock excavation, and here the estimate on rock excavation was much less than it actually turned out to be. There was quite a rocky ridge in the area and there was much more rock so that will cost more because it's higher than the estimate quantity; but the question of course in connection with the firm arrives over what price should be paid, and we naturally felt that it should be the price quoted for rock in the contract. I don't think it would be necessary to make any further statement on that. We're negotiating with them and endeavouring to get a settlement fair to both -- (Interjection) -- no with this company. We're negotiating with them to settle as far as money is concerned.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item, since the Honourable Minister has accepted to reconsider my request I would like to extend to him and also to the First Minister an invitation to come down to my riding and I will show the honourable gentlemen around and treat them to the best of hospitality that we can muster.

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

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item, the Honourable Member for Swan River -- I'm sorry he's not in his seat -- I understood him to say earlier today that the road was now complete and finished; that fine controversial piece of skiing road. Well I'm a little surprised because every morning I hear on the radio on CBC on the road report that there's a 12-mile section which is impassable and that people have to detour on the old road. So I don't quite understand which one is correct here, whether the Member for Swan River is correct and possibly the Minister can clear up this item for us.

MR. THOMPSON: As I understand it the road is complete. I think there's some gravelling going on at the present time. I'll have to bring you right up-to-date on that -- you've got me a bit confused with these two conflicting reports. I'll endeavour to get the information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) - passed.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I want to confine my remarks to the item in Highways Branch but at this point I want to ask the Minister where the copy is of the schedule of access roads? Does the Minister have a copy?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, I'll give you that information when we get to highways.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I presume I'll get -- will I have a reply to my Order for Return on access roads when we reach highways?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, that was tabled this afternoon.

MR. MOLGAT: Well the order I received, Mr. Chairman, was one with regard to the Norquay Building. I didn't receive anything with regards to my questions on access roads.

MR. THOMPSON: I'll check on that.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, while we're still on the item 1. (a) I believe the auto fleet comes at this time does it not, under Administration; the fleet of cars for the Provincial Government? Is this the time when the Minister wishes to discuss it? What has been the policy of the department insofar as the new type of cars that have come out, the compact cars? Is there an established policy now as to purchasing either that or standard cars and what about the imported cars, European cars? What is the policy of the department on that matter?

MR. THOMPSON: I think my honourable friend is aware of the fact that we ask for quotations on cars. Compact cars have been used. I think the return filed gives you pretty complete information; it gives all the cars which we purchased this last year. Did you refer to imported cars? I think you mentioned imported cars. We haven't been buying, to my knowledge any of those, I don't think. (Interjection) There are a few, there have been a few, but the majority of the cars are not imported cars. The compact cars have been tried out in many cases and have been used to some extent, but I don't think I can give you any more detail than the complete list which you have in front of you of every car that was bought and where it was purchased and the model and make. You have that information.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we just received the return this afternoon. I frankly haven't had a chance to read it. I wasn't so much interested in the individual details of each car. What I was wondering is exactly what is the policy of the department with regards to the purchase of cars? Are they going to change it over to compact cars or are they going to stay with standard cars or what exactly is the policy? When do you purchase a compact car and when do you purchase a standard car? What is it?

MR. ROBLIN: I'd like to just say a word on that, Mr. Chairman, because this is something that the Treasury Board does consider. By and large our plan is an . . . . . one; that is we buy the car to fit the job and if it's a job which it seems can reasonably be satisfied with the purchase of a compact car, and many of them are, we have been buying more and more compacts for that reason. The difference in price to us is rather small because of the tax implications which my honourable friend will be aware of, and the trade-in policy of every two years or thereabouts which has been adopted for some time now on cars makes it sort of a marginal proposition financially except insofar as operational expenses are concerned and they might be marginally lower. It's been an experimental one; we've tried out the compacts and mostly they've been very satisfactory, and my opinion is that we'll be buying more and more of them as we trade in the standard ones and as time goes by.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I thank the First Minister for the information. I gather then that this time there's no firm policy on compacts. Now did I understand him correctly that they are keeping track of the costs of the operation of compacts as against standards to see whether there will be economies to be effected in the operation of the cars; is that correct? I presume that they will not have any firm information on that at this stage as the compacts after all have been fairly new and next year we can look forward to possibly more information in this regard. Now insofar as the purchase of the cars, he mentioned the two year exchange policy. I believe there had been a survey made at one stage and based on the fact that the government buys minus sales tax, recommending more frequent trade-in. What is the policy now? Is it based strictly on two years or mileage and is there any consideration to trading-in more frequently?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the question of trade-in policy was one that was investigated rather thoroughly by the Kellogg-Stevenson investigation which reported in 1956, and at the time of their report the suggestion they made that a two-year trade-in period was most advantageous to the province financially was adopted and that policy has been continued by the present administration. The rule that you work on is that the government steps into the picture as a supplier of transportation when the individual concerned uses so much transportation per year; if my memory serves it's about 12,000 miles a year. There is a break-even point as between rentals and government supply. Insofar as government supplied cars are concerned therefore, they then put in a very considerable mileage each year, at least 12,000 in most cases, though there may be exceptions, so that we get that amount of use. But the Kellogg-Stevenson peoples' calculations were pretty clear that regardless of that factor a two-year trade-in period would net the government the least cost in the operation of its fleet due to the effect of depreciation combined with the position respecting sales and excise taxes, and though

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . I wouldn't maintain that this is an ironclad rule, that is the general policy that is followed by the department in purchasing cars.

MR. MOLGAT: Does this department presently buy all the cars in the government service or are cars bought individually by other departments in certain cases?

MR. ROBLIN: The procedure is that the departments concerned buy cars much the same way as they buy their other supplies, and the purchasing arrangements are made through the Government's Purchasing Bureau.

MR. MOLGAT: All the automobiles then in the government service are finally purchased through the Purchasing Bureau, is that correct? Now that will not apply I presume to boards and commissions. Is that so?

MR. ROBLIN: No. We have no responsibility with respect to the administration of commissions in respect of this matter; they are on their own.

MR. MOLGAT: Are the boards and commissions presently buying their automobiles on tender basis in the same way as the purchasing department does for the government as a whole?

MR. ROBLIN: I can't answer that, from my personal knowledge I believe they are.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, just one more question. The Honourable the Minister did not answer the question about the Morden-Sprague designating it as a highway. If he wishes to, I suppose I could ask that question under highways. He may not have the answer ready right now. I consider it very important because I understand the policy of the government is that before a town could qualify for an access road it must be not more than five miles in length and come off a highway. The Morden-Sprague presently is just a 100 percent road, therefore those towns do not qualify. That's why it's of great importance to the people of my constituency to have it designated as a highway. If the Minister wishes to answer under highways, I'll wait.

MR. THOMPSON: I can only answer that we will take the matter of reclassification under consideration.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask some questions or a question also with regard to additions to the fleet of vehicles, so perhaps I might as well ask it here. The '58-'59 report says that there were 58 personnel-carrying vehicles added during that year; the '59-'60 report says 142 were added during that year. Those were additions to the fleet. I noticed just as I glanced at the return that came in today, that the figure that was given was just purchases of cars and I would like to get, if I could, the net addition to the fleet. Now we have '58-'59; we have '59-'60; could the Minister get for us the additions in this year that is just now finishing so that we would have those. And could he, at the same time, bring us up to date on the total numbers in the fleet?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1) (b) - passed. (2) - passed. (3) - passed. (c) passed. (d)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what we're paying taxes on, the properties that we do pay taxes on. Also I note that there's an increase of, oh some \$10,000 in taxes and I might ask him does he figure this might be adequate in view of the reactions that are setting in in increasing municipal taxes?

MR. THOMPSON: Well, I don't think my honourable friend would want me to read all the taxes. Do you want the details of all the taxes we pay? We pay them in many municipalities in Manitoba, including the Metropolitan area of course. We have two, or three or four pages of taxes here.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, well I certainly wouldn't burden my friend to that degree. . . .

MR. THOMPSON: . . . . they're paid as you know on real estate at the equivalent rate of taxation in the community.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder Mr. Chairman, if he would just outline the type of places that they pay taxes on. For instance I don't think that there's any at all on this property. I'd like to ask if taxes are going to be paid in respect of the new administration building to the City of Winnipeg?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, the real estate. We pay on the Headingley Gaol to the R.M. of Assiniboia - \$629.64; down at Boissevain the Land Titles - Highways Branch; the City of Brandon have several items amounting to \$4,294; Court House, Land Titles -- everything we own there's a tax paid on it.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . administrative building that has just been recently -- the Norquay Building?

MR. THOMPSON: The land.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. THOMPSON: The real estate; the land itself.

MR. PAULLEY: Just on the land; but nothing on the structure?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, that's right!

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, you made such speed once you got started there that I didn't get my questions in with regard to Post Office, under (b). I notice if the comparisons with last years' figures are correct that there's an increase of two here. Last year we were given seven, this year the sheet that was passed around gives nine. The increase in amount for salaries is something like 35 - \$3,600, but the total increase here is less than \$30,000, and yet I notice, comparing the two reports that postage alone rose by \$34,000 -- more than \$34,000, as between those two years. I was wondering if the Minister had or could get the estimate of what postage will amount to this year? Because my guess is from the activity I see around the Post Office that due likely to the paperwork that goes on these times, I suppose to some extent to the huge mailing list of the propaganda sheets, that the postage must be increasing year by year. Now the total increase is less than \$30,000; salaries alone account for \$3,600 or thereabouts, and yet in the two years that I mention there was an increase in postage of more than \$34,000. If that same trend has carried through this year, I would think that this would be inadequate. Can the Minister tell us or maybe he'll have to get that information as to what the estimate is for postage for this current year?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, the two additional postal clerks are required in the Norquay Building where all Post Office operations are being conducted. The additional monies required this year for the issuer of driver's licenses which are a two year issue requires an increase in the estimates for this year.

MR. CAMPBELL: .....Mr. Chairman, the fact that it was rising so quickly before, I would wonder if this would really bring it up -- be sufficient? Has the Minister a figure on the estimates for the current year?

MR. THOMPSON: \$23,600 is the increase for the coming year over the past year. \$23,600.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, what was the reason for the increase; was it because of the Norquay exchange or what?

MR. THOMPSON: In telephones; the telephone accounts ..... We have two additional employees to operate the new larger switchboard in the Norquay Building.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, but I was thinking primarily, Mr. Chairman, on Supplies, Expenses and Renewals.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, that's additional equipment required for the new administration building, for the Norquay Building.

MR. PAULLEY: That's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 - passed; 3.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, actually what went into the Norquay Building was largely people who were housed in other locations previously, were they not? People who were either in the old Broadway Buildings or in some other buildings in the city. Now, does the move in there mean that much of an increase? Wouldn't there be an equivalent decrease in other locations? After all we haven't added that much more suddenly in equipment and staff have we?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, we have the new main telephone switchboard; the main switchboard has been transferred from this building to the Norquay Building. It provides for 800 locals and 120 trunk lines with an estimated amount of 1,300 telephones that are to be installed in the new building and similar equipment which is now in use in the Legislative Building such as bells, buzzers and so on. This is all an additional installation in that building as I mentioned.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, what we are passing here is what we're going to spend next year, that is starting March 31st of this year until next year. Now the Norquay Building, surely all that has been done, putting in the new 'phones and all the rest of it. That is completed, they're in operation over there now. How come we have such an increase in cost for the subsequent year?

MR. THOMPSON: I failed to mention that the departments which are in there, Agriculture, Health and Welfare, Mines and Resources and Labour and so on paid their costs directly out of

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.) ..... their estimates. They're now charged to this particular .....

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 - passed; (e) - passed; Resolution 66 - passed. Item 2 (a) ...

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, at which stage does the Minister wish us to discuss the Norquay Building; under (d) Auxiliary Buildings or ....?

MR. THOMPSON: I have no particular preference. I think this would be satisfactory here.

MR. MOLGAT: At this stage? It's immaterial to me; whichever one the Minister wishes -- under 2 (d). While we're on the general item, is it not the intention to set up a separate heading in the future for Norquay Building as we have for Legislative Building, Government House and so on?

MR. THOMPSON: No, not at the moment.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, on (a) 1, I notice that there's a reduction of two in salaries here. Does that mean -- will that be accounted for by the transfer of some people or some responsibilities to the Norquay or other building?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, there's a reduction in two positions, a former caretaker, due to the re-organization of the cleaning staff and the employment of an upholsterer, so there were two -- there's a reduction of two. And the new party, their salary is paid by the Provincial Architect's appropriation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (b) - passed; (c) - passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Under (d), I have this afternoon received from the Minister the return to an order regarding the move into the Norquay Building. Now I notice that the return states that in view of what was being transferred, the office machines, equipment and files, it was impractical to write comprehensive specifications and schedules to form a basis for a contract price. Well, I can appreciate that that might be difficult all right, and in that case, estimates would seem to me satisfactory. However, further on when I asked what the estimates were, or if they were requested, the answer is that the estimate was prepared by the department. What I can't understand, Mr. Chairman, is why estimates were not requested from various moving firms who are in this type of business. Winnipeg has a lot of transportation firms located here; we're a centre of distribution -- many firms are in operation. Could the Minister explain why we did not request from various firms estimates on the cost of moving.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, many moves have been made in the administration of the government over the past several years. Often the moves are made by the department themselves. In this case we had four or five departments move, but in many cases, say for example, when the old age pension group moved into the Broadway Building, they moved on their own; there have been other moves I think in the Attorney General's Department and various departments. It has not been customary to call for tenders for this type of operation; and here we found that there was a sort of a continuing movement. You couldn't do it in a single week-end or at a single time, and so it was necessary to be spread out. We heard from some firms; we got, what the department thought, was a very reasonable quote from this firm and they felt that it was acceptable. This firm agreed not to charge extra for overtime and so on when they were working all night, and they absorbed those extra costs. And the contract, I think the figure here is \$15,000 or so, it was felt that it was reasonable to accept the bid of a firm, or the offer of a firm to do the job who could do it in accordance with the method in which the government wanted it done, that is, spread over a period and at odd hours, and do it at a price which seemed to be quite reasonable and which compared to the average standard moving rate, less the extras which I mentioned, night work and so on.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't quite understand the Minister's reply because in the order for return here, it says that estimates -- rather, it does not say that estimates were requested, it only says that an estimate was prepared by the department. And yet now in speaking the Minister says that this particular firm -- I presume he means the one that did most of the work, \$12,000 worth out of \$15,000 -- presented a bid or something of the sort. Now was this the only firm that presented a bid or did other firms present bids?

MR. THOMPSON: I'm not just sure whether we received bids from one or all of them, or what. I'll have to find that out. I only know this that the department followed the normal procedure, that is to get somebody to do the job.

MR. MOLGAT: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, but there seems to be a conflict here.

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . . My request for an order I think was fairly clear and I simply asked whether the estimates were requested subsequent to asking my question on tenders. Now if estimates were requested, then it seems to me I should have had a reply in this Order for Return. If they did not request it then how come only this one firm submitted a bid? Did other firms submit bids? If so, what were they? I appreciate the Minister may not have the information right at hand but I would like to have the information before we conclude the estimates.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before -- or is the Minister concentrating on that? Before we leave auxiliary buildings, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister two or three questions. He may not have the answers available. If not, I'd appreciate receiving the information later. The first question would be: how many buildings for which leases were paid previously to the building of and occupancy of Norquay Building; how many buildings for which leases were paid have been vacated; what buildings are now being rented in the Greater Winnipeg area, and are any rents being paid for buildings already vacated by departments moving into the Norquay Building?

MR. THOMPSON: We've vacated two buildings -- three all together. We have given up the lease on two and have, of course, abandoned the Sherbrook Street Building. In answer to your other question about how many leases do we now hold, I think I'll get that information for you.

MR. PAULLEY: Would the Minister -- the last one was; are there any rents being paid for any buildings that have already been vacated? Actually who -- (Interjection) No, I was just wondering whether or not because of the term of leases, the length of leases, we may have vacated some buildings now for which the lease hasn't run out as yet, and I'm wondering if there..

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think so, because we sort of watched for that. There may be one or two but I doubt it.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes. Well I'd like to know if there are.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, on the item (d), I notice that there's a fairly substantial reduction in both the number of people and in the salaries in this item which would indicate that perhaps due to some sort of consolidation that the work of looking after these auxiliary buildings has been decreased. But then when it comes to supplies, expenses, equipment and renewals, there's a much larger increase. And I would be inclined to think that if there's some added efficiency in one regard perhaps there would be in the other. Could the Minister tell us how it comes that we have the reduction in both the number of people and in the salary item and then we have a very large increase, almost a doubling, of the other item.

MR. THOMPSON: We have contracted for the cleaning in the Norquay Building. It was put up for bid and went to the lowest bidder. It's a contract job over there. We don't hire the staff for the cleaning. It's contracted to a cleaning firm.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . . .so that the salaries remain just of the ones -- the salary item excludes the Norquay Building now; but on the other hand if the contract were a money saving one why it would seem that the other item of supplies, expenses, equipment and renewals shouldn't rise so much, should it?

MR. THOMPSON: It's quite possible that the sum is in there -- the contract figure, but I'll have to confirm that.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, could we get, not necessarily at the moment, but could we get some details on the cost of the contract and the maintenance of that building?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in comparing the figures of last year with this -- and the comparison may not be valid because of the Norquay Building now having to be provided for in full -- salaries have been reduced by \$41,000 but there's an increase of \$160,000 on supplies, expenses, equipment and renewals. It seems to be out of balance. (Interjection)

MR. ROBLIN: You can't operate a big building like that without having those . . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, I appreciate that, but an increase of \$161,000 is a pretty large increase unless there is contained in this estimate, the answer might be in this that there is some provisions here for additional office equipment and the likes of that that wasn't formerly there.

MR. ROBLIN: It's a pretty big building.

MR. PAULLEY: \$160,000?

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, yes, when you get an office building like ... He'll give you the facts. He's gone to get it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what other buildings are presently covered by these Auxiliary Buildings, Winnipeg district. Which other ones are included there?

MR. THOMPSON: The Detention Home on Vaughan Street; Headingley Gaol is listed there; The Land Titles Office, Winnipeg Revenue Building, Kennedy Street; County Court, St. Boniface; 146 Pioneer Avenue East; The Maw Block, King and William Avenue; Government Building on William Avenue; Government Building, Mall and Osborne Street; Government Building, 405 Broadway; an office building, Broadway and Colony; The Motor Vehicle Building, 818 Portage Avenue; The School for the Deaf on Wellington Avenue; an office building, Pembina Highway (1760); The Manitoba Technical Institute, Portage Avenue; Ingram and Bell Building; an office building at 545 Broadway; the Power Building; Lombard Street Building; an office -- (Interjection) -- yes, this is being cancelled. This lease is being cancelled. The office building on Edmonton Street, and the Norquay Building, which we have mentioned.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate what happened to the old equipment from the buildings that are being torn down, for instance the Broadway Building?

MR. THOMPSON: Oh the equipment itself? It's being used where feasible and some has been sold I understand. (Interjection) I'm not sure. I'll have to check on that. I know we've sold, I think up to a few days ago, about \$12,000 worth of -- mainly materials, I think. I'm not sure about equipment. I'll have to get that. I think it was mainly salvage material that has been turned over for sale.

MR. PAULLEY: Might I ask, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is going to give us a detailed explanation of the increases in this for (d). (Interjection) Well no, I want justification, Mr. Chairman, for the reduction of \$41,000 in the salaries in respect of auxiliary buildings; and also justification for the increase of \$160,000 in supplies, expenses, equipment and renewals. Now the Minister in answer to a question of mine a few moments ago told us that there were two or three buildings that have been vacated as the result of Norquay Building and yet at the same time as we are vacating some buildings we have this considerable increase, and I would just like that .....

MR. ROBLIN: You and me both. I'm right with you there. That's progress though.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be advisable to hold this item -- in view of the fact that there is a considerable amount of information to be had on it, if it wouldn't be better just to hold it until the Minister can supply us with the information, tonight probably. We're close to the closing hour now and quite probably he can get it between ....

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if there's a disposition to do that, I'd like to put a couple of additional questions on that I presume come under this item. If the Minister is in the position to tell us now, I'd like to know what the price has been received or is to be received for the Sherbrook and Portage Building. We had some reference to that building and site last evening when we were discussing the City Hall site, and I understand that the property itself, the land is being retained by the government, but the building was to be sold; I presume it has been sold. What was the price received and is there any present plan what is to be done with that site? Then I would like to ask too, with regard to the wrecking of the buildings over here on the old university site: is the government making some money out of the wrecking or is it paying money for the job? (Interjection) No but there are companies that are glad to get those jobs. What is the situation with regard to that?

MR. THOMPSON: We're not selling it, of course, we're demolishing the building. The lowest tender was \$5,576; the highest was \$44,000 so we gave it to the lowest bidder for demolition.

MR. CAMPBELL: The cost is \$5,000?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, .....\$576. In connection with the operation across the street on the Broadway site, as I mentioned earlier we have sold about \$12,000 worth of material and I think we have spent about \$25,000 or thereabouts.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is that by tender? Was that job let by tender?

MR. THOMPSON: No, that's a department job, within the department. We're hiring the men.

MR. CAMPBELL: Day work? Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister did not reply last night or since, so far as I have heard, to my question about the portion of this area across Broadway that belonged to the City of Winnipeg. Does the \$800,000 figure that we have heard used, does that -- as well as buy us out of the agreement with the City of Winnipeg regarding the City Hall site -- does it acquire their two properties as well?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, it does.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it the intention to demolish -- I think there's the one building on that site now, I think it's an old house on the City of Winnipeg site. Will that be demolished as well?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, that will be demolished.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, there was some consideration to holding this until the Minister got the balance of this information after the supper hour.

MR. MOLGAT: The demolition of the Broadway site I think was undertaken as a winter works project if I remember correctly, is that not the case? Did I not see a newspaper report in that regard? Is that the reason why it was done by the province itself rather than being let out on a tender basis?

MR. THOMPSON: I don't know that we could say that that was related; it was a job that could be done by department staff and we thought it should be done; others were hired to help do the work but there appeared to be no reason to put it out for tender.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I thought the Minister said that the cost of demolition there was \$25,000. Is that over and above the wages and salaries paid to the staff of the department?

MR. THOMPSON: That's an estimate of the cost of doing the work. I don't know whether I can get you a later figure than that on the actual expenditure to date, but that is an estimate of what we should spend before the end of the current fiscal year; that's by the end of this week.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well does that estimate include both the people on the payroll and those that you will hire, or is that in addition to the payrolls.

MR. THOMPSON: It includes both.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, why is it then that we have decided to demolish the Broadway site ourselves, but in the case of the Sherbrook Building this has been let out on tender?

MR. THOMPSON: It appeared to be more practical to get somebody to do the Sherbrook job. It will be a much longer job. It was thought that this one could be done by day labour by the department. I don't know that there's any real reason other than that. We felt, I think, that we could probably get a better and cheaper job done in connection with the Sherbrook building by putting it up for tender, which has happened, I would suggest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) - passed . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I believe it was understood that we would leave this item stand, was it not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon?

MR. MOLGAT: Was it not understood that we would leave this item stand? (Interjection) Well, I think there may be some more questions that will arise when the Minister brings us further information of course.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) - passed . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, we're going to have a full discussion on it yet, so let's pass it as he says. So we don't have anything to remind ourselves about it as we go along, but we'll still have a full discussion at 8:00 o'clock on this.

MR. CAMPBELL: Are we going to have a discussion or let it stand, Mr. Chairman? I remember that when my honourable friends were over here that they asked for many items to stand and we always accommodated them.

MR. ROBLIN: I have no objection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stands, agreed? (e) 1 - passed. (e) 2 - passed; (f) 1 - passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: On (f) Mr. Chairman, I suppose that the increase in staff here, a considerable increase in staff and some increase in supplies, expenses etcetera, is that directly related to the heating of the new Norquay Building?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, we have four new employees because the chief engineer of the Central Power House is to be in charge of all the government buildings in the Metro area, with

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd.)....the exception of those buildings which are presently under the supervision of a chief engineer. So we have added the four new employees to take care of the additional job there.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, was it necessary to add any heat generating units in order to accommodate the Norquay Building?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, I think there was an addition -- there was one addition.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, with regard to (g), I was speaking a minute ago about the fact that in the financial year 1959-60, the report tells us that there were 142 cars added to the fleet. I was wondering that with such large additions to the fleet, how it is that the same number of people can keep up with the work at the garage? It appears to me that we have just the same number of people as a year ago and actually a small, a very small reduction in salary.

MR. ROBLIN: .....a pretty good bunch over there.

MR. CAMPBELL: Pardon me?

MR. ROBLIN: There's a pretty good bunch over there; Del Begio's got it well organized.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I think that that question deserves an answer.

Because 142 units is a lot of cars and it's just possible that some of these are being serviced in the City of Winnipeg that work out of the City of Winnipeg. I think we should have an answer to that question.

MR. CAMPBELL: ....if that is the answer, Mr. Chairman, that the majority of them are in rural Manitoba, but my remembrance is that even a percentage of those from rural Manitoba come into this garage especially for major overhaul.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Might I ask the Minister if there's -- the estimate doesn't seem to indicate that there will be -- but I wonder if the Minister could outline to us whether or not there's going to be very much work done in the Selkirk Hospital insofar as improving the appearance of the hospital itself. Unless it's coming under Capital.

MR. ROBLIN: It's under Item 5 here in Public Works.

MR. PAULLEY: It's another item, is it?

MR. ROBLIN: I think you'll find that there was an item already passed in the Department of Health and Public Welfare which referred to this rather than this department's estimates.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, I see.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli): You were in Ottawa Russ.

MR. PAULLEY: And I might say that that's one of the reasons I think, that your estimates went through a lot more rapidly than they would if we'd been here, because there were a considerable number of questions in respect of Selkirk Hospital that I had all lined up for you, Mr. Minister. Unfortunately for me I was not here.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): We should arrange that every year.

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