

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 21, 1966

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I think just before the supper recess I was getting on my feet to ask the Minister some further questions insofar as the financial situation on the road construction. Last year in the Capital estimates we passed a total of \$18 million of borrowing for highway construction. At that time we were also told that there was an 18 million carry-over from the previous year which gave us a total of 36 million available for construction. In addition to that of course we passed the current, and I would like to know from the Minister exactly where we stand now, insofar as the Capital from past years, how much of it has been used; how much is still there as Capital. I understood in the presentation of the estimates that it was the intention of the government to proceed now on a straight pay-as-you-go basis. I'd like to know what there is still in the Capital Fund and what is the intention so far as that money is concerned.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I answered that question once this afternoon for the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, but the answer is that at the end of the fiscal year, at the end of this month, without looking it up and getting the exact figure, 17 million - 17.1 million - something of that nature left in the Authorization Unused, say 17 to 17½ million, and our estimate is that we will have enough money voted cash in the current estimates for the program that's anticipated this year. So this being the case, we should still have the authorization of the 17 point something for authorization for continuing with our free advertising that we have been carrying out.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before the supper hour, I also agreed to attempt to find out what the estimates were of the work that was accomplished in 1965 and that which is planned for 1966 on the Trans-Canada Highway. The figure for 1965 is \$2,300,000 and the anticipated expenditure for 1966-67 is \$4.9 million.

The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains asked for other figures of average prices, and the staff of the department tell me that there's really no means of providing anything that would be helpful because of the various standards of design and what not that take place in all phases with the exception of calcium treatment and asphalt surface treatment, and the average rule of thumb figure could be about \$1,500 a mile for calcium and approximately \$2,500 a mile for the asphalt surface treatment. But the surface that I'm talking about is the asphalt itself placed on top of whatever base is there, and it varies so widely by means of the different depths and also of gravel haul and location of gravel and so on and so forth, that they tell me it's impossible to come to anything that could be considered an average figure.

MR. HYRHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, the department knows how many miles of grading it does a year, how many miles of gravelling, and certainly they know what that costs them, and to find an average all you would have to do is take the total cost and divide it by the number of miles and you've got what I'm asking for. I know the discrepancies in one location as against another could be tremendous, that's why I asked for an average. Surely the department can come up with an answer as to what the grading cost them in 1965 and what the gravelling cost. If they know the number of miles all they have to do is just divide the number of miles into the total cost of grading and they know what the average mile of grading cost. I don't see anything difficult there. I don't mind telling the Minister why I'd like this information. I'd like to compare the various years for the information of the members of this committee to see how much has been spent according to the figures that we've been given, and if the Minister would give us those figures, I would certainly appreciate them.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, the answers that we would get from that comparison wouldn't mean a thing, so I'm not prepared to develop that kind of information as coming from the department as an accurate estimate of what an average price would be.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I don't agree with the Honourable Minister at all, because surely the construction, say the grading as between one year and another will not make a very big difference. It will be as one location to another, but if you have 150 miles of grading one year and 175 miles of grading in the other year, both those years will encompass the same type of factors, so I don't take that as an answer.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't in the House this afternoon when the Honourable Minister presented his - or when his estimates came up - but I wonder if he has mentioned anything about the cloverleaf and the overpass at the junction of No. 1 and the Perimeter in Assiniboia.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . . Is it in the estimates for construction this year, or is it not?

MR. WEIR: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PATRICK: It is?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on (a), this afternoon the question was asked the Minister regarding the location of the Minnedosa bypass and the Minister indicated then, as we are all aware, that he's rather close to the situation but that he could not tell us at this time where the bypass was going to be. I wondered how he gets it into his estimates in that case. If he has not decided yet where the location is going to be, how does he determine what the cost of it is going to be, because surely the location is going to have some influence on the cost, and if he's built up a cost figure based on the figure of the various projects he has in here, surely there must be some idea as to where it's going to go. How else can one establish the final cost?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, there has been no final cost established. It's all very simple. The amount in here is the amount of money that it's anticipated would go this year, of the size of the projects that would be left this year, which isn't by any stretch of the imagination the whole project. So it's not very difficult at all and I'm still in the same position, I don't know where the location is except that it's west of Minnedosa.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is there any intention of not having the location other than the straight line of No. 10 Highway as very clearly seen on the map? Is it the intention of the department at all of moving it from that obvious location?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, just before we adjourned this afternoon the member for Ethelbert raised the point about the roads in the rural parts of the province with regard to the consolidation program. What does the Minister propose to do in the unorganized at the present time? In the municipalities we have roads which are called provincial roads which are 100 percent provincial responsibility, and then we have the balance of the roads which are looked after 100 percent by the municipality. Now in the unorganized we have certain roads which are market roads which are 100 percent government, and then we have the school district roads which are built on a 50-50 basis. Now with the new program, the new consolidation program going into effect, we're certainly going to need an improved road system. What plan has the Minister got in mind for this area?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I indicated this afternoon that I had no new policy to announce in this field, that in the unorganized that roughly the plan that the Honourable Member for St. George has mentioned is the case, with the exception that he didn't include school division bus roads which is 100 percent provincial responsibility, but the circumstances surrounding consolidation is very much a part of the interest of, not just my department but the Department of Education and other departments at the moment, and if there's something new to announce, it'll be announced in due course.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, the problem that will arise though that -- the Minister is quite right, I overlooked the school division routes, but the present school division roads are only for high schools. Now these roads will certainly not be adequate for the secondary schools -- or the elementary, I beg your pardon -- the elementary consolidation program, and if we're going to get these children to school, to these consolidated schools, many of the roads are not adequate for these buses that will be required. Some program will have to be instituted to make sure the children get to school regularly because some of these school districts just don't have the funds to bring their roads up to the standard that would be required for a bus. In the event of that - I know this question is going to be directed to me - what would the Minister suggest I advise these people?

MR. WEIR: The only thing I can suggest is that he given them the same answer that I just gave him.

MR. GUTTORMSON: They'll be none the wiser then.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister a question that I believe he overlooked. How many miles of trunk highway is still only gravelled?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that I have that with me, I'll just -- the latest figure I have is 826 - 826.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: That's 826 of provincial trunk highways?

MR. WEIR: Right

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the Minnedosa bypass, I have been informed and have noticed in fact that there were survey crews working about a mile west of Minnedosa this winter and I suppose my honourable friend will say that they have been studying

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . this particular area, but it is likely that we will have an election before too many months and it is likely that my honourable friend will have to announce to his own constituents where this bypass is going to go because it could easily affect some of the electors - I mean the way the electors mark their ballot could be affected by where this bypass goes - and if my honourable friend is going to have an election in a month or two and if there's going to be a decision made at that time, perhaps my honourable friend would know right now where the bypass is going to go and we could settle that once and for all.

Now there's one other matter, Mr. Chairman, that is repeatedly referred to me and that is this problem of flooding as a result of changing the road bed often. My honourable friend will know that when a new highway is constructed, a high grade is put through on any road, that often it can change the course of the water. Sometimes farmers on one or the other side of the highway receives flooding damage to his crops or fails to get his crop in because of flooding or fails to get it off because of flooding. On about four different occasions I have referred a problem to him that affects a farmer a mile north of Eden, and I think on each and every occasion he has told me that I have referred it to the wrong man, I should have referred it to his honourable colleague the Minister of Agriculture, but I get kind of -- they pass the buck from one to another on this. Now in future - and there's no question about it, there will be future cases - I wonder if my honourable friend would take it upon himself to just send my letter over to his colleague the Minister of Agriculture and between the two of them, somehow or other - between the two of them, somehow or other resolve this problem.

The same thing occurred in a sense at Gladstone when, as my honourable friend will know - I am sure he will know - as a result of the silt coming down the 15 miles of highway, down the ditch there, it completely plugged two or three farm dugouts, and I think the Department of Agriculture dug them out on two or three occasions. So, I would just plead with him for the life of this government. I see my honourable friend over there is suggesting that they may not be the government after the next election. The two gentlemen that are getting their heads together over there. I'm not concerned about what we'll do when we get over there, I'm concerned what my honourable friends are going to do as long as they are there. And so I plead with him that in future when I make a request of him and he says that I am attacking the wrong man, well, will he forward my letter on to the proper authorities.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify one point and that's on the same question asked before - Highway No. 101 at Portage Avenue. It says grades and gravel, grade separation structure - this includes the overpass eh? Okay, fine.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, for clarification, the announcement regarding this causeway over the Lake Winnipeg narrows this afternoon, I've had occasion to talk to one or two persons about it and they're naturally very pleased about it, but the question they ask and I would like to be able to have this clarified. When would the Minister expect that work will start on this causeway and when will it be expected that it might be completed?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I can't give any specific commitment on that, but my guess would be with the type of work that it is that it would probably be started after freeze-up next fall. I, hopefully, would like to think that this would be the last summer that we would have to operate the ferry. That would give an indication of when I hope it can be completed but whether we can meet that schedule or not, I can't really say.

MR. GUTTORMSON: As I understand the Minister, the Department would plan to work in the winter on the ice, is that correct?

MR. WEIR: I would presume either on the ice or through it when that comes working out probably from the shoreline.

MR. Guttormson, It can't be done during the summer months?

MR. WEIR: Well, can't is kind of a definite word, Mr. Chairman, and I'd hate to hang my reputation on that word can't. I have really no indication from the department as to when they plan to schedule it. This is some second guessing on my part and if it's possible and they have designs prepared and are ready to go, no doubt they will be proceeding it it. The other thing that's bound to enter into it is availability of equipment, and for the heavy fill and rock fill that will be required for the causeway there, I would think if at all possible, they would be trying for winter construction; but I really can't say definitely.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, we received this afternoon a brochure of the projects scheduled for 1966-67 that's on provincial trunk highways. Would the Honourable the Minister also have a schedule for those provincial roads - the work that he's going to do on those? Can we have a similar . . .

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I've already indicated that the money there is in lump sum which will be spent by the engineers as the pressures dictate throughout it. The majority of it will be spent on relatively small projects, many of which would be probably too numerous to mention and relatively small upgrading jobs for this year. I hope very shortly we can get into the stage where we have a progressive upgrading program of the provincial road system presented to the House in the same manner as the trunk highway system; but it isn't practical for this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) - passed. (c) - passed. Resolution No. 41 passed. Resolution No. 42: (a) - passed. (b) --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under (a) - I'm still getting some complaints and I can't quite isolate them in point of time as to whether they are still happening or not. This is with regards to contracts and holdbacks and sub-contractors. I'm sure the Minister is aware because we've discussed here in the House on a number of occasions before a number of cases which I'm sure he's thoroughly familiar with, which I understand are still not settled in a number of instances. Now has the procedures been changed in the department to ensure that the holdbacks are in fact held back in all cases and that wherever there are claims coming up from - sub-contractors or from employees that there is something to fall back on.

I have a case right now that goes back to 1962 where lumber was sold to a construction firm doing work for the government. They did not pay the individual who sold them the lumber. He then approached the department and asked for repayment under the holdback. This apparently - the holdback was not sufficient. He claims that the same contractors were given further work by the department at a later date - under a different name it is true - but still the same principals, and that still he cannot collect. I think this is a very bad practice insofar as our procedures - every one loses confidence in that sort of an operation when it goes on. We've had a number of cases now - I brought some up last year to the Minister on the perimeter highway east of Winnipeg in the vicinity of the overpass there, up in the area of Dauphin and Ste. Rose constituencies on No. 5 Highway. Claims that went over many years, and I would like to know from the Minister whether or not the procedures have been changed and is there now complete protection insofar as a sub-contractor or employees with regard to the holdback on prime contractors.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, there has been no change in procedure and I think that he probably recognizes the difficulty sometimes in winding up what have proven over a course of time to have been difficult projects, and possibly even reaching the lawsuit stage before the disposition of the monies that are held back can be distributed. These are some of the difficulties that we run into in settling difficult projects of this kind. Thank goodness we don't have many but the ones that we have are sometimes quite difficult and there are some - I think probably I know the contractor that the honourable member is discussing and we have that - some of our difficulties, the holdbacks were all held back as far as I know. The thing that always can happen is if people go overboard in credit and there's more gets out than your 15 percent holdback is, then of course, you're not covered except for the labour and material bond which is now being carried by the - forced on the contractors. This of course, wasn't a term of the contract back as far as 1962 - I've forgotten, it was either a year or two years ago that we passed the legislation for the labour and the material bond. We hope that this will have eliminated our difficulties.

One of the other difficulties that you have of course in this kind of a case is a contractor having more than one job in an area - one with us and another job with other people, say a municipality or something, and them charging for goods and materials in the same community and the individual doing the charging not knowing really for sure which job the material can be placed against. It is a difficulty. I think that it's been eliminated and we still have a few of the - well when I say a few, I don't think it's even that many, it might be one or two of the old ones kicking around that are in trouble and there has been talk of court action and so on and so forth between the contractor and ourselves. Maybe this would be the best way to settle it; I don't know.

MR. MOLGAT: Does the bonding procedure now definitely protect the sub-contractor and the employees?

MR. WEIR: Yes.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could give us a brief explanation on Item 1 (c) Unemployment Insurance - \$50,000 item.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, the unemployment insurance that is there is - the figure that's there is for casual staff that are taken on by the department for part-time employment. If they're not full-time employees then they are covered with unemployment insurance. Civil servants are not covered under the Unemployment Insurance Act, but the part-time employees that are taken on for short periods of time are under unemployment insurance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 42 (a) - passed.

MR. MOLGAT: What is the policy of the department so far as taking on contractors with whom they've had trouble in the past, where a contractor has been working for the department and has been unable to fulfill his contract. Does the department then treat him in exactly the same way in the future, or are there any additional penalties, or any additional safeguards requested. Where the contractor had been working under one name and proceeds to re-incorporate under another name, again in the case where he has not been living up to either the standards or to the terms of the contract, are there any penalties in those cases or is he treated in exactly the same way as any other contractor?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, we haven't really enough experience to have a definite policy on it, but there was one case where we had had difficulty and the same contractor under another name was low bidder on a job I believe with another department and on our recommendation, prior to cleaning up the one that we had before, he was turned down, and the second bidder was awarded the contract. The same contractor eventually received further work from us and we tightened the specifications - tightened the inspection and so on and so forth to try and make sure that work was carried out and the individual I'm thinking of - I'm not sure what his chances would be if he was low bidder now. My guess would be that there might well be a recommendation by the department that the work not be awarded to him. We have a precedent for it but by and large, this hasn't been a very severe problem and I hope it doesn't get to be one. Measures of this kind is the only thing that I can see if it does get prevalent that can control it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, what is the policy now for the department insofar as contractors within Manitoba and contractors outside of Manitoba - is there any difference made insofar as the bid?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, the present position of the department is that same as it has always been and it is now the same with the other prairie provinces: low tender gets the job assuming that it's considered that he's capable of doing it.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, do the other prairie provinces abide by that now - our contractors have access on the same basis exactly to Saskatchewan and to Alberta? What about northwest Ontario? Ontario has been operating I think on a pre-bid qualification basis in the past. Does this still apply, and what is the situation of a Manitoba contractor bidding on an Ontario job?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'm really not aware of that. We haven't had the same amount of people going back and forth between Ontario and ourselves, I presume because of the distance between the basis of operation of the larger contractors and Manitoba. They do have pre-qualification. As far as I know there is no local preference in Ontario, but the books of the company would be open to scrutiny and the company would be established on a pre-qualification basis as to the size of the project that they could bid on and so on and so forth. As far as I'm aware, there's no local preference as far as the work is concerned; but again, because of the distance separating our contractors, they more have a tendency to move west than they do east.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, in connection with firms going into receivership that have contracts from the provincial government, what is the situation? I take it the contractors lose their deposit or the 15 percent holdback - that is lost to them and they will not be able to collect; is that right?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, they lose not only the 15 percent holdback on the work that they have performed, but they're not able to complete the work we call on the performance bond, which amounts to 50 percent of the value of the contract, hire the balance of the work done by another contractor or do it ourselves and charge it up to the bonding company.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE Q. C. (Selkirk): ..... bid bond as well?

MR. WEIR: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) - passed; (b) - passed; (c) - passed; (d) - passed; (e) - passed; (f) - passed --

MR. HRYHORCZUK: . . . . . by the Minister the municipalities are no longer getting any grants for roads that they're responsible for. What about bridges? Any policy insofar as bridges are concerned or does the same apply to bridges?

MR. WEIR: It does to bridges, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is this the case for all municipalities? Even those that have special bridging problems because of creeks and rivers that are flowing in those areas?

MR. WEIR: This is the case at the moment, Mr. Chairman. I think right at the moment the ones with the heavier bridges were the ones carrying the heavier traffic and it may have a bearing on the development of the provincial road system because on many of those roads that require bridges of considerable amounts of money that are beyond the municipalities reach then it's possible that for the traffic that's on it there should be a consideration not only by doing something about the bridge for them, but taking the road that the bridge is on over.

There are bound to be special circumstances develop which are going to require possibly a new look from time to time, but for the present that's the way it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (e) - passed; (f) - passed; (g) - passed; (h) - passed; Resolution No. 42 passed. Resolution No. 43, passed. Resolution No. 44, passed. Department of . . . . .

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, under Provincial Trunk Highways I should like to ask the Minister a question in regard to Provincial Trunk Highway 238, six miles of river road from Parkdale to Lockport. I notice it has stretched now to 7.1 miles; he might explain that. But the reason for asking the question is some five years ago when the government took over this road, this scenic river road from the Municipality of St. Andrews it was a step forward, and at that time they announced the intention that they hoped eventually to hard-surface this road. Since that time Mr. Val Werier of the Winnipeg Tribune in an article in a magazine section last fall, pointed out the historic value of the road and the old stone homes and the like, and I took it to be a criticism of the government for not having done more about maintaining the roads in the area.

Now I'm not willing to agree with Mr. Werier and I want to give full credit to the department for what they have done, but I do think that they owe it to the people now to let them know just what they intend to do. Was it designed to be a Centenary project to have it completed by our Centennial year? I know they've had considerable difficulty with riverbank slippage and this has been discouraging. It certainly has been a wonderful improvement but - they haven't had a traffic count that I know of, but I can give the Minister one of these days if he'd like my traffic count because on weekends many many people use this road. It provides quite a bit of pleasure for the people of Greater Winnipeg in a short-run to Lockport and back. I would just like to hear the Minister state just what they are anticipating, with all the difficulty they have, for the immediate future.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that I don't need to tell the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks of the very difficult problems that we have with the road that he's talking about. I know that he recognizes that to put an expensive surface on the type of road with the conditions that we are presently experiencing would be a pretty foolish thing to do with people's money.

There are two or three things that are being done. One thing that's being done is an experimentation of grouting along the river hoping to be able to stabilize the bank in that area to see if it can maintain the road on its existing location; and there are other looks being taken. I don't want to be too optimistic about this because I am sure the honourable member recognizes the difficulties we run into when we talk about a change of location in that immediate area, but another look is being taken to see if there isn't a more moderate approach than the one which we took before in assessing the possibilities of developing a scenic drive through that area. This is being done, but again I want to stress that I don't want anybody to be too optimistic about it because I have really no idea of what the outcome will be. In the meantime, every effort will be made through the use of calcium to attempt to keep the dust down, not only for the people that live on the road, but for the many many people that on a Sunday afternoon enjoy the road for a Sunday afternoon drive.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, regarding the matter that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has been speaking about, and with particular reference to the sliding of the river road in that particular location, I wonder if the Minister has made further representations to Ottawa regarding Ottawa's responsibility for part of that slipping. Now a number of years ago Ottawa did acknowledge its liability and did spend several hundred thousand dollars in riverbank

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) . . . . protection, putting in riprapping, putting in Tyndal stone, and putting in piles. Now it didn't seem as if any of that work was of sufficient avail to prevent the slippage, but I think if the Minister would again make representations to Ottawa, there's a new Minister of Public Works down there, there might be a possible chance of them again recognizing and admitting their liability, because in my own opinion as a layman, I think that a great deal of the slippage there is due to the rising and falling of the levels of the Red River with the opening and closing of the locks.

Now the Federal Government takes the position that the slippage is due to drainage from the lands to the west, but I think it's a combination of both, and I feel it would be worthwhile to make a further effort to have Ottawa at least admit its responsibility for that road slippage. It's true that they made agreements with the owners of the lands adjoining the banks of the Red River at the time of opening St. Andrew's locks, but they never made any agreement with the Province of Manitoba, and I think they would still be responsible for the highway down there if it can be traced to a Federal Public Works, and I think that part of the responsibility can be traced there.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister a question about the length of the road. It's increased now from 6 to 7.1 miles. The reason I ask that, I'm interested in finding out if they have assumed responsibility for the portion adjacent to St. Andrew's Church. As you know it's quite a historic spot. I'm just wondering whether that's where the extra mile came in. Thank you.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, no; I haven't made any approaches to Ottawa. The Water Control over the years has been pressing them to fulfill their responsibility towards the river as a whole. He raises a good point here and I'll see what I can do with the Minister of Public Works at Ottawa.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . . they won't even assume responsibility for the slippage of the road right by their ship channel and at one time they did, but they're going to lose that ship channel if they don't do something pretty soon.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, in 1945, the verdict of the Federal Government was that if it could be proved that the erosion of the bank or the slippage of the bank could be attributed to the action of boats going up and down the channel, that is from the wash of the boat, they would accept responsibility, but they would not accept responsibility for the raising and lowering of the St. Andrew's dam.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Highways two questions. One is regarding one of his propaganda signs on No. 1 Highway. It's the one two miles west of Portage beside the Mount Pleasant School. I had a delegation of parents come to me on Saturday last expressing concern about this sign, that it was distracting the attention of motorists as they went by the school. They felt that if the sign were either taken down or moved it would remove a hazard there where cars are stopping to pick up children and children are crossing the highway.

The other question I have for him is, when did his department stop giving out information on traffic counts? I have here a letter from a high official in his department that answers in detail seven specific traffic counts and they give the information as asked. I would like to know when did this policy change and it no longer become information for the public?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I know of no such letter, to answer the second question first. I'm not aware of the information having been given out and the policy hasn't changed. Sometimes things happen in the best of regulated circles and I am at a loss to explain it. The other thing is that I will have the sign checked to see if there is something can be done about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 44 - passed, Department of Public Works.

MR. MOLGAT: Sir, before we leave 44 I just want to ask one specific question of the Minister. Some two or three years ago now we were involved with difficulties with the mine at Bissett and there was some provincial money put into this operation. Last year on the discussion of the Estimates of Public Works, or what was then Highways and Public Works, I suggested to the Minister that the connection between the Bird River Road and the Bissett Road, which is fairly close, if that were completed as I think had originally been planned, that it would give tourists access for one thing and certainly more travel into the area and the possibility of opening up the area. One of the difficulties that we are faced with in Bissett is that it's strictly a one industry town. If the mine closes then almost all of the employment is gone.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)

I notice that in the program for this year we are proceeding with the Lea River bridge. If my geography is correct I think it is one of those in that area. Is it the intention to connect up these two ends at the moment - either, I guess Radhope would be the closest one along with the Bird River Road, and complete that whole circuit.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, in this particular area there is quite a look being taken at the area east of Lake Winnipeg there, and I hope by this time next year we'll have a better idea of where we go in that area. I'm not in a position to say at the present time.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item, what is the situation when it comes to Metropolitan Winnipeg? Do we, as a province, are we taking over certain streets just like we have taken over highways, or are we just making contributions to Metro for the maintenance and also for the building of streets in Metro Winnipeg?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, within the Metropolitan Corporation, the province pays 50 percent of all of the capital construction including acquisition of right-of-way for the Metropolitan street system. We have no roads 100 percent ourselves as such, with the exception that it has been understood from the beginning of bringing in the new policy that No. 59 Highway within the Metropolitan area would be built to an adequate standard at 100 percent cost to the Province of Manitoba because it was so much below standard that was required; and No. 6 Highway north. While it's being maintained, well maybe by our equipment, but is a Metropolitan street at the present time. We are committed to paying 100 percent of the cost of this artery as well because of the fact that it is so far below standard.

All other streets including the Trunk Highways and everything else is 50-50 shareable with the Metropolitan Corporation. There is \$1,000 per lane mile grant towards maintenance in the Metropolitan area which amounts to approximately \$68,000 a year.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the item then, the Minister is not in a position apparently to tell me what the plans are on the Bissett-Bird River connection. I would like to appeal to him again to give this matter very serious consideration. I think it's vital to the opening up of many areas in Manitoba, including the great areas of our North, that we get roads in. We appreciate that they can't always be complete hard-surface roads to begin with, but the access is of supreme importance. If we are going to develop these areas, permit diversification, get people into them for development purposes, then there must be access roads.

In this area to the east of us, adjoining the Province of Ontario, there are at this time certain developments going on in Ontario and if we have access roads available it will mean that much of that development will continue to funnel through the Province of Manitoba. That the people who are operating there in the area north of Minaki and up as far as Red Lake if they were connected up with Manitoba roads would actually make much more use of Manitoba supplies, Manitoba people, all of our towns here would benefit from it and the access itself would bring in new developments. If we continue without completing this road system then I think we are likely going to continue having single industry operations and this is not desirable for the area. So I appeal to him to complete that system, finish up that road connection which I think was originally planned, and I am sure that from the overall standpoint that the province will benefit largely.

MR. WEIR: We're having a long hard look at this entire area, and the other point that I wanted to mention is that I have written, and I am hoping to receive an invitation to come and discuss the situation with the appropriate Minister at Ottawa, because I feel that this is one of the areas where a continuation of Roads to Resources or something of this nature could be of very great assistance, not just to Manitoba but to Canada. We are interested in roads in these areas and we are having a hard long look at them right now.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, are maps available of the Metropolitan area where the government taking over streets are shown? Have we any maps of that kind?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, we don't have any but the Metropolitan Corporation have. I think that I could get one for the honourable member from Metro and give it to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 44 -- passed. The Department of Public Works, Resolution No. 100 (a) --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister intend to make a general statement for Public Works or not?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have no general statement that I wanted to make on Public Works except that I would like to just take a brief minute to acknowledge the efforts of

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . the staff of the Department of Public Works, the same as I did on the Department of Highways, for the manner in which they have carried on with a very heavy program and worked long hours and fulfilled everything that they could, even going beyond and above the call of duty in the interests of the people of Manitoba. I think that most of the larger projects have by and large been discussed in other departments. The areas that are left pretty well are the service areas. I will be happy to provide any additional information that I can that the members would like.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I want to agree with the Minister insofar as the staff is concerned. All of us are in pretty fairly close contact with the staff at all times and we certainly appreciate the service that they provide to all of us. I wonder if the Minister has anything to say insofar as the next plans of the government with regard to office space. Are there any plans in the works now for any additional office space for government departments? At the moment as I understand it, the Norquay Building is completely used of course, and we now have the two locations on Portage Avenue, the Highway Services Building and the old M. I. T. Now are these going to continue as is or are there any plans for the centralization of government offices and any new construction?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, there's no immediate plans for new construction. There will be some reallocation of space. I am not in a position to say definitely right at the moment exactly what's happening. We are negotiating at the present time for the purchase of a building in the immediate Legislative Building grounds area here, and the outcome of that will dictate part of our next move. If that comes about, then there will be some reallocation of existing space and it will provide I think the capacity that's required for the time being.

MR. HILLHOUSE: What are the plans of the government regarding parking facilities in the immediate vicinity of the Legislative Buildings here and the Law Courts? Is it the intention to build a park-away structure or has the government given further consideration to an underground parking area beneath the park which comprises part of the Mall approach.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Selkirk has brought up probably my biggest bugaboo, the thing that I fret about the most because it is something that I think that I have to stand up and frankly admit is a difficult situation at the present time. We do have quite a bit of area around here now for surface parking. When the Revenue Building is completely demolished and set up, I am hoping that we will be able to have our draught regulations. I think that the only means of control here now - and we haven't gone at it in a systematic manner of any type - but I think that we now have the information to base a decision on.

I think that we are going to have to come to the provision of parking and establishing fees and rates of parking and assigned areas and things of that nature because there just appears to be no other means of allocating parking and space and things of that nature. I frankly believe from the studies that I have seen, that for a certain period of time, if we could get our regulations set up this summer that we could avoid building a structure or anything of that nature for some time to come, because I think that we've got quite a number of freeloaders using our space, coming from all over, and if we could once get it set up on an organized basis that we would have a little elbow room to see what is going to develop in the area before we proceed. For the present time at any rate, an underground parking area would be out of the question from the standpoint of cost.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, this question has come up several times in several years, and the Minister now refers to the fact that there are freeloaders. I'm not sure that that statement is correct and I'm under the impression that there's a Commissionaire on the parking lot between the Norquay Building and the Courthouse. I've had occasion to look for space there in the big allocation of about five stalls that are allowed to the Law Society and you can never find any room there unless you get there at 9:00 in the morning, and it seems to me almost every car I've seen there has a sticker of the Manitoba Government, unless they are the freeloaders.

I think that it's an irresponsible act on the part of this government to erect a building such as the Norquay Building alongside of the Courthouse and not pay attention to parking needs at the beginning. Any good planning involves provision of adequate parking space, and if the Minister thinks that charging a fee will rid him of the problem, I would like to suggest that he try to use the parking lot which I think belongs to the Provincial Government and is operated by a private enterprise on York and Edmonton, and I think he will find that even if he wants to pay there is still no space there. That is my experience.

I find that when I have to appear before the Labour Board, it becomes a practically

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . impossible task to find a location there - and I say the Labour Board because there are different hours that one appears there. I have tried to find parking space at different times of the day, and this parking lot where they are charging the fee is still crowded - over-crowded. Many times you can't get in. I don't know why the delay will give the government any more information than it could have had by now, because surely there are not more cars or less cars that will be requiring space there now that the Revenue Building has come down. I don't think there are that many spots that would have been used by occupants of that building, nor do I think that that lot will create so much additional parking. I feel that it's poor planning and a negation of responsibility to construct structures the size of the Norquay Building without making sure that there's adequate parking. I see nothing wrong with the provision of a parking building and a charge for it. There's nothing wrong with charging for it in my opinion, but there should be space allocated and I think that if there were traffic counts there, then I think that the Honourable Minister could have had the information long ago.

And while I am on my feet, I want to ask the Minister about the buildings that are coming down on Kennedy across from the Lieutenant-Governor's mansion. Does the government have anything to do with that? I ask that particularly because of the building that had been used apparently by the Purchasing Department of Public Works which I understand is no longer being used. I would like to know, does that building - or did it belong to the province? And if so, what did it cost and how much money was spent on improving it and how long was it used by the department? What are the plans now? Is this one of the buildings that is coming down? Was the use of it in compliance with the City and Metropolitan zoning plan? Is there a correct use of that property from the zoning standpoint by using it as an office?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, maybe the term I used earlier on as freeloader isn't the best, but the biggest area of concern I think is in the immediate area surrounding this building, people heading off in different directions. As far as the Commissionaire is concerned, the one in front of the Norquay Building is the easiest to look after because of its compact space. I don't say it critically of the Commissionaires; they are trying to do a good job and in some areas it's almost an impossible task.

The buildings across from the building here, there are - I don't know how many offhand, but there have been some which have been purchased by the province, including the one referred to in which the Land Acquisition Branch was in. I'm not sure about zoning. All that was done to the building was a coat of paint within the interior to brighten it up as temporary use, and that was fine and dandy until one night the fire went off and there were no pipes left in the building. The building wasn't worth the price of the pipes and it had originally been bought for demolition in any event. So it is one of the buildings that I'm not sure what state it's at, whether it's been demolished or being demolished, but in any event it is being demolished. There are several properties in there that have been purchased by the province for the possibility of some future use, but in any event, not wanting to see other high-rise apartments in the immediate future there until we see where our complex here is going. There are several properties in there. I don't have the information on costs of what's been bought and what's there and so on and so forth but I would be happy to try and get it, or it would probably be good material for an Order for Return. It might be easier filled in that manner, but I'll be happy to try and get it for the honourable member, whatever is easiest for him.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well is the government working along with the Metropolitan Corporation in the development that is envisioned there, in view of the fact that it is considered one of the top-grade zonings in central Winnipeg?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have no immediate plans for development of the land. Our immediate interest is to protect it from development, to have some breathing space in the immediate area here, and we have no ultimate plans. I am sure the department are aware of the Metropolitan Corporation zoning rules and regulations. They are back and forth for one thing or another all of the time, but at the present time there is no immediate use contemplated for the land and it will be used for parking in the meantime.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, if I can just go back to the parking situation. Apparently I was talking about the parking area between the Courthouse and the Norquay Building whereas the Minister was talking about this parking area around the Legislative Building. Does he want to suggest now that the area behind the Courthouse is going to be sufficient for its needs?

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm not suggesting that the lot behind the Courthouse is sufficient for its needs, but I am suggesting that we have quite a bit of Crown owned land in this

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . immediate area which is capable of servicing the government departments and the people coming back and forth. I think that the department have studies going on to determine ways and means of having some longer term parking and some shorter term parking and so on like that to attempt to provide for the various types of business that is carried on in these various places, and find some other areas probably a little further removed for those that just bring their cars down in the morning and take them home again at night, so that there is something a little closer for the people that are coming at varying times during the day.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, a parking lot is not within the plans of the zoning department of Metro for this area, and if it is, would it have to be a building; is it going to be hardtopped; just what are the plans?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware -- I think that there's just parking there at the present time. We have no administration over it, and as I have said, I think that the -- I haven't seen the plan yet, but I know that the department are working on it and what the details are going to be I just can't tell you for sure.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is it true then that -- well, I'm not saying then -- I'm under the impression that the province is not bound by Metro zoning. Is that correct? If it's correct, does that mean then that the department is going ahead with its plans without needing to comply with Metropolitan zoning?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can't answer that. I'm not sure whether we're bound or not, but we attempt to comply. I'm probably talking a little bit too much about something that I'm not too well refreshed on and maybe saying things that aren't exactly correct, but I think I'd just like to leave it at that and if I can find some further information I'll be happy to provide it.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me as to whether or no motor vehicles assigned to civil servants come within your jurisdiction?

MR. WEIR: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they do.

MR. HILLHOUSE: That being so, I wonder if he could tell the committee how many motor vehicles are owned by the Government of Manitoba and assigned to various civil servants, and how many of these motor vehicles are actually assigned to a civil servant as part of his remuneration or in addition to his remuneration.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I can't answer that right offhand. There's an Order for Return in on it which will provide it, with the exception of the question where you are enquiring as to those that have it assigned as part of their remuneration. As far as I am aware, there are none of them that receive a car as part of their remuneration as such.

MR. HILLHOUSE: They get their salary and a car?

MR. WEIR: They get their salary and a car but there is a \$20 charge per month to anyone that uses the car for private reasons. There has to be special permission for anyone with an assigned car and an agreed spot to put it before they are given the opportunity of not paying the \$20 for the assigned car.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . . . the cars that just remain in the parking lot from morning till night, they're never used at all in connection with government business excepting travelling to and from the individual's home?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not in a position to answer that one. The assigning of the car and the request for the car must be the responsibility of the department through Treasury Board in having it approved in the first place. Looking after them once they're bought is the first time that I come into the picture.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . . . jurisdiction over the actual giving of the car, that belongs to the various departments. Well, would you try to prevail upon your colleagues in the Cabinet to take a look into this and find out if there isn't a more economical way of handling the situation?

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, on Page 8 of the annual report, it tells us that they've spent \$643,128.67 on the replacement of or additional new vehicles. Now I suggest in future it would be pretty simple to put down there the number of cars purchased in any one year. In fact, you could make a pretty quick calculation as to how many they bought if we knew the policy in respect to purchasing vehicles.

Another interesting item I noticed on Page 8 of the annual report is that they authorize 3,279 wash jobs. Is that not done at the Provincial Garage or do they allow the various employees a one-wash job a week, or what is the policy in respect to that I wonder. That's an interesting page there. It tells you exactly how many gallons of gasoline they use - over a quarter of a million; they used nearly 6,000 gallons of oil and about a ton of grease; 522 gallons of anti-freeze and so on.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that inasmuch as it is also reported in the annual report that my honourable friend is responsible for the maintenance of something over a thousand government buildings, that some of them would be out at the Macdonald Airport. A year ago we were told that the government had purchased the Macdonald Airport and that the Provincial Government has opened - it says in this article here - negotiations which may lead to the creation of a multi-million dollar industrial park at Macdonald. I haven't heard anything at all about that development. I believe that an auction sale was held out there sometime in 1965 and a number of the buildings disposed of. I wonder if the negotiations that are referred to in this article fell through and they decided to have an auction sale and salvage what they could get out of it. I wonder if my honourable friend could enlighten us on this particular subject.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed too that there are provisions in the Public Works and Highways for a full Minister's Salary of \$12,500. I'm not suggesting for a minute that my honourable friend is earning or is taking the full \$25,000 a year in addition to his indemnity, but my question is: is it the intention of the government to appoint a new Minister or will that be done after the election, or during the election, because the provisions are here under Minister's Salary for \$12,500 in both departments, so perhaps my honourable friend could enlighten us on that as well.

And I wonder - my honourable friend did refer to this particular Order for Return - can we expect to receive it shortly? I wonder when could we expect - I know he can only speak for his own department - but now it seems to me there are a great number of Orders for Return that have not been returned to the member that submitted it. I wonder when we might expect to get the information we have asked for.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I might just answer a couple of those questions. The wash jobs - I think they are entitled to one a month. Those from within the Greater Winnipeg area use the Central Provincial Garage; those that are of course outside of it are unable to. I think they use the garages in the communities where they have them - provincial garages - and others don't.

As far as Macdonald Airport is concerned, the transaction that the honourable member was talking about isn't the one that was being negotiated I am sure, but they were those older buildings that were creating a fire hazard. The Department of Industry and Commerce is still attempting to find developers for the buildings at Macdonald. If this isn't possible, why then something else will have to be done about it.

As far as the Minister's Salary is concerned, it's true I just get one of them and I haven't really got, I don't think the responsibility of saying when another Minister will be named.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, could we have, or can we find in this annual report the cost of maintaining the Macdonald Airport for the year ending 1965?

MR. WEIR: I have it here, Mr. Chairman, I think. The total estimate for this year is \$12,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed; Resolution No. 100 -- passed. Resolution No. 101 --

MR. GUTTORMSON: What is the policy with regard to the charging of civil servants for the use of government owned cars. Did you announce that already? -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry I didn't, I was out at the phone. I'll read it in Hansard then.

One other question. Would the Minister consider changing the bells in this building so that people can hear them in the Committee Rooms. It's almost impossible if there's a conversation going to hear the bells, and I think that we should resort to the old bells that we had last Session.

MR. WEIR: On that point, there were some parts of the old system played out and had to be replaced, and we'll have to put up with this while the proper material is obtained to put them back at the level they were before.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, on Resolution No. 100, I noticed in Salaries there for Others, the amount that's being voted this year is \$100,180 as against \$78,645 for last year, approximately an increase of \$22,000. Now I appreciate the fact that there has been a split between Public Works and Highways, but if you go back to Highways you find that the Salaries for Others this year is \$191,245 as against \$118,600. Now I'd like to know something about the increases in salaries in respect of Public Works, and if the Minister wouldn't mind going back to Highways and giving some explanation for this.

MR. WEIR: This is where, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Resolution No. 100 - 1 (a) (1) - the Minister is \$12,500; Others are \$100,180 as against \$78,645 for last year. Then if you go back to Highways, you'll find that the Other Salaries for this year is \$191,245 as against \$118,600 in the previous year.

MR. WEIR: In Highways, the increase was due to a transfer of staff from Operations and Contract Appropriation, the same people being listed under a different appropriation, and the additional staff that was required with the break-up in the Accounting Department which had been together between Highways and Public Works, not being able to split half a body and things of that nature - very little there - and the extra work load due to the provincial road mileage is the explanation that I have for Highways.

On the -- I can't explain it in detail, Mr. Chairman, from what I have here although a fair chunk of it is - each of these departments now have a full-time Minister which works into your total, it doesn't work into your sub figure. Each -- (Interjection) -- pardon? And each one has a deputy which adds in - before there was just one and an assistant and the assistant is here. There was an upgrading of engineering and architectural salaries during the past year which will account for part of it.

I don't notice any indication of extra bodies, so I think it must be in that area, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . . the Minister say then that there has been actually no saving between the separation of these two departments; there has been an increase in expenditure.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that there was any saving. At the same time as the departments were split there was an increased load carried by both departments and I don't think that it's fair to say that the entire cost or increase is because of the split in the department.

MR. HILLHOUSE: You increase efficiency do you?

MR. WEIR: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do. It may not have worked itself out at this stage of the game but in the long pull I believe it will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 101.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words on Resolution 101. I usually rise at this time of the year. This year I have very little to say except to add we're much impressed by the way the building is being maintained. The colour scheme now is - many people certainly like it. But I'm just wondering if I should say once again, when are we going to do something with the front doors - the front doors. We have revolving doors at the other end of the building and during the period of the storm here when we had the high winds it was almost impossible for anyone under 150 pounds to open those front doors. Now, every supermarket, Mr. Chairman, have these doors today with an electric eye on them. I don't say we have to go into anything too elaborate, but surely, we must be thinking of this building as a building of utility too as well as being a monument and if we're going to use it, with all the people that come here - from Seven Oaks alone in one week we had 180 pupils - and I think that it is time now that we took a look at it.

In the members' room, I have had a suggestion made to me and I want to pass it on to the Minister. There's a fairly large room there called the members' room - some members have said to me that they thought this should be subdivided similar to a department stores credit department where you can sit with a person in some degree of confidence and chat. If you try to use that room there may be one or two people in there and its - the large space is of no avail. I know that with a building like this it is difficult to make it more utilitarian by putting in partitions and that sort of thing, but they wouldn't have to go to the ceiling, it could be done with modern materials such as glass I suggest that perhaps three or four small compartments -- there are desks there already. I never see them being used. I think we could

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd)... put them to use. The members would be able then to take one of their constituents in there and talk to them with some degree of privacy. Caucus rooms are not really suitable because - not only of the acoustics but because other members of the caucus want to use them at the same time.

One other suggestion, Mr. Chairman, because I really don't have too much to suggest this year, is that it has been pointed out that a refrigerator in the members' locker room - we're able to get nice hot coffee there from time to time, but if the weather happens to be warm like it is right now, you can't get a cold drink there. I don't think this would be too much to ask to have at the session every year one of those electric refrigerators brought up.

I would like to ask the Minister if he thought that removing the Tourist Information Centre from this building would sort of ameliorate the parking situation here. I will have something to say about that under the Department of Industry and Commerce. I think that the Tourist Reception Centre should be that where we do receive people and it should be down on Assiniboine Avenue. I just want to ask the Minister, is much of the congestion here caused by people driving up to this building asking for parking information?

May I once again thank the Minister for the service that we get here from the cafeteria.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, as far as the front doors is concerned, I think I have good news for the honourable member. I think that we'll find a new door this year. I think they have a design worked out for a revolving door that won't deteriorate from the appearance of the building; this is something that we've all been concerned about is doing anything that might harm the appearance of the building, and I think that they now have something that will solve it.

As far as the members' room is concerned, I can appreciate the problem that he poses. I'm prepared to give it some thought and have the staff give it some thought, but I would think it would need to be another room in the building. This is one of our committee rooms which I think I'd hate to see subdivided, it's rather a nice room if it's the one that I think you're talking about, east of the ordinary members' room here - or north of it, and I doubt that. I'll see what the staff can do refrigerator-wise for him.

And as far as the congestion is concerned, we're really having this difficulty at all times of the year whether we have tourists or not. Maybe you'll have good cause for having a couple of reception centres, but I think that there's something to be said for inviting people to come to our Legislative Building and bringing them here so that while they're looking for other places to go, they also have a look at what I consider to be a pretty fine head of the house for the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: I'd like to ask the Minister two questions with regard to - one is with regard to the use of land that is held by his department that is not in use, for example at Portage in the land fronting the highway, that is part of the Boys Home property, I know the Minister has had many requests from people who wish to buy the land and so on, but would he consider a short term leasing of this land for playground purposes? For example, the Playground Commission in Portage are desperately short of land and they have made enquiries about this piece of land that is fronting on the highway and the east end of Portage. Would he consider a short term lease for this purpose? That is one question.

The other one is, with respect to the buildings at MacDonald Airport. Are there any more PMQ's for sale? There's a group - I think it's a church group at Oakville who would like to obtain one of the metal PMQ's and they were told that there are no more for sale, but since that time, I think there have been a few sold.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, first about the land, I'd be prepared to consider any proposal which of course would have to be - it can be channelled through me if they wish, but the use of the land as long as it's used for a Boys Home is really controlled by the Department of the Attorney-General. It's true we administer the buildings and so on and so forth, but until - once they have the control of it and the use of it, it's subject to their uses, not my department's whims and desires, but I'm sure that both departments would be pleased to consider any suggestion and see whether or not something could be done or not.

As far as MacDonald is concerned, Mr. Chairman, there haven't been any of the PMQ's sold. There has been two or three moved out which are being used for government purposes - one is at the mental hospital, I believe, in Brandon and the Attorney-General's Department I believe, two of them someplace else. There have been none sold. If something isn't forthcoming, consideration will have to be given as to whether or not the PMQ's be sold or something. At the present time until we can come into something a little firmer, I think my answer would have to be no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed. Resolution No. 101 -- passed; Resolution No. 102. (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) -- passed; Resolution No. 102-- passed. Resolution No. 103. (a) -- passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on the Provincial Land Acquisition, who is there now for whom this branch does not act? In other words, what government bodies presently still do their own purchasing and acquisition of land?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, this branch acts for all government departments as of July 1st. The Statutes prohibited this department acting for parcels that had been begun prior to July 1st, but this branch acts for all departments of government now for any acquisition.

MR. MOLGAT: When the Minister says departments of government, he excludes I presume the utilities, however. Now, could he outline to us which utilities and which bodies that are in essence government corporations still operate separately. I presume the Telephones still purchase on their own. I presume that is the case for Hydro; I presume it might be the case for the Government Liquor Control Commission. Are there others? Are these three first of all, definitely excluded and are there others?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge all three are still acquiring for themselves. I have no record of what ones are using the Commission. As you recall the Bill - there were two sections in the Bill last year, one was land acquisition and the other was the establishment of the Commission. The Telephones and Hydro and any of the other Boards and Commissions are at liberty to use the Commission for certificate as to value of land without the Land Acquisition Branch having anything to do with the purchases of the land.

I can try and find out for you but I'm really not aware of it. They're the only boards and commissions that I know of and I believe that they are all still purchasing their own land. They may be using the Commission for a certificate; I'm not sure.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . . tell the committee as to whether or no that committee that has been set up to study or to advise on a new Expropriations Act, whether when that legislation comes into being will it do away with the Land Acquisition Act or will it be used in conjunction with the Land Acquisition Act.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'd have to go by my recollection of the Bill. I think that it would go in conjunction with the Land Acquisition Act, wouldn't replace it. That's from memory now . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman at the time the Bill was passed, we had introduced a resolution suggesting to the government a complete change in their land acquisition methods. I'm pleased to see that this branch was set up. I think it is a forward step, because certainly the land acquisition methods previous to that left very much to be desired. I'd like to recommend to the Minister, however, that it be extended and cover all government operations be they crown corporations or boards or commissions. If they are in fact corporations of this government, using public funds, then all of the acquisition should come under this one single body. I think there's much to be gained by having one method of operation so that the public knows quite clearly at all times exactly where they stand regardless of what government body they deal with. I don't think that the public in general make the differentiation that we might make here between the Telephones or Hydro or Liquor Commission or Highways Branch or one of the others; as far as they are concerned these are government bodies. I think it would be much better to have the one body acting for all groups.

I still get complaints in many areas about the methods of purchasing. A lot of people have the feeling that when the land agent comes along for the government, the individual who is easy to get along with and says yes, "what is it that you're paying" and he's told, "well, the rate is \$80. an acre," and he says, "fine, that's what everyone's getting," and the answer he usually gets, is "yes, that's the general rule," and the fellow who's easy to get along with, proceeds to sign on that basis. But inevitably there are some who say no I'm not satisfied with that and who hold back. Then we end up with the situation that those who hold back end up by getting substantially greater amounts for the land that is taken from them. This creates trouble all the way down the line then. Those individuals who were prepared to co-operate and sell at what has been assumed to be the general rate down the line feel very much aggrieved and I think that they have good reason to feel that way. Surely if we had the one policy, the one board, and if they followed a consistent practice of dealing with the public, on an absolutely open basis, that is if they are going to pay certain individuals greater amounts then it be understood that those who signed in the early stages will have the opportunity to renegotiate, I think it would change entirely the attitude of people towards government purchases. Because as it stands now, a number of them

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)... feel that they've simply been taken advantage of - that if they are prepared to co-operate, whatever the project happens to be, not hold up the matter and sign in the early stages, then they end by being the goats in the operation . . . . and some other individuals end up by getting a lot more money.

Now this surely is not desirable from the government's standpoint either. I don't think that the saving that is involved is justified insofar as the attitude of the public. If we are going to do these things properly - and I know how difficult it is, and I know what an item of cost this can be - but after all we are dealing with the public. It's their money; the projects are there for their benefit and I think it's important that all of those involved end up by getting fair and equal treatment. I feel at this time that this is not always being done and if there were one body involved in all of the government purchasing chances are that the policies could be followed in a much more consistent way. I would urge on the Minister that regardless of what government body it is, Utility, Commission, Board, or what it be that the purchasing be done by this one central body.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I would like to go along with that Mr. Chairman, and I also would like to add municipalities. I would allow the various corporations to exercise powers of expropriation but when it came to fixing the value, the value would be fixed by the Land Appraisal Commission, and by that method and means we would get some uniformity in prices throughout the province because just as my Leader said, the variations that exist between compensation paid by different crown corporations is really staggering in some instances. The difference between say the Manitoba Hydro, the Manitoba Telephone System, then other departments of government, then finally you get down to the municipal level. Now the municipalities can't compete with these other bodies and it makes it so much more difficult for municipalities to arrange settlements with owners of land that are being taken say for public works. I feel that the best method of achieving that uniformity would be as my Leader suggests, leaving the right of expropriation to the various crown corporations and bodies and municipalities, but giving the Land Appraisal Commission sole jurisdiction over values.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think the Leader of the Opposition has raised a very good and very valid point because what is happening now is that we are penalizing those people that are co-operating in the first instance, and I think this is sad because we want the people to continue to co-operate in dealings where we have to expropriate or we have to purchase land and the ones that come forward first and are willing to negotiate, they find themselves later on to be short-handed and have been dealt with in a way that I don't appreciate. I certainly subscribe to what he said and I would like to hear from the Honourable Minister on this.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, the steps that have been suggested may well be logical extensions of the arrangements that we've got now. I think that the one thing that the Commission is going to do -- it's almost too early to tell, it took them a while to get organized and get moving, it's really too early to judge it too effectively yet -- but the one thing that it is going to do is have an understanding of what makes up the price with different people, out in public, so that they know what the score is. Often cases that people think that there have been differences in the basic price haven't been differences in the basic price at all but damage to property when they divide the whole area taken by the number of acres, not recognizing that there's shelter belt or there's improvements of some kind or something like that that's happened, and one individual says well I got so much money, and really all he did was divide a larger sum by the same acreage and the basic price was the same. I think that there was a lot of areas here and I think that my department and others did the right thing by saying well really we can't tell another man's business to everybody else up and down the road and there was never a means established of making public what the compensation really was in these cases and letting it be known how it was made up.

I think that the Commission is going to do this. I think that in all fairness I would say that a pretty good start is to try all at once to get all of the government department's organized so that there's as little work stoppage as possible, because there is a big organization job in trying to keep up in the original instance of this land acquisition problem as you go out with the schedules that are being set by the various departments for proceeding with work and things of that nature; but I really think that they're making a pretty good stab at it this year and the suggestions that are being made may well be logical extensions of this nucleus that's been built up.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, on the subject of land acquisition, a matter that's causing a lot of annoyance in my area and I understand this situation is prevalent throughout

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd)... the province, is the long period of time that people have to wait for their money for land that is purchased from the government. On No. 6 for example, there was some new construction, and there have been two to three years since the land was purchased and the people are still waiting for their money and they're understandably very annoyed and they are chasing me to see why they haven't been paid. I think they have a right to be annoyed because surely when the government collects money from them they want it promptly but when they sell property to the government they have to wait and as I say it's been two or three years now since some of them have been waiting for the money they have coming to them.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, this surely must be the balance of the money that you're talking about, not the whole price for acquisition because they're entitled very promptly to their first 75 or 80 percent of whatever it is, and the balance is paid after the construction and after a survey because the estimated number of acres may not be exact. We have what you might call an inter-departmental impasse which I've been trying to get ironed out for some years now to get the Land Titles Office so that they would accept the registration of an engineering plan in the Land Titles Office, rather than the registration of a plan signed by an M. L. S. as far as right-of-way acquisition and transfer of property and the likes of that is concerned. Probably for some good reason they're not too prone to do this.

I think that we will maybe be able to catch up a little now because I think that there's been another land surveyor or two graduated and stayed with us. But the difficulty that we've had is that there's been apprentices or whatever you call them, picking up the trade of a M. L. S. to be able to get his papers, and have gone through the graduation with us and I gather it's a pretty good field on the outside and they would leave us and there just hasn't been enough land surveyors to keep up with the amount of work that we have been doing. This is the sort of thing that has been holding up these final payments, is getting something that was able to be registered and accepted by the Land Titles Office for transfer of the property. I'm hoping that we will make good strides this year in getting the backlog cleaned up.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The Minister is quite right. It's the balance of these payments that they're waiting for but it varies from anywhere from maybe \$25.00 to \$500.00, depending on the amount of land that was purchased from the government. It's my understanding that in addition to having to wait this length of time for the money, they are also paying taxes on the land that they sold to the government, and this seems most unfair that they should be penalized to pay the taxes on the land. Now is there any provision to compensate these people for the taxes that they're paying on land that isn't there own?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, no there isn't at the present time. The whole answer to this thing, if we could take the engineering plan that we used to build the road and move it into the Land Titles Office when you built the road, and if we could get them to accept it -- but up until now -- and as I say I'm not being critical, they probably have a very good reason for adopting this attitude -- but my people are attempting to work out some means whereby something of this nature can be done. On top of that, even if that doesn't happen, I think that our land survey situation is going to be better this year and we may well be able to make some strides ahead instead of slipping backwards on it like we did for a couple of years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; Resolution 103 -- passed. Resolution 104 -- passed. Department of Labour.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, I see we just have enough time to pass my Estimates this evening. It has become customary though at this time to acknowledge the competence of ones staff and the co-operation that we have in our respective departments, and I certainly would be remiss if I did not do this for the fine staff that we have in the Department of Labour. It is not a large staff, but we certainly have quality.

I would like also Mr. Chairman, to thank members of the labour community and of the management community and also my colleagues in this House for their kindness and consideration to me the past months. I must say that I am feeling fit. I am looking forward to certain events that are professed to take place this year and trust that my constituents will see fit to return me to this House as a member of the government.

I suppose in order to give us something to talk about in this non-controversial area, I should point out some of the more favourable aspects of our work this year because we have had -- and I would like to emphasize this -- that we have had considerable stability in our labour-management relations in Manitoba this past year. This is remarkable, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we've had practically full employment and we are all aware that in years of high

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd)... employment and when collective agreements have to be negotiated, that quite frequently there are strikes. Some of them sometimes even of the very serious nature, but fortunately, that did not occur here in Manitoba this past year, and when we think of situations that have occurred in neighbouring provinces, why I think we can be most grateful to the farsightedness and the abilities of the parties concerned to negotiate reasonable agreements. Now it's quite true that we've had some vigorous bargaining. Let's face it our unions are strong, and sometimes they're even militant; but our management sector, Mr. Chairman, manages to protect its interests with strength and determination too, so it seems to be a reasonably fair fight.

I might say that this has resulted in a busy year for our conciliation staff, and they have rendered very effective service and I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute particularly to our conciliation officers. There is an increasing acceptance Mr. Chairman, of third party intervention as an important and useful instrument in the settlement of labour disputes. And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that this third party intervention has proved to be helpful to the party, and we certainly hope that the legislation before the honourable members at this time, will help to continue the good record that we have and even improve upon it.

I would have to point out to you that the minimum wage has been reviewed this year and that by the end of November the minimum wage in Manitoba will be as high as general minimums in any province of Canada. I might say in connection with this, Mr. Chairman, that it is our intention to appoint two female representatives as additional members to the Minimum Wage Board; one will be from Labour and one will be from the Management segment. I might say also that to some, our minimum wages are still not high enough; to others of course, they are too high; but I believe, Mr. Chairman, that they have been established in a very responsible manner and with due regard to the many factors that have to be taken into account.

Another significant development of the past year has been the work that has been accomplished by the Labour Management Review Committee, the Committee commonly known as the Woods Committee. The Woods Committee has, Mr. Chairman, I think made good progress towards its broad general purpose. It is trying to arrive at a better understanding of our labour-management problems by reviewing them in a dispassionate climate of joint study and debate. It was put to me quite aptly I think the other day when they said this Committee has provided a forum where the voice of moderation can be heard and heeded. Now, the fact that all of its joint recommendation may not be completely satisfactory to all of labour or to all of management, I think is quite understandable; but the consensus which the Committee itself was able to arrive at is I think most helpful in the development of sound and healthy labour-management relationships, and we are looking forward with I believe a well founded optimism to an accelerating industrial growth through good labour-management relations. As we look to the future, we can expect that these will be helped and enhanced by expanded programs in training and education with the assistance of both the labour and management sectors.

It is gratifying to know that as we grow industrially that we as a community are giving an increasing attention to the human factors involved. We are not only committed to the development of our physical resource but we are also committed to the development of our maximum opportunities for the human resource, and also to the safeguarding the welfare of the individual worker through the good labour standards, through sound collective bargaining procedures and through training and retraining programs and other similar measures.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose I might be expected to deal with some of the unfavourable aspects of our work and at first I thought that I might try and do that, but then upon reflection I find that perhaps I should leave this side of the picture to those members of the House who seem to have a much more highly developed skill and aptitude in this direction than I have. So I would like once again, Mr. Chairman, in closing these brief opening remarks to consideration of the estimates of the Department of Labour to thank both the labour and management sector for their participation in the tripartite actions this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank the Honourable Minister for the introductory remarks he has made in introducing his department. I would also like to compliment the staff in his department because for the years that I have requested any information or phoned the department they have been most co-operative with me and supplied any material that I wished to have.

The Honourable Member just mentioned a few of the comments in labour matters such as full employment and minimum wage and Woods Committee. One thing, Mr. Chairman, that

(MR. PATRICK cont'd)... concerns me mostly is this government's lack of policy as far as labour matters is concerned, because what actually the government is saying to labour and management, you fellows get together, whatever you decide on is okay with me. This raises a number of questions, Mr. Chairman, because what does the government say about the public interest. Is the legislation wise or is it needed, because we made our stand known in this House in respect to the government supervised strike votes for the last three or four years. As members in the Opposition we said it was ineffective, it was an insult to labour and that it should be repealed, that section of the act. Now I certainly agree with the Honourable Minister that -- I agree with the legislation he proposed although I did have some reservations in part of it because in the new bill it says that strike votes taken to be secret but it doesn't say who is going to take the strike votes. The Minister has not clarified that one point to me so I am not quite certain just exactly what the legislation is going to be. I know that I also would have wished that probably our estimates would have been a week from today because I know the two bills that are before us are most important. We're also waiting for some legislation in respect to Workmen's Compensation and Unemployment Insurance which interests me because I did have a resolution that I was going to submit to the House, to the committee, but I have waited till this point and I feel if there's no legislation coming as far as unemployment insurance is concerned, I will hand my resolution in.

Getting back to the secret strike vote, Mr. Chairman, what is the policy of the government. I know it's easy to say that we are bringing in legislation what the Woods Committee recommended. Well, this is fine. I agree with this; but does the government feel it is good legislation. They haven't taken a stand; they don't say so. All they're saying is we're bringing in the recommendation of the Woods Committee.

Now what about the relative positions of the parties itself. Is the government neutral? Do improvements in the conditions of the working men depend on management agreement, and what is the government saying? These are some of the questions I would like to know. If so it's not fair to management whose duty is strictly to its self interest and it's not fair to a working man who has a right to look to the Legislature for help; and if so I think it's not fair to the people of Manitoba who have a right to look to the government for interest, and in many areas of labour matters the government are saying, "well, we have set up a committee and whatever they agree on this is the legislation we're going to bring in." But my concern is there are so many areas that the government or the committee will not agree on, labour and management will not agree on, and what is the government to do in that area.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, during the labour estimates, we stated that the labour report itself was a waste of time and a waste of money and it seems to me this year the Minister has done exactly the same thing, except probably somewhat worse than last year, because in the general comments right at the beginning there is very little as far as labour matters are concerned. All it says is about the Woods Committee, what it has done -- we have a real good report in respect to Woods Committee here and it's very easy to read and easy to follow.

In the general comments where we would have expected something about the government's philosophy in labour matters, we instead have a discussion of the Woods Committee. The report says that the Woods Committee has been able to reach unanimous agreement on a number of changes in the Labour Relations Act which it believes are essential to bring about labour bargaining. These proposals have been forwarded to this government for the last few years by the members on this side of the House for the last few sessions. I know the Woods recommendations were in relation to the Labour Relations Act and the ... strike votes.

In the Woods Committee itself, Mr. Chairman, I know there's a section where they were dealing with the secret strike vote and I believe it is Mr. Enton who has been invited to come to Winnipeg and speak to the Committee because some three years ago I know, when I spoke on the labour estimates I have quoted from his book and stated the things that he said to the Committee here in Winnipeg, so I feel that if the government would have listened to us on this side, I'm sure they wouldn't have to spend three years and bringing in the recommendations now.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would say we are concerned with the principle that this government is following. It takes no initiative on its own but merely follows what labour and management together can agree upon. This is hardly giving direction. This is not at all what the essence of political parties is supposed to be. There are many items as I've said that the committee, that labour and management will not agree on and I feel that the government has to take some initiative and bring in some legislation which is good for the people of Manitoba.

I already mentioned I was somewhat critical of the Part 2 of the Tables in the report.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd)... It's got pages and pages of statistics, there's no information, no explanatory remarks in respect to statistics, you would have to be almost an expert to follow the statistics as far as the report is concerned. I notice that in Apprenticeship Industrial Training Division we have 15 pages of tables, including speeches or meetings of education. This is the better part of the report which gives us some good information.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to refer to the Manitoba Federation of Labour report and on Page 12 of the report there's Section 54-55 dealing with the Crown Corporation employees, which denies the employees of Crown Corporations the same privileges enjoyed under legislation as those of private employees and further do not provide the same privileges to the Crown Corporations as the Federal Government does. I would have to go along and agree with the report - what's in the federation brief because this would bring it with the same legislation what the Federal Government has done.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, . . . convenient point to ask the Committee to rise. Unless the honourable members are disposed to finish the department.

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

#### IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.