

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, November 6th, 1958.

Opening prayer read by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.  
Reading and Receiving Petitions.  
Presenting reports of Standing and  
Select Committees.  
Notice of Motion.  
Introduction of Bills.  
Orders of the Day.

HONOURABLE GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw attention to one correction in Hansard for November 3rd, Volume 1, Number 8, Page 3, on the top line there is one figure which reads as follows: "indicated a yield of 9.73 cubic feet", that figure should read 0.73. I thought it was worthwhile to make that correction.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources; could he indicate when my Order for Return will be available.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped it would be ready today. I think I can promise the Honourable Member it will be ready tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the Honourable Member for St. Matthews to take the chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Concerning adjourned debates on resolution 3, Capital Supply.

HONOURABLE ERRICK WILLIS, Q.C. (Acting Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, I should like to give some attention to the questions which were asked just before dinner, particularly the question of completion of the projects. It is true that a number of them

MR. WILLIS (Continued)

appear in this estimate which appeared previously in the previous estimate. They were not completed and therefore they appear again. The money which was appropriated for these items was transferred to other items of which I have the list with me, and spent on those and that's why in some cases you get a repeat in regards to them. And that's, as I say, is why they are appearing both one and the other. But they were not completed and this is for completion and the amounts which were appropriated for this purpose were transferred to other roads of which I have a list. I would be glad to give it to Committee if they would like to have it.

And then again, in regard to Government equipment, having been away from the department for awhile, I didn't know all the answers but all the equipment which the Government has, appears in the annual report which each Member probably has with all the details in regard to it. This is the statement from the Chief Engineer in regard to the equipment - "After World War II, the Province had number one priority in the allocation of road machinery, several pieces of grading equipment -- mainly crawlers and scrapers were purchased. As equipment became available to contractors they started buying a lot of rubber-type equipment in much larger sizes than the crawler-type models that we had. The price was reduced below what the department would carry out the work." This is the important part I would like to emphasize - "Rather than replace our grading equipment for modern equipment, we traded crawlers and scrapers for maintenance and snow removal equipment, draglines and loading equipment, cabooses, water-tanks were set up as heavy maintenance crews to accompany our gravel crushers, mobile asphalt planks for patching and asphalt road mix works." The value of the equipment is \$3,800,000.00 as shown in the 1956 - '57 annual report along with the types and quantities of each type as shown in the department's annual report for 1956 and 1957. In other words, the department has now practically no dirt moving equipment. It was traded in on this equipment which has been indicated and they have none now, and that was apparently a change in policy.

In regard to the perimeter route ..

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, if I may interrupt my honourable friend right there, I think it is mentioned in the report though that they have some other equipment such as even surface laying.

MR. WILLIS: I understand very little of that, although they have, of course, a vast quantity of maintenance equipment which is all listed here and in the annual report. But you won't find there, and they tell me there is practically no dirt moving equipment which is left. Therefore, at the moment they are not able to build the ordinary type of road. Nor, of course, do they have any equipment in regard to concrete and as far as asphalt is concerned, their equipment is for patching.

MR. CAMPBELL: ....Now, Mr. Chairman, that's not all, I think, that they have of asphalt equipment.

MR. WILLIS: No, they left this here. It's a very long list. I would be very glad to turn it over to you and have you look at it but it's in the annual report.

In regard to the perimeter route - Waverley to Oak Bluff - when these estimates were prepared it was thought that we would have to stop concrete work prior to November, but due to favourable weather it appears the concrete may be finished. But it is almost certain that the shoulders will not be completed this season.

MR. CAMPBELL: What one was that?

MR. WILLIS: That's Waverley to Oak Bluff on the perimeter route.

Then on the Trans-Canada - Seine River we had questions in regard to that. This item is in the current year's estimates that delays were incurred pending final negotiations with the C.N.R. with respect to the Symington yards. However, grading is now being done in the vicinity of the Seine River, the Seine River bridge is to be built this winter. Consultants are designing the C.N.R. overpass, depending upon them, the contract will be let for its construction.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is it in this year's appropriation?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, it's in there. Question from the Member from Minnedosa as to the Oak River bridge, P.R.H. No. 24. The actual construction of this double-barrelled culvert which is the same thing as a bridge is provided for in the 1958-'59 estimates. It will be built this winter under our winter works program. It will be necessary to reconstruct the approaches one quarter of a mile on each side of the new structure with a high fill over the culvert. This cannot be graded and gravelled until the frost is out of the ground which will be in the fiscal year 1959-1960.

Question from the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, re P.T.H. No. 4 east of Victoria Beach - seal coating. The actual mileage according to the highway map is 47 miles. The mileage shown in the estimate is from Beausejour into the parking lot at Victoria Beach plus the mileage from Victoria Beach corner into Grand Beach. To avoid increasing the details on this list, these two items were consolidated but it must be well known that the portion from Beausejour to Stead Corner was paved this year. The portion from Grand Beach corner was not in this year's program, but in order to have a continuous pavement into both of these important beaches I authorized the paving of the road into Victoria Beach. The nature of the work is seal coating, which I am sure the Honourable Members know that seal coating is an application of asphalt oil with the sand cover to seal up any shrinkage cracks that inevitably occur after laying hot mix bituminous base. The road to Grand Beach was laid about four years ago. It will be given a new seal coat at the same time as the other portions of the highway are being done.

Member for Ethelbert asked in regard to P.T.H. No. 4 - Foxwarren to Reston - completion of the bituminous mat. This work is under contract to the Nelson River Construction Company. The

MR. WILLIS (Continued)

item on the estimate shows the identical mileage of the contract and is shown as completion of bituminous mass. Terms of the contract provide that the black top shall not be laid until after October 15th without the approval of the engineer.

MR. M.N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Could the Honourable Minister tell me how much of the 24 -- 21 miles has been completed - mat laid?

MR. WILLIS: This says that due to - they are still laying now the first lift of the mat. It is ..... longer this fall, the balance of the work will have to be done next spring. Allowance of the balance of the allocated money for this job which will not be recorded this fiscal year was transferred to pay for the pavement from Grand Beach corner into Victoria Beach, the money being asked for in this vote is for the completion of next year's paving, shoulders and the seal coat which may be applied early next fall.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I asked another question. I guess the Honourable the Minister overlooked it - the one on access roads.

MR. WILLIS: Yes...

MR. HRYHORCZUK: That's what I prefer to call them.

MR. WILLIS: The question in regard to access roads, that is now our policy, to build from the highways into various towns along the route and there is, as one would expect, a variation in it, the type of road which was built is what is adequate for that situation depending on the size of the town, to a degree upon the distance off the highway. The access roads are normally a 30 foot top and depending upon the road from which it came, they vary, normally if it is from black top, it is black topped. If it is from the ordinary highway, a gravel highway, it becomes that as well. There is no definite decision as to the exact mileage which will be included, depends upon the local situation and the amount of traffic which - around three miles which has been the furthest that we have ever approved.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, following that up, before I name the roads I have in mind, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister one question. He told us this afternoon that this was a new program and it is to some extent, but I find out that he actually had two new programs; one which appears in the list that he handed to all Members in the House and the other that appears in the newspapers. And I have here, Mr. Chairman, a copy of the latest Winnipeg Tribune, and I find that the program listed in the Tribune does not correspond with the program that is shown on the list that was handed around to the Members.

MR. WILLIS: There is one extra item, I explained that this afternoon. I will do it again if you like.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I didn't hear the Honourable Minister's explanation.

MR. WILLIS: Oh, yes!

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I did hear the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs get up and thank the First Minister for having this piece of road put in which was added after this program was distributed --- the Provincial Secretary, I'm sorry --- the Honourable Provincial Secretary this afternoon got up and thanked the First Minister for that addition.

A MEMBER: How true.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: And it's in connection with that addition, I would like to know where that comes into the program. That addition is not a part of our highway trunk system. It is not on the highway. Is it not the Honourable Minister's intention to declare that a highway? No. 2 question: He mentioned that these access roads would be about three miles long. In the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education, I see a road on the second last page of this program - Sifton - five miles - Sifton to P.T.H. No. 2. That is not a highway. Will the Honourable Minister tell us whether he intends to declare that five miles a provincial trunk highway.

MR. WILLIS: In regard to the road through No. 2 to Notre Dame de Lourdes, as I have said today that has been on the program. If the Member for Ethelbert doubts that, he could speak to the Deputy Minister, but in the typing it was not included. It was passed. Everything was approved in regard to the road officially by the engineering department, also by the Cabinet, and then we found out that due to a typing error, I don't know whose it was but one girl typed it - it was omitted. It's always been on the program - it wasn't a new idea and it's there and it's going to be approved by the House, I hope, and it has the full notice of the House as well. It will be a 100% road and it will be the commencement of a highway which will go across there. Until it is built it will not be declared a highway. We do not approve of the policy of declaring highways and building them afterwards because if you do so then they appear on the road map and people think they've got a highway and when they get there, they go into the mud, which is directly contrary to our policy. Consequently, while you have highway construction you don't have it listed as a trunk highway because in the past that has been done and I've always been opposed to it and I'm still opposed to it. As far as the road through Sifton is concerned, it will be built to highway standards 100% by the Government, and after it has been built it will be declared a trunk highway. It is just as simple as that.

MR. W.C. MILLER (Rhineland): In view of the explanation given

MR. MILLER (Continued)

by the Minister that one item was not on our list, I would like to ask him if possibly trunk highway No. 32 bituminous mat might also be in that category and I wonder if he wants to surprise me at some later date ...

MR. WILLIS: I think maybe a double surprise would be too much.

MR. R.W. BEND (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, I haven't taken any part in this most interesting debate thus far. The main reason that prompts me now is that very early on yesterday, I asked three questions and one of those questions was - was this program an entirely new program or was there anything on it that had been on the program that had been announced at the last Session. Now I know the Minister quite well and I know that when he answered with a straight "No", that he really believed that that was the situation at that time and I am not being critical of that. But then, Mr. Chairman, when the same question was asked again today and when a specific instance was pointed out, then the Minister was quite frank in saying, "Well, it's possible that there is". And if anyone is wondering why this debate is going on, you have all kinds of examples why, because you just cannot seem to get the clear picture. Now then, I want to make it clear right at the outset that we are not arguing about the program as such, neither are we offering opposition on this side, to the Government policy, but I am certain if any of us on this side have a responsibility it is one of finding out exactly what this program is and we have now been sitting for three sessions in here and we haven't been able to find out.

Now then first of all, of course I admit that I wasn't at all surprised to find that the newspapers had the information before us, because that is not new. I know that when I wanted to find out anything about the Gas Commission I could find it out much quicker in the paper than I was able to find out through any means of communication to us. And then, of course, when I was interested in the interim report on education, again I found that the quickest way to do that was to look in the papers. And so it was no surprise to me that in order to find out what the road program was, I looked in the papers and again it was no surprise to me, today, that when the Provincial Secretary pointed out that all we needed to do was look in the papers, we would find the program there again. Now, I have one simple request of the Minister in this connection and it has nothing to do with asking for a new road, but could I get on the same mailing list as the Winnipeg Tribune?

Now then, last night as the debate wore on some of the Members on that side got a little impatient and I can understand that. It's awkward to sit back and not take part in a debate and it gets very aggravating to see us getting up all the time. I know. But I'm going to tell the Committee this, Mr. Chairman, any time that this House is faced with a program that entails the spending of \$33,000,000.00's of dollars and nobody on this side asks questions, then as far as I'm concerned, whoever happens to be there certainly are not carrying out their responsibility. And what is this delay?

MR. BEND (Continued)

This was specifically mentioned by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare last night - the delay, of course it's quite a delay. I mean it's a day so far, or a half a day for the spending of \$33,000,000.00. And so I have shown that if we go so far as to try to ask some questions and to try to get some information and to try to make perfectly clear what this program really is, then of course we're causing a delay.

Now let's take and I know that the Honourable Minister knows this, that we have been good friends all this time and I don't intend this speech to change it, but let's just go over what occurred here yesterday.

The first speech that the Honourable the Minister made was announcing a brand new program, a new program of highway construction, a new type of highway construction. This was going to be different. Now you look over the miles that are here, and I haven't totalled them up, but what is the new type of construction. Well I know he pointed out what a great road No. 75 was, nobody has argued that point; I know that he pointed out that in certain areas certain heavier construction had to be used, but in this whole program, what is the evidence of it? There's no change in what has been done before. There are some 30 miles of concrete in certain areas where previous policies would have put concrete.

Now in the second speech, when the Honourable Minister spoke, he admitted quite frankly, and I give him credit for this, that this was nothing more or less than an extension, in many cases, because he said, and I think this was good, that we found that we had a good year for building and although we had completed the amount that was set out in the original estimates, we continued on. But that was nothing new, that was simply continuing on what had already been planned for and so when you look at this new program, and as far as I am concerned I give credit where credit is due - we do need highways and certainly nobody else, I'm sure, is going to get up and argue in this House against them, but what we've been trying to do all through this period is to sift out and find out what this plan really means. Now wouldn't we have been guilty, Mr. Chairman, of negligence of duty if we had stopped the discussions yesterday at the point at which the Minister said "This is a brand new program, there is nothing on it that was on the previous one." Now that was the odds, and we had gone and said the program is a completely new program. When, Mr. Chairman, such was not the case and this questioning has brought that point out.

Now then, we come to this, too. Questions have been asked and the Minister has said well, if you go to the Deputy Minister, or if you go to the Chief Engineer or if you run around all over the building, you'll find somebody who will give you the information. Now, Mr. Chairman, we haven't got that kind of time. Surely this is the place where we get the information and I simply, and I'm certainly making a deduction here I'll admit, but I think on fairly sound ground - if the argument in answer to our question had been good, had been a very good one that would have given good marks, well, surely we would have had the answer. But when you find you're unable to get this answer, when you find that the answer is different, then of course, what can you do? You can only

MR. BEND (Continued)

remain as we are over here, confused to find out exactly what this program is.

The Honourable Member from Brokenhead asked two questions last night, and I understand he is going to get his answers by letter. Well, that's good, but they were of interest to more than the Honourable Member. We had a simple straight forward question here, a simple question, four miles of road that the Honourable Member from Lac du Bonnet asked, he was accused of giving the same speech twice, three times and he has yet to get his answer. Does this four miles of road or does it not parallel an existing highway? Now surely that's a simple question and surely the Honourable Member from Lac du Bonnet shouldn't have to answer it three times and then -- ask it three times and then not get the answer. He's got me furious now too, because I'd like to know if this four miles of road parallels a highway or not. And so I'm asking that question and I'm sure the Minister will be able to tell me and I'm sure he'll be able to tell me why, because I can remember discussing with the Honourable Minister on another occasion a request for a road and the answer was "how can we give you that road when you're so close to another highway, and the answer is no." So I'm interested about this four mile piece of road. I would like to get the answer, if it exists - why it exists.

Now then, there are one or two other points that I might as well make and I don't intend to make another speech on this. But I want to make it perfectly clear that so far we have been unable to determine how new this program is.

Now then, the next question that I would like to bring up is respect to the federal sharing of roads. Now the Honourable the Minister spoke perfectly true when he said he had resolution here requesting this, that that particular time the Government was in the centre of an extensive building program jointly with the Federal with respect to the Trans-Canada. There is one point, and I do say this most kindly, in fact, I'm not intending to be anything else but kind here, because really I haven't been able to figure out yet whether this is an extension of the old, half old, whole old, half new or where the division comes - but I remember in one of the speeches given by the Honourable the Minister that I was impressed with this - he said - I believe the time is come - and this is not quoting him directly, when we should try in this Province to get on somewhat the same basis as the States of the Union are, and I believe at that time that he used as an example the State of Minnesota and their program is something on the basis of so many dollars of federal help from Washington on the basis of miles of accepted trunk highway and population. Now then, I simply ask if he still feels that that is a good idea because, I'll be quite frank, I thought it was, at the time he mentioned it. Now I know the Honourable Minister has said, well we think that as a result of our pressuring Ottawa that we've got this road to the north. Well, if my memory serves me correctly that road came out as a special project that Ottawa would be willing to share in and really does not fall at all under the subject material that was passed here unanimously in the House requesting that the Federal share on a fifty-fifty basis with further roads. And, I



Mr. Bend (Continued)

would be further interested to know if the minister still thinks there would be some chance of convincing Ottawa nor, or at some future date, of an over-all basis of financial help similar to the States, that he mentioned at the time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I finish up then with only, with two requests, one: to be put on the same mailing list as the Winnipeg Tribune and No. 2: to find out if this four miles of road does really parallel another highway.

MR. S. JUBA (Logan): Would the honourable member from Rockwood-Iberville permit a question? He had made some mention regarding the report of the Royal Commission. Was it your intention to cast a reflection on the members of the Royal Commission?

MR. BEND: Mr. Chairman, how far can you get away from any possible logical deduction? I simply read in the Tribune and very glad to read it, of the report of the interim commission. I did not say how it got there. I simply thought that it would be good if I could get on that mailing list. I casted no reflection on anyone.

MR. JUBA: It was your intention.

MR. BEND: What did you say?

MR. JUBA: I see. You don't deny that it was your intention to cast a reflection on the members of the .....

MR. BEND: Certainly I deny it.

MR. JUBA: Well, that's all I wanted to get straight.

MR. BEND: Well, alright.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the "Tribune" circulation. I am just trying to make up, trying to remember whether it's, let me see, \$2.50 a month. Whatever, I'm sure I can put my honourable friend on the "Tribune" circulation list without much trouble and if he really is serious in that respect, I will be glad to do so.

MR. BEND: You misunderstood me. I wanted to be on the mailing list for information.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, well, according to my honourable friend, he's satisfied with what he reads in the "Tribune" so I'll put him on that mailing list.

I just wanted to make this observation, Mr. Chairman, and I must congratulate the honourable member. He raised the point in an amusing way. I got a chuckle out of it, and it's a good little dig, and I don't hold it against him. But I must confess that I'm just as annoyed as he is that both those particular articles appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune.

I must congratulate somebody on their staff because they cer-

Mr. Roblin (Continued)

tainly scooped us completely. Before the report was on my desk, they knew what was in it.

Now I don't want the honourable member from Logan to take any offense at this but in the case of the gas issue, for example, we did try and find out what happened and I must confess that we weren't successful; all we knew is that the only copies we had were all wrapped up in a vault when the news appeared in the paper and they had only been seen by myself and one other.

Now, that's no explanation, - no excuse, - it's one of those things, I rather fancy that an energetic reporter who talked to the people interested, not on the Commission itself, I don't mean that, but other folks that had an interest in the gas issue or in the education issue, could probably come pretty darn close to the mark if they were speculating ... (interjection) ... Pardon? Yes, some of it in the education report was verbatim, but with this interesting peculiarity that it was not verbatim of the final draft which was presented to the government. There was a slight difference, which we noticed, which apparently was in a previous draft. Now, again, I'm not making any comments about how that happened because I simply don't know. The commissioners in both cases gave me their assurance that it was done certainly without their knowledge and I accept their word for it completely and unreservedly. I can say to the honourable member that unfortunately I can't explain what happened; all I know is that nobody in the government, as far as I have been able to ascertain, certainly nobody among the ministers, disclosed any information in that way. And I'm assured that none of the Royal Commissioners did. But I think that we have to appreciate the fact that an important report like that probably goes through several drafts, - there's a good many people in on it, and with no malicious intent, certain facts about the report can certainly become public knowledge. I suppose the commissioners discuss what they're talking about with some people who might be interested in the affair and to ascertain their opinion or get their views; and in all innocence that sort of thing might happen.

But I'm really not interested in conducting a post-mortem into the affair. I can't supply the honourable member with the answer. I can only give him my assurance that, to the best of my knowledge, the leak did not come from either the Royal Commissioners or from the government. Now, I can't explain it. I apologize to the House for it because it certainly shouldn't happen and I regret it, and I was a little bit annoyed when it did happen, but there it is. That's the best I can do for my honourable friend.

MR. BEND: Mr. Chairman, that's satisfactory to me.

MR. JUBA: Honourable, the First Minister, only recently we read in the newspaper where one of the members of the Royal Commission, that is the Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission, had voiced his opinion on a certain matter which was under discussion by the Commission. I wondered if it is not in our power in this legislature to sort of lay down some sort of a policy as far as members of any Commission is concerned. And I'm referring

Mr. Juba (Continued)

to the one on amalgamation which was recently made where one member studying the problem has come out publicly and has stated his views of the matter. In my opinion, I think it's wrong and possibly the members of this House could do something about it. And as far as the Royal Gas Commission is concerned, I could assure you that the members of the Commission were extremely cautious not to speak to anyone in order to voice an opinion one way or another. We felt that we did not want to prejudge the case and we waited until such time as we got all the facts together. And when we got the facts together, we compiled it into a formal report which was delivered to the government.

MR. R. TEILLET (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a position that I must come to the defence of the Mayor of my city. And I admired that cartoon in the Free Press that I think was quite apt.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I really think probably we shouldn't follow this too far. Let's get back to the issue that is before us.

MR. TEILLET: I do want to speak of leaks, and my answer was this. There was no difficulty in that instance,--no trouble at all in finding out who had talked to the Press. He had no hesitation in giving them his name. He gave the statement quite clearly. There was no question of leaks or anything else. His Worship stood up in front of the entire public with that question so that I do think that we should go easy on reflections of this kind.

MR. BEND: I'm only going to finish this once and for all. I simply made a simple request and here this gets into people having to defend somebody else and all this. That was not my intention, Mr. Chairman. I made a simple request that I would like to be where I could get this information and I assure you that if I had been trying to blame anybody,--I would have used an entirely different tone of voice.

MR. JUBA: The honourable member has no intentions of embarrassing anyone?

MR. BEND: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it perfectly clear that I had no intentions of casting reflections on anybody.

MR. F.L. JOBIN (Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Public Works a while ago, volunteered to supply the Committee a list of transferred appropriations. Could we have that please?

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, before we leave this matter of leaks, due to the fact that the First Minister is prepared to give us some information in this regard, I wonder if you could also explain to the Committee how the conversation between Mr. Tom Kent, the Editor of the Free Press, and the Minister of Education fell into the hands of the other very good news-

Mr. Molgat (continued)  
paper in Winnipeg, the Tribune, as reported.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't want to follow this too far afield. I can only say this, Mr. Chairman, because I know of that matter and I really am surprised that my honourable friend is so indiscreet as to mention it for a number of reasons, because that matter was thoroughly investigated and the source of the information was discovered. And I think that if you ask Mr. Tom Kent, I think he will be able to tell, and I think will also be able to tell you that he is perfectly satisfied with the explanation that was provided to him. I certainly have no intention of mentioning names.

MR. MOLGAT: ..... I wondered in view of the fact that this was again in the papers unknown to us.

MR. WLLIS: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member for Rockwood did get himself in trouble by asking all these questions. However, as he asked them with a smile on his face, why, that helps a good deal.

In regard to the program, I myself discovered only at dinner time that all of it wasn't entirely new. Only about 98% is new so that I'm sorry that that is so. And the reasons for it are obvious that some of the work which was previously projected was not able to be finished, and as a consequence, they transferred the monies to these other roads and continued them which were not on the previous program. And that's the way it all occurred. I'm sorry that I did say, it's quite true, that the program was new because I was so informed. I'm "Johnny come lately" to an old job; I did come here the first of July but there has been quite a bit to do in the meantime, so I haven't got everything completely under control.

The responsibility, of course, on the Opposition, is to criticize. When I was there I did. And I think you get a better government by having such criticisms so we think that's the proper thing to do. The honourable member said they couldn't find out. I should like to tell him that in most, the legislatures in Canada, they don't bring down a detailed report. All they say is: Roads - \$115,000,000.00 - and then later on they try to find out what the roads are going to be. But here, we bring down a complete and detailed statement in regard to all of the roads.

Now, the minister has said that newspaper got it first. We follow here the traditional system which has been followed, I think, certainly in the House of Commons, and certainly in most of the legislatures in Canada - that you have your copy - when you start to read it - it's released to the Press - not before. I had several requests for it to be released to the Press but I always remember that one of your ministers, one time, had a great misfortune. Come Friday, he was on the program for that afternoon, so he released the program to the Press. His name happens to be Mr. Bell. He released it on Friday and in Saturday's paper it appeared in the newspaper in great detail, and it wasn't mentioned in the House until Monday. So that I remembered

Mr. Willis (Continued)

that well and tried to avoid it - because when the newspapers came to me and said "Can't you give us your program so that we can analyze it or start printing it or something?" I said, "No, I remember what his program appeared two days in the newspaper before it ever was in the House at all." That was understandable. I don't blame him at all because one can easily drop into a difficulty like that and he dropped into it.

As far as the Winnipeg Tribune is concerned, all this information was released to the Free Press, the Tribune and everybody else at the same time.

Now in regard to the question of a new type of construction, as I pointed out at the time, and I will repeat again, in regard to the heavier roads there will be a new type of construction. When the estimates came in, I asked them to go back and make sure that they had enough base in it. With the results that they went back and the estimates rose, in accordance with them. It's entirely true that some of the roads will be just the ordinary construction because they just have ordinary traffic. But where you have heavy traffic, this time you will have heavier roads in 1959 than you had in 1958. I suggest that it's incorrect to say that there is no change because on the number of roads there will be that change, and I trust that it will be noticeable as well.

I'm glad the member brought up the question - he said that this was merely an extension and it was not new. Each year, we carry out a program here, most of which is extension, but new, - but new. In other words, if you're working on a road which is 200 miles long, you may do ten or 20 miles a year. But each time you do that, it's an extension of the program but it's entirely new construction.

MR. BEND: Mr. Chairman, I know the honourable the minister would want to understand what I meant when I said that, and maybe I wasn't clear. I meant that it wasn't new in the type of construction, not a new piece of road. Obviously, it's a new construction as was originally contemplated, but I was saying it was nothing new in the type of construction since it was extending the road already built. That was what I meant by "new" in that connection.

MR. WILLIS: Well, I think you and I have it straight but I read it in the newspapers and they didn't have it straight so I'm glad to drag in this discussion at this time, because it is an extension and it is new.

Well, I don't play any favourites there and sometimes I like what they said about me in the Free Press better than the Tribune. And sometimes in the Tribune better than the Free Press.

Now, I thought it was a little unkind for the member to say that they have to run all around the building to get this information. It's in pretty good detail in the statement which is there and I think it can be gleaned from that pretty well. But the member got in a hurry and I didn't have time to sit down with him and draw it out on a map, and I was afraid it might become an epidemic and there might be 25 people wanting to do that. If that were the case, I wouldn't be able to come into the House

Mr. Willis (Continued)

tonight to explain these details in regard to this program.

Now, as far as the road is concerned, it was in doubt, in regard to this parallel road, if we might come to that. There is to be - if it's the same road and I think it is, - from Beausejour straight west to connect with highway No. 22, there will be a road built there, a gravel road, by the government, connected with 22.

When No. 4 was built through Beausejour, to a degree they seemed to think that it left them a deserted town. I had the whole Chamber of Commerce of the town in here, asking that this road be built so that when people came there from the East, from Kenora, they could go straight West and go down 22 without getting into the heavy traffic. They complained that they had been by-passed by the previous government; that they had built No. 4, but connected it with the Grand Beach road, without going into Beausejour at all. And that, as a consequence, they were - that businessmen were finding that they were getting about half the business that they had before. There was still heavy traffic and we thought by building this short piece of road, we could siphon it off on to highway No. 22. Nothing has been done in regard to this but it is in the program; it is now the intention to build that type of road in that location, whereby, they will, without too much dust, but with some, be able to go over to No. 22, without being on No. 4 highway and cluttering it up to get to 22, which will become, in my opinion, a very important highway in the Province of Manitoba. So, for what's it worth - that is the story with regard to that road itself; it will be built.

Now, in regard to federal aid, I think that was the last item which was spoken to by the member from Rockwood. I have not changed my opinion in regard to federal aid. And, since I assumed this office, I talked to the government at Ottawa, two or three times, in regard to it. I will be there next week. I will talk federal aid a bit more, because sometimes it takes a little convincing. But we have been able to interest them in northern roads for one reason particularly. Years ago, the Federal Government was convinced that they should do some federal aid and they built the Trans-Canada when I was in this job before. That was helpful, but it was helpful more than it appeared at that time. It was helpful because, in order to supervise the building of the Trans-Canada Highway, the Federal Government had to have a large staff of engineers; and having a large staff of engineers, in regard to the Trans-Canada, they were not liable, and didn't overnight, let those engineers go elsewhere. So you have them now working on these northern roads, which for Manitoba, mean 15 billion dollars, split two ways. So that we have not yet got the Federal Government to agree to the United States system, in which, I believe, in which I moved motions here I think, on three or four occasions, and got endorsements, finally. The member from Russell got in my hair a couple of times. He broke it up, but I finally got, one night when he was away, I think, we put it through here, unanimously, in this House, and we had one seeking federal aid.

Federal aid will continue to be a problem in this country - and a great one - and a very useful one - and no one in this

Mr. Willis (continued)

Chamber should forget that that is a matter which should be taken strenuously to Ottawa and this government will take it strenuously to Ottawa.

In the United States, in Montana, through there, and Texas, particularly Montana, which is a poor state, they haven't got the money to build proper roads through there, but they have proper roads, built by federal aid and they pay 50% of the cost. And so it is, with us, in many of the provinces if not all, in Canada; that because of the revenues which are obtained by the Federal Government from gas tax; from tax on machinery; from tariffs and the rest, in my opinion, they have a duty to perform in giving us federal aid for our highways. I've believed that for years. I shall believe it until I'm here no more. Therefore, as far as we are concerned, we agree entirely, as far as federal aid is concerned, we believe that our foot is now in the door, and we're not going to remove it. And if, through the Canadian Good Roads Association, and others, we can give help and influence, then that will be a great step in the right direction. It is just a little unfortunate that as far as federal aid is concerned, the Province of Quebec will not join with the other provinces, to seek federal aid because they are suspicious of federal influence. They want to keep away from it as much as possible. It is their traditional policy and, as a consequence, we are not getting their assistance in regard to seeking federal aid from the Federal Government, either now or ten years ago. And, consequently, that is one deterrent. But, I think that even itself, can probably be overcome, and that eventually, in this country, I would be amazed if we do not have a proper system of federal aid for highways, similar to the one in the United States. Because, in Canada, we deserve it.

MR. BEND: Mr. Chairman, I'll only be a moment. I am grateful to get the information, but with respect to the distributing of copies, I haven't intended to get into that part. However, I would like to just point this fact out: That while it was quite true that the release would be given to the papers in order that they could publish it that night. While we were discussing it here in the afternoon, I remember quite well, (in '49 and '50) when the honourable minister mentioned, the other day, that it had not been his custom to circulate such a thing as this at the time, -- that's quite true. But towards the later years, and I know at least the last three years, that at the time the minister was presenting his estimates -- while it is quite true that he had released those to the Press -- we were provided here with a copy at the same time as the minister was providing his address, as the honourable member from Springfield mentioned when he pointed out the type of thing we had the other night, in his speech -- last night.

MR. WILLIS: I made enquiries in regard to this, and so far as I can find out, it was inaugurated by Mr. Robertson, when he was minister; for the distribution to the members at the same time as the distribution to the Press. That's the first time it was

Mr. Willis (continued)

done here, so I am informed, and I remember, for instance, that when my good friend, Mr. Morton, was here, I had great difficulty in getting details of the roads and he gave them to me the next day as a special favour - a copy of the one which he had read from himself. Consequently, the system was inaugurated by Mr. Robertson. There is no reason why it shouldn't be, in the future, - as I say, - I delivered it ten times, without having done so. All I did was exactly the same as before and I didn't realize that I would get these severe criticisms for doing what has been done here, year after year, and for twelve years in succession, anyway.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, last night I directed a question to the honourable minister. I asked him if he intended to expand the present road program to the spring session, if and when it was held, and he replied "there will be other roads built". What I meant was, will there be any other P.T.H. highways in the spring program?

MR. WILLIS: There will.

MR. JOBIN: Could we have that list of transferred road appropriations, please?

MR. WILLIS: Why, sure.

MR. BEND: Would the honourable, the minister read them, Mr. Chairman?

MR. WILLIS: That's what I had in mind.

MR. WILLIS:..... As against the apparent saving by not having completed the other roads, additional projects were authorized and completed. Here they are: Poplar Field to Broad Valley - grading; P.T.H. No. 22 to Grand Beach Corner to Victoria Beach - paving; P.T.H. No. 31 Pembina Valley to P.T.H. No. 3 - grading; P.T.H. No. 59M extension of P.T.H. 59 to Libau - grading; Roblin Boulevard access road - grading; P.T.H. No. 5 Eden South - bituminous recap mat; P.T.H. No. 8 Gimli to Camp Morton - grading; P.T.H. No. 34 to P.T.H. No. 3 to No. 23 - double prime; access roads Birch River to P.T.H. No. 10 to Bowsman to P.T.H. No. 10. That is the list.

A member: How much money involved?

MR. WILLIS: Just under \$1,000,000.00. Just under \$1,000,000.00.

MR. CAMPBELL: Could we have a copy of that list, Mr. Chairman? I mean copies for all of the minister, members.

MR. WILLIS: I'll get them for you.

MR. CAMPBELL: And could we also have the ones that were listed as not completed from which this \$1,000,000.00 arose?



MR. WILLIS: The repeats, as it were?

MR. CAMPBELL: No! No! I understand that this amount, \$1,000,000.00, was made available because of the fact that some other roads were not going to be finished this year. Could we get a list of those roads as well? The ones that were not ....

MR. WILLIS: I don't have it but I think I can certainly get it. The facts are that they were unable to be completed. Those monies were used on these roads which I have outlined to you; some of them authorized by your government; some of them authorized by this government. But they were completed there and those monies were used in that way, so there wasn't a saving but there was a transfer of expenditure from those to the others. Therefore, you get a repeat in the roads, which are on this program, and on the previous one because they were not completed.

MR. W.C. MILLER (Rhineland): Would you care to predict how much of the \$33,000,000.00 in the next year's program, might be diverted to other projects not mentioned in the submission to us?

MR. WILLIS: Well, I could not estimate the diversion, if any. I would hope that these would be completed entirely, and that there wouldn't be a diversion; but in the wintertime, there will come another program - I hope and expect - and while there's life, - there's hope.

MR. JOBIN: Mr. Chairman, first I would just like to deal with a statement the Honourable the Minister of Public Works made just a few minutes ago, when he said that we have been able to interest them, (that's the Federal Government) in northern roads. There has been some talk about \$15,000,000.00 joint co-operations spread over five years. I think that this House should refresh it's mind that this particular venture was started at the time of the old government. This was part of Diefenbaker's vision, and we co-operated .....

MR. WILLIS: I think that's entirely true. Not in doubt.

MR. JOBIN: That's fine. But I just resent this statement - "we have been able to interest them in northern roads". Now, it's true the minister has, to some degree, answered some of the questions that were raised here yesterday and today, - some remain unanswered, - and I don't want to be accused of making a speech the second time, although I, perhaps, will; but it will be very brief. But, yesterday, in the House, I said that if it was within my rights as a member of this legislature, a member of this committee, that I would like to see some proof of the engineering and of the planning done on the road between Mafeking and The Pas.

MR. WILLIS: Here it is right here.

MR. JOBIN: We were offered by the minister, in a form of

Mr. Jobin (continued)

jest, and now by the member from Morris surely in another form of jest, that our proof is a member of this legislature. With all due respects to the member from Swan River, who knows the country and knows the roads - certainly neither the minister nor the member from Morris says that that is my proof. The minister did say .....

HON. JOHN CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities): I understand, and this was only a few months ago, that you people were going to have that road completed by 1960. How could you possibly do it if you didn't complete the grading and gravelling in one year?

MR. JOBIN: O.K. As soon as I finish with this. The minister did say, though, that they presented the facts and figures to me at my desk and I said "go ahead". I think those were, roughly, his words. And so, yesterday, I said that if it's within my rights, I'd like to see some of that planning and some of that engineering. Because, personally, I don't think it has been done.

In regard to the question of the Minister of Public Utilities, it is true that the then-Premier of the Province of Manitoba, in The Pas and, I think, in Flin Flon, said that No. 10 would be black-topped in 1960. When he made the statement, I shuddered, because I felt sure that he was making a mistake. Because, and as proof of that, if we take the tape of the programming, the planning of the former Minister of Public Works, he told us, (and you can go back to it for proof) that No. 10 would be hard-topped by 1961. And you know, as well as I know, that you can't black-top it until the completion in 1961. The Premier made a mistake. I never followed that up. You never heard me say that we would have black-top by 1960. In the speech that he made, he made a mistake. Nobody checked him there and it was just left unnoticed.

Now the reason I asked, yesterday, for some proof of the engineering and some proof of the planning, was because we are concerned with the \$33,000,000.00 - and I am repeating what I said yesterday - we are concerned with the \$33,000,000.00 road expenditure. The work that is envisaged from Mafeking to The Pas - (I'll be criticized from across the way for giving this figure) - but the grading and the gravelling will, when it's completed, cost pretty close to \$5,000,000.00. \$5,000,000.00 is one-sixth of the budget that we are asked to pass. Now if, as proof, we have the word of the member from Swan River - is that sufficient proof? On one-sixth of the budget, should we approve the whole budget, when that's all the information that we are able to get? Now, I'm so convinced, I say this again and I repeat, go ahead - give her full blast; build that hundred miles if you can do it. As a matter of fact, I have had people from the north congratulating me today saying "well, at least the government will move Heaven and Hell to get that hundred miles done", and I'm sure that's true, too. But I am so convinced that it is a physical impossibility to build that hundred miles, Mr. Chairman, - consider rebuilding 100 miles of road on a straight stretch on the Prairies?

Mr. Jobin (continued)

Has it ever been heard of - let alone up north?

I am so convinced that they can't do it in one year - and I am so convinced that they can't do any more than roughly 50 miles of it, that I would be prepared to auto-ski over that amount that they complete - over the 50 miles, provided that the Minister of Public Works would make the same undertaking, - to auto-ski over that amount that they don't finish within the next year - between now and next December. I say it can't be done and I am willing to make that challenge that I'll ski over everything in excess of 50 miles they do, if he'll auto-ski over that in less than 100 miles that they don't do.

MR. B. CORBETT (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, my name has been mentioned here and if the Minister of Public Works will excuse me, I would like to say a word, regarding the impossibility of building 100 miles of road in one piece. I haven't got the figures, but I am quite sure that, in the last season, there has probably been two or three hundred miles of new grading and gravelling done in the province. I cannot see - this was done in smaller sections in various parts of the country, but I cannot see any more difficulty in building 100 miles of road divided into five or six different contracts by contractors, than building a greater number of miles of road in various parts of the country.

Regarding the surveying - I have no official information on this. It is just what I found out from my own observations, being up on the road. I don't know whether the honourable member for Flin Flon - he can't go home or he doesn't travel that road -

because there have been survey parties working up in that country, I believe, for the last two months or so. But I cannot swear to that because I have no official information, except what I learned from my personal observations.

And I would like to just mention another thing on this estimate here; on that point brought up by the honourable member for Ethelbert; on that 20.1 miles of road. I think he would see on that item there - it's completion of work on there - which is necessarily a job that wasn't completed this season, the contract was let and naturally they are going to complete it next year. And possibly the reason it wasn't completed was the fact that a great number of the contracts were not let until so late in the season this year that it was impossible for them to finish their jobs this year under this year's appropriation.

I have nothing further to say, but I am quite confident that I would like to have the job of supervising that 100 miles of road, with all the hungry contractors in the country sitting, twiddling their thumbs, half the summer - a lot of the summer; I am quite sure I would like to have the job of supervising the road, and I would assure the honourable member I would make a small bet with him right now, that it can be done and will be done.

MR. M.N. HRYHORCIUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, relative to that Foxwarren-Russell road that has been just

Mr. Hryhorczuk (continued)

referred to by the honourable member from Swan River. The reason I raised it, the reason I am going to talk about it again very shortly because, referring to the Winnipeg Tribune again, the final edition of today, if you look on page 14, you'll find this, and I quote from the paper, "The new program includes plans for 38 miles of concrete highway and 437 miles of bituminous mat surface". 437 miles. During the recess, I went to the trouble of going through this program to find how much mat was promised in the program, and I find there was 437.7 miles. The newspaper, anybody reading that newspaper, would take it for granted that that's 437 miles of new mat. And I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, I have information, from very reliable sources, that at this moment, there are 14 miles of that road completed and that the balance will be completed within the next few days.

Now this is only one instance of where we have been able to obtain accurate information. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, acting as Minister of Public Works, anticipating that more of this nature would be uncovered, came in tonight and gave us a statement in general terms. Yes, there were programs--1958 were tied into this so-called new program. Now that is the point that I want to make, and I think it has been made.

Now insofar as my honourable friend, the member from Swan River is concerned, I've known the honourable gentleman for a great many years -- in fact, I consider him one of my very close and intimate friends. I think the first time we met is when he got into government service, way back in the early '20s -- I used to drive him. And he made a great reputation for himself in the early '20s, because he did build roads through what was considered impossible terrain in those days, and the first road that he built was a part of No. 10, north of what we call the town site of Powell. Now, it also happens that the honourable member from Swan River was in charge of the building of the present No. 10 from Mafeking north. And the reason I know that, Mr. Chairman, is, back in the '30s, we were hunting caribou up in that country, and we ran across quite a number of trial lines that looked as if they had been run by engineering crews, any number of them. Eventually, we came to what is now P.T.H. No. 10, and lo and behold, there were hundreds of men with wheelbarrows, building the grade. It was quite all right to put that gradethrough at that time in that fashion, but I, like the honourable member from Flin Flon, am very skeptical whether today, with the traffic that we have, (there was no traffic on that road at that time) with the traffic we have, that he can do it. And if the honourable member from Swan River will see me after we adjourn, I'll accommodate him with a little bet, if that is what he's looking for.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I think probably these gentlemen are not going to bet at all. I don't think so. I don't think there are going to be any bets in regard to it.

I rise now only to say that these two honourable gentlemen over across the way, one a financial man and the other a lawyer; I only suggest to the legislature that possibly a graduate engineer, who has spent his lifetime, pretty well, on this road, might

well be considered to know more about it than the two honourable members who have spoken, and I have been at different gatherings, particularly one at The Pas at the opening of this highway, when it was stated by no less an authority than the then-Premier Bracken, that in his opinion, Bert Corbett was the greatest road builder through difficult terrain that there had been up to then. And he put Mr. Barney Campbell, who assisted on it, as a close second. So that on that authority, I say to you that here is a man who thinks it can be built, probably who has more experience in building roads in that area than anyone living, that he has built them, and he says he would like to build this one. And I, for my part, without further discussion, am willing to accept his word in regard to the probabilities of it rather than the two gentlemen who sit opposite.

And, as far as we are concerned, we recognize there is a risk; we are taking that risk, knowing what it is, and it's a calculated risk, and we have 100 miles to build there, and if we get a very wet season, we're in trouble. If we get a dry season, we have a good chance to finish it. And so we're going ahead.

MR. JOBIN: Just one observation. Somewhere along the line, the minister has missed my point. He says that this is a calculated risk. He is right. I agree with him. I congratulate him for taking this calculated risk. My contention has been, and is, this is roughly, this job is roughly, one-sixth of the total budget for roads. My claim is that you have not had sufficient engineering, nor given it sufficient planning to say that you're going to do it. And if this is the case here, then I suggest maybe it exists all the way through this budget. I have one other question and that is "to ski or not to ski" -- that is the question.

MR. WILLIS: I have heard the honourable member make so many speeches in this legislature in regard to the neglected north that I thought we would get nothing but praise from him in regard to this road, instead of criticism, and I am just a little surprised that he is throwing road blocks in the way of it and that to a degree, he says it can't be done. Thereby, he probably tries to frighten us in regard to it. But I assure him that for the benefit of him and the people from the north, we will go ahead with it, no matter.

MR. JUBA: There is an awful lot of betting here in the House and I was very surprised when I heard of the honourable member from Ethelbert make an offer to the gentleman from the north here, regarding the road program. It struck me as kind of amusing because only a year or two ago, when he was the Honourable Attorney-General, I had asked him if he would make a draw on a margarine contest, and he thought it was just awful and he wouldn't make the draw. Now he is betting.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if it would be in order for me to ask a question of the minority government, if they have a long range road program. The reason I say that if it's in order, because I have heard a lot of discussion here about "is this a new program."

It reminds me of my various trips into the Province of Quebec. One government that was in control of the province and the road building program at that time had decided to build certain highways. We happened to be going down this highway. It was a beautiful concrete highway - and then we came up to this big checkerboard - that was the end of the highway. I had asked this manufacturer what happened to the highway and he said that government was defeated and the following government did not have any intention of completing that highway. Now I was just wondering if the members on this side of the House expected a program of that nature; that the program that was started by Liberals should be ended with a checkerboard; and then this government bring in an entirely new type of program and start roads elsewhere. It is kind of confusing, Mr. Chairman.....pardon?..... to take advantage of my handicap and am going to have to be quick and get the microphones. So they did nothing to be applied here as far as continuing a program. Yet, these programs, the program of the Liberal Government was fine -- but it's like yesterday's newspaper. They have no control, so it's yesterday's newspaper - it was the old program - so this government brought in a new program or a revised list of what they intend to do. May it be on the same highway, or not, it doesn't make any difference. I think that is very important that they continue the program and they just constitute a new program 'cause it's a new government. We've got to face reality.

Now, my explanation. As I said before, although I sit on this side of the House, does not necessarily express the views of the management on this side. But I just wondered, getting back to the question I want to ask. Does the government have a long-range program, and what I mean by that is this; will certain revenue, that is your sales tax; your gasoline tax; be earmarked for highway construction? We have heard this argument in the House some time ago, and I just wondered if that would constitute a long range program, because, in my opinion, I think it is a good program to undertake - highway construction, based on certain types of revenue. Now, I can't give you details of what particular types of revenue - but based on some sort of a formula, in addition to grants from the Federal Government.

Now, I don't know, it may not be a fair question to ask a minority government, and I know that possibly they are not making long-range programs, not knowing what the outcome will be. And if that side of the House seems, by some strange coincidence, a sort of get together of some nature, to throw them out; but I just wondered if that is not what they have in mind. And if so, I think it would be a very welcome sort of a program.

MR. R. TEILLET (St. Boniface): I think there is one more question here. By this questioning, we have brought out quite a number of facts. We have discovered one potential new highway in the constituency of the Honourable Provincial Secretary. I would like to ask, under the items 'miscellaneous'. Here you have about six or seven other chunks of roads in other cabinet ministers' constituencies with one, I believe, in the whip's constituency. Are these also potential new highways? And, if the minister would

tell us where there might be other potential new highways developing in the province.

MR. W. LUCKO (Springfield): Mr. Chairman, I rise to defend the Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. JUBA: That's the reason I left it to the very last.

MR. LUCKO: Mr. Chairman, I noted there was so much confusion about certain miles of road. One fellow states five; one states four; and in fact, my honourable friend from Beausejour says six, I had better make this whole thing clear.

Now, if you get the program that reads 1957 and '58, (and I will give you the whole reason for that) and we'll make a pretty good case out of it. Thirteen miles of grading from Anola to Provincial Trunk Highway No. 1 East - that was on the 1957-58 program. All right. Now, we go along to 1958-59 - this very same road, from Anola to Provincial Trunk Highway No. 4 East, - gravelled, calcium and chloride. Fine, we come to the new program '59, - just presented by Honourable Minister of Highways today. He comes along with this road. Fine, because I wanted to make this quite clear. I don't want to be accused that somebody may think why didn't you do it and when didn't you do it. It's just possibly -- it just couldn't be done. Follow here these programs: 1. That's the first year; that's the second, and I see you're doing the right thing to stay here. Now, the reason for that five miles of road connection is, you take all the traffic that is coming from the East. We have heavy traffic from the North, from Grand Beach. Now, they pile into Beausejour and you get that bottleneck in there. The way we feel about this whole thing is if you can break the North traffic on the by-pass of Beausejour, and take them on the No. 4, back into Winnipeg, and if you can divide the traffic, send them right to No. 22, that has to go to St. Boniface. And here, that is the logical solution, and I want to congratulate the minister upon that. I file, if you notice my "for return", because I personally found that that shouldn't be built as a market road, and I want to advise you right now, you proceed with it and get that road built to the highway standard and don't be afraid ..... defend you on it. I can assure you of that.

MR. JUBA: Would the gentleman like to change seats with me?

MR. LUCKO: Not with you. I've never been an Independent, and never will in my life.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the whole travelling public in the East will appreciate that that is the right solution.

Now, it may look to some honourable members in this House, that it is only within a mile's difference. I want to be frank. I live within three miles of that road. Nobody knows it better, and it might look to some of the fellows, (no, I am not talking for myself) it might look to some of the honourable members in this House - how can you go and build another road within a mile's distance, when the other one is fine? But that case there is

entirely different than you would think.....There is just no question over that. We must divide our traffic back on to 22. Only I feel sorry that you went with your new program this year, and that they'd been as far as Anola, but you never went on 22. You would have solved your problem completely for traffic if you gave them a dust-proof road. I am not going to stress for that or anything. Another program, I personally feel, that the shoulders on No. 4, from Beausejour should be widened as fast as they can, to reach No. 11 at Whitemouth. This is a very heavy road, and I am satisfied that the minister, with his spring program, will come along and he'll consider that. You've taken care of No. 15; you've taken care of all other roads; there is only one left and that's not a trunk highway, it's not a trunk highway system, and there is quite a confusion over it. And I am sure the Honourable Minister of Highways has been approached by it. That is the road when the Trans-Canada Highway was built and the old Dawson road was turned back to the municipality. Now, I don't know what your opinion is, whether your intention is to take that back as a trunk highway--I doubt very much, but I would advise the minister with the traffic and the old road that it is, that at least if you can't take it back to the trunk highway system, that you will consider the much higher percentage so we can get that road rebuilt in the highway standard. It is sharing the traffic and there is no question over that. These people should deserve that.

Now, I will come back, but I'm not going to be good now. (No, not you!) -- I am coming back to the Honourable the First Minister now. I'll still come back to my days that we both were at the great opening of the waterworks at Beausejour on the 24th of September. The Honourable First Minister was asked to speak and I listened very carefully. And here is the words he had been using when he got up he said: "I see what a great necessity there is for you that you need that No. 4 road to be rebuilt." We are building the shoulders for you. Well, I would advise, "Oh, now wait a minute. I listened very carefully to that. He said, "We see that it's such a great necessity to the people of the East and we are building the shoulder for you on No. 4 highway". Yes, Sir!

MR. ROBLIN: ..... my honourable friend talks about shoulders and things like that.

MR. LUCKO: You spoke on that. Now, here is the third year's program. It's right here. What does this program say? Eighteen miles from Lockport to Beausejour, - widening, grade, structure and base. Now, did the Honourable the First Minister have anything .... to do with it; he was still in the position when the work was authorized. And a year later, yet, we got from Beausejour to Tyndal, a year before we did the shoulders. We fully recognize that. We knew that would be it. There is no question at all. We recognized that. We did it. Now, that was on September the 24th. A month later, the Honourable the Minister of Public Works comes with this press clipping. Now, I want to read it again because I don't want to hear say the minister never read it,



never saw it. Here is what that press report says: "The Honourable Errick Willis, Minister of Public Works announced Monday that his department has started construction of four-lane highway east from Lockport to the point at Beausejour. This four-lane highway road will connect with the Lockport and with four-lanes south of Winnipeg". And the minister goes further. The minister says, however, that he could not give no details as yet, on likely projects to be paid out of the special \$24,000,000.00 appropriation going before the special legislature. Well, alright. To shoulder the expenditure of the money, and all of us, the members of the House, voted for it at this current Legislature. The statement like that I said and I was approached by the people from Beausejour; they are still in doubt whether it's a four-lane highway. Well, I am satisfied I can make that statement. It is not a travelling four-lane highway. It is a 24-foot blacktop road and an eight-foot shoulder, and I am sure the minister will go along with me. I am not accusing him on that, but let it be clear to the people what it is. I have been telling that right along. They told me, well, we must believe the minister for that. I don't accuse the minister, but I'm going to tell you (I'll be right in the long run), that it's going to be a 24-foot road and eight-foot shoulders.

Now, you have on your program here, I have noticed on the new program, you have 6.1 miles from Seddon's Corner to the radar station. Now, I hope that you will be much more successful than we were in the last two or three years. This six miles of road in there, (we have a lot of people travelling there day and night) and the main reason of this whole thing is that's a radar station; that's a national defence; - not only Canadian, but joint-American, - and the Highways Branch fully felt that we should get some contribution from the Federal Government, or even from the United States, because this road is going to be built for their purpose. Now, that is the question, I would like to know whether the Honourable Minister of Public Works was successful, and much more successful than we were, to get any contribution towards the construction of that road. I also congratulate him on it. That road is very badly needed to be put in there,--very badly needed.

I hope that the program that we have, the new program, will not be changed. I just want to make a little statement. During my time in the House, when I came, - and I'm speaking of my own boundaries, of my own constituency, we only had 93 miles of Provincial Trunk Highways System, that is the old No. 1, what we call. With the new map that will come out next year, we will have 247 miles of trunk highway, and I hope when the minister will remain in that department and, carry the way I carry, we will have much, many more miles. We haven't got too many more to build; we'll need more blacktop to finish these roads.

And I come back, again, and I want to congratulate him on that extension of five miles to Beausejour. I'm sure, I will help him, we'll defend that.

MR. SHUTTLEWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to persue this new highway, because, apparently, the only new highway that there is in the program, is the one that is left out. And that's

the road from Rathwell, down to Notre Dame. Apparently, that is the beginning of a brand-new highway. It's rather odd to me, Sir, that if there's a new planning division, that that step mightn't have been left until we have the full plans of a new highway and that be in it. So I would like to ask the minister if that had been a two-thirds road previous to that, or on what basis it had been built.

And we've also heard this evening and today, Mr. Chairman, a lot about seeking information, and I don't think I should let this opportunity go by without putting the House in on a little experience that I had over the dinner-hour. I decided I would seek a little information on my own, so, after dinner - we live out in the, in that area south of Corydon, on Lockwood - I jumped in my car and I drove out Waverley down to the perimeter route, just to see what had been done from Waverley to Oak Bluff, because I'd been over it a month or so before. I knew the concrete was started so I thought I would slip out and see what was done.

And as I drove up unto the road there was a foreman, who I took for a foreman, being there, he held a flashlight. I stopped and wound the window down and I said to him, "my name is Shuttleworth, a member of the legislature, and I was interested in seeing how this road was done." "Oh," he says, "your name's Shuttleworth? C.L. Shuttleworth? Well, I work for your Opposition, -- you'll get no information out of me." And, I felt like coming back and suggesting to the minister that he certainly had his staff well trained.

However, I didn't let that stop me right there. I went on talking to him, and before I left, I'd found out quite a bit of information. In fact, I found out that two lanes of concrete had been completed right from Waverley to Oak Bluff, so not taking that as a complete answer, I drove it myself, and came back in around on No. 2, and back in again. And certainly that's going to be a very beautiful road when it's completed, but I really got a great kick out of this, "you'll not get any information out of me, I work for your Opposition." I would like the minister to indicate to me whether the road from Rathwell to Notre Dame has been a two-thirds road.

MR. RIDLEY: Mr. Chairman, I didn't intend to get drawn into this debate, but I am surprised and alarmed that the member from Minnedosa said this is a new road,--this road from Rathwell to Notre Dame. This is not a new proposed road, and I'm surprised that you, being a member of the government, that it hasn't been suggested someway, because we've had, Oh, three, four, five years ago, - three years in a row. I was called over to Notre Dame de Lourdes with representatives from Portage la Prairie. Mr. Christie, if I recall, was there then, was the member from Cypress, I believe, and that road was proposed to be built from Rathwell right through to No. 3 highway. It's a straight road. There's not a turn in it.

So, it's no new affair. We've been working on this for years. I went over with the late member, Mr. Hugh Morrison, and, of course, we were all well satisfied to have it down on our end. We were hoping for it. But that's as far as it's ever gone. And

I must commend the Provincial Secretary for taking action and getting some work done on it. So, talking about those kind of roads, I'm inclined to believe the honourable member from Flin Flon, - that there's going to be more Tory gains. If you keep talking about that kind of stuff, - there will be more Tory gains.

MR. SHUTTLEWORTH: . . . . It's not a new road. I certainly know the road quite well, but it's a new highway. That's the point I pointed out, - that it's apparently a new highway.

MR. JUBA: Mr. Chairman, listening to the honourable member from Minnedosa, and his tactics in approaching the employees, the civic employees, the provincial employees, it was only a matter of a few years ago, that I was criticized and condemned by the same honourable member, when he was the Minister of Utilities, for talking to provincial members, seeking some information, and I am very much surprised that he should get up at this time and apply the same tactics which he did not approve of several years ago. And I am very much surprised that the member adopted them tactics.

MR. SHUTTLEWORTH: Mr. Chairman, on that particular occasion, I understood that the honourable member for Logan never said who he was. He went up and didn't indicate who he was.

MR. JUBA: I beg your pardon? I beg your pardon; as such was not the case and you have had an awful quick lapse of memory to even suggest that. And I think it is totally wrong. And, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member should not have said that, when he criticized and condemned me only a matter of a year or two ago. To come before this House, when he is sitting on that side of the House, and apply the same tactics, it's hard to understand, I can assure you.

MR. TEILLET: I didn't mean, I didn't intend my question quite seriously. The items specifically referred to are: Broad Valley; Fisher Branch; Fraserwood; Arborg. I think the minister gave us the information on this Sifton P.T.H. to 20, Riverton West to Ferry Landing, Fisher Branch East, and La Riviere South to U.S.A. Is it intended that those roads will become part of the P.T.H. system? It's purely a matter of information.

MR. BOULIC: I may give, possibly, a little bit of information to the honourable member from Minnedosa, about the proposed road from Rathwell to Manitou, eventually. That road has been tossed around for many, many years, and it seemed that every time the Liberals unfurled their road program; every year they seemed to run out of money at that particular point, and I must add, that after looking on the list that was given to us yesterday, I was wondering whether the Conservatives weren't running short of money, too.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The minister has informed us that he intends to build other P.T.H. roads and said he will announce them at the

next session. I'm going to ask him. I'm interested in knowing whether any other plans are considered for No. 6 and the reason for me asking this question is in view of a statement which was made by the Honourable the First Minister in my presence.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chairman, in view of the road development that is coming along, I might suggest that the Honourable Deputy Minister, or minister, or Acting Minister of Public Works, not forget the one remaining road in my constituency that he has overlooked and that is No. 41 from St. Lazare across the plains, and I hope he will bring it in in his future ..... (Interjection)..... listen here, I have been trying to help you and boy, if I ever turn on you! The only road left in my constituency that I think he should take into attention and I requestfully submit that he give it consideration at his next program, which I expect he will bring down later on this winter.

MR. ALEXANDER: ..... compliment the honourable member from Birtle-Russell of being one of the few Liberals that wasn't complaining about this road program and now he's disappointed me.

A Member: Don't you disappoint me.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister has asked me to repeat what his statement was. Some two months ago, we both had the privilege of attending a dinner in Ashern which was tendered by the municipality of Siglunes and at the dinner table, the First Minister mentioned the deplorable condition of No. 6 highway, south of Lundar and said at that time, he would bring it to the attention of the Minister of Public Works, which I was pleased to hear and I was wondering why it wasn't on this program which has been shown me, or shown the House. A subsequent question I would just like for clarification; I would like to ask the minister on these access roads; where a road by-passes a village, will it be one road, I mean, I'm speaking of, for instance, the town of Warren, where the highway circles right around, - will there be one road leading into it and how will they decide from which end will the road go into the, the access will go into the town?

MR. M.E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): I would like to say a few words. We have heard from practically every part of the province, but I must confess, there has been very few remarks from the solid south. But, I would like to mention that we heard so much about the roads, the road building up in the north - I wonder how many members ever took a trip to Florida. Did they think, maybe, the conditions are terrible? In 1927 -- If you go to Florida, you go down, take a trip across the everglades which is in the neighbourhood of 150 miles, built through solid muskeg and about four or five feet of water. They have a canal up the one side, you can use for boating, and I think, with the engineering today, we should have improved a considerable amount. If they could build that in 1927, then surely we can build this road through bog at the present time.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm going to start off my speech by saying that I hadn't expected to take part in this debate, but I will admit that there is one matter that I had not intended to discuss in connection with it until some attention has been made to the road of interest to my honourable friend, the Minister of, Provincial Secretary. I, too, have had a great deal of interest in that road, because at one time, the projected road from, you begin at No. 2 at Rathwell, go south to Notre Dame on to Manitou, and then going the other way from No. 2, across to Portage la Prairie, was of great interest to me and I was on those delegations that, before the time that my honourable friend spoke of, for many years. And, I was even part of a delegation that came and called upon my then-colleague, who is Minister of Public Works, who is now Acting Minister of Public Works, again; tried hard to get him, at that time, to build that road and being his colleague, in those days, I thought that perhaps I could use some influence with him. But his decision was made. I never complained too much about it. The decision was made back some years ago, if not in my honourable friend's time, but if not, then very soon afterwards.

The decision was made to put the first so-called north-south highway in a location, I think it is approximately 14 miles west of there -- that is the so-called Gladstone-Austin-Holland road, going on down to Swan Lake and so on south. The decision was made, I might say, in those times, certainly against my small influence, because, I, too, was a member of those delegations and we tried to get that route accepted. The other one was accepted, as I understand it, as an alternative, at least for that time, and as the first of the Provincial Trunk Highways north and south.

Now, I'm not complaining. When other people suggest that we are complaining on this side of the House, this is not a complaint. Mine are not complaints. We're simply seeking information. But I would like to ask the minister, is it now decided that we are going to have north-south highways, as close as 14 miles apart? I must confess that I'd still be glad to see that road projected to the north side. Oddly enough, with the re-distribution, the other road is now in my constituency as well so; if I didn't have it at that time, I acquired it later on. This one, I think, is a good road if --- good location --- if it is decided that these north-south roads to highway standards, can be built as closely as 14 miles to one another, and I think that's the point of interest to us because if the highway program is being expanded to that extent, that we can have now instead of one trunk highway north and south between Portage la Prairie and Brandon; if we can adopt the principle of having one every 14 miles or so, it really will make quite a difference. I doubt that that policy will be endorsed wholly by the present government.

I remind my honourable friend, that he was not too inclined to that particular road years ago, when he was the minister. Well, times change. Perhaps it's a good plan.

But the question I have been waiting to ask for a considerable length of time. Again I'm seeking information that is certainly not criticism. I am interested in the remarks of the honourable the minister, with regard to what he terms heavier roads,

and he insists that heavier roads are going to be built. Now, I, in fact I understood him to say that he had instructed the engineers to go back and re-assess the plans that they had made so as to be sure and they brought in heavier, stronger plans for him. Now, the question I ask of him, are these roads going to be heavier than this one - my colleague says they inspected tonight - the Waverley to Oak Bluff road? Are they going to be heavier, if that's the proper term, than that road? Are they going to be heavier than 75? Are they going to be heavier than the new Trans-Canada between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie? And if they are going to be heavier than those, where is the location of those heavier roads? I would be interested to know that.

Then to come back to this point that we have been trying to make, and we're not trying to make it with any carping criticism, we're trying to make it because we really want to know how much of this program is duplication. Because when the minister says that in some cases money was transferred from work that wasn't going to be done this year, to some other work that was done, surely the money was not transferred from this section down here like the member from Minnedosa refers to as being completed now, so far as the paving is concerned. The money wouldn't be transferred from there. That job is done as far as the major expenditures are concerned and yet, we have a 6.7 miles, showing on this sheet. Now, that's the same kind of a point that the honourable member for Ethelbert Plains has been mentioning with regard to the 20 miles. We're not arguing about the mileage that's shown but we are saying that it should not be estimated that all of that construction is to be done. Now, I know that the explanatory note says completion of concrete paving. In this case, I think as of the date that it is laid on our desk, it is already completed. But my point is that the mileage 6.7 is shown over here in total and, naturally, I would think that .67 will be the figure that's used in adding up the concrete mileage that's being done, is to be done, in this so-called new program. And using that 6.7 miles as an example, that 6.7 miles is already done! Now, I would like to know how many other cases there are of that same kind of thing, because that really throws the calculation completely out of balance as far as I can see.

MR. E.J. WILLIAMS (Churchill): .... heart wringing effort I have heard in the last two days. It is ironical that I should come from the largest land area in the Province and have the least miles of roads and still nothing in this for me. I feel somewhat like Cinderella. I feel in similar circumstances as the honourable member from Rhineland, that the only difference is that the Fairy Godmother has not visited my area yet, but I understand that she has been very good to him in the past.

MR. WILLIS: First, the Leader of the Opposition. I would be glad at a subsequent date, to show him where the heavier construction is to be. He will know as well as anyone that construction will be in accordance with the soil and in accordance with the traffic which it is to carry. Therefore, all will not be heavier but considerable will be heavier, and that revision was

made so that it would be heavier in that way. Now, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, has spoken about the highway (what I like to call the Holland road) and I think I was on the job when they started that. 34? Because the first thing that was done was to build the bridges and once the bridge was built, the highway followed. And in regard to the planning there, I think if you'd take a ruler, you'd find out that Highway No. 34 is almost in the exact centre between the next highways which run from No. south, (almost exactly in the centre) that is between No. 13, which runs south from Oakville, and the No. 10 south from Brandon. This is almost exactly in the centre and that was the purpose of that location. Then, when you split that again, you have No. 4, which I would hope would come directly south, directly south across the Trans-Canada and down to a point between Rathwell and St. Claude, as I see it on the map, and that again, is almost exactly in the centre between the next two highways, namely No. 13 and No. 34. That would appear to be a logical location for the next north-south highway in that area, - almost exactly in the geographical centre. Therefore, I suggest a reasonable place. Then when you, you do have to, from No. 2, you do have to move west slightly to Rathwell, and where we would come down again to, probably, Altamont, and through there. And as far as that is concerned, it's almost exactly half-way again, between the next north-south highway.

In my office one day, some years ago, a very nice-looking young lady came in and she wanted to see me. She came in and said: "I've just one question to ask, and then I'll leave. Is there any law in Manitoba against building a highway north and south?" I'll always remember that, and I think she was exactly right that while we had east and west highways by the dozens, we had very few north and south highways. And, therefore, this, I think, is reasonably good planning, so far as the highway is concerned.

The honourable member for Churchill has spoken, and I think he knows that we have plans for Churchill roads as well as others. In fact, we have some of them under construction at the moment. And while they're not trunk highways, they will serve Churchill in a way that Churchill was not served previously.

The member for Logan, was asking in regard to a long-range program. May I say to him that we expect, this winter, to set up our planning division and from that will come largely our long-range planning, at that time. Under the Ontario system, they plan to plan in advance, at least five years. When I was last there, they had completed the three years under a plan which we will follow fairly closely in the Province of Manitoba. The member for Logan asked if we were going to earmark our gasoline tax, and may I say that there is no present plan in that regard.

The member for Springfield has asked if that was a four-lane highway. May I say to him, it was never intended to be a four-lane highway. I issued no statement that it ever would be a four-lane highway and it is exactly as he has indicated, a 24-foot top.

The member for Minnedosa said we'd better get our new planning division going, because he didn't like the plans, and, I

Mr. Willis (continued)

think I have covered that because it will be done very soon. Now, there's just one other matter that I would like to mention. I think the member for Minnedosa had a kind of an amusing experience tonight, when he ran across a man who said he was a supporter of this government. May I tell him that there are getting to be more of them all the time. But I well remember, a few years ago, when I was Leader of the Opposition. I went to Lac du Bonnet and I went down to where the planes were, there, and I said to him, the man in charge, there, I said "My name is Errick Willis. I happen to be Leader of the Opposition. Is there any chance of me getting a ride on one of these planes?" He said, "No, Sir. Nothing but government big-shots".

MR. TEILLET: I still haven't had a question to my answer - an answer to my question, even I'm getting befuddled here. I still haven't had an answer, and I do mean - I did intend that question seriously. The minister just now indicated a new routing of a potential highway between 13 and 34, and I think it's of interest to all of us to know if this La Riviere south to U.S.A. connection is part of it. I do - I would like to know if these miscellaneous items are intended to become part of the trunk highway system?

MR. WILLIS: I'm sorry that I omitted that, because I didn't do it on purpose. When you look at these, you'll find in the miscellaneous, many important roads; some of them are 100% roads. And as far as that is concerned, technically, I suppose somebody might catch me up and say they're not definitely trunk highways. In addition to that, there are a few in there which start, or starting of a trunk highway, and this time, for instance, the road through Sifton; it is one of those where it's not yet a trunk highway because we are against the policy of calling it a trunk highway before it is. Jimmy Gardiner did that in Saskatchewan; they demanded that he have more trunk highways; he gave them 5,000 miles one day and had the signs put up. They still have them, and they're still mud! And so, we want to keep as far as possible away from that plan, and largely these are trunk highways, but in a few instances, you will find that they're just 100% roads.

MR. TEILLET: The answer then would be that these items had not at this moment, intended to be a part of your plan to extend the trunk system, at this moment.

MR. WILLIS: They have an excellent chance of being - let's put it that way.

In regard to the by-pass at Warren, I'm sorry that I by-passed that myself. In general, there will not be a road in and another road out. There will just be the road in. There probably will not be exception to that; I know the location at Warren; I've driven in there many times. I have one very good friend there whom I call on frequently, and there I understand, of course, it's a slanting road, and it would be probably logical to go in on the angle that ... I don't think that would become



Mr. Willis (continued)

the government's policy, because if we did, there'd be no end to it. I think it will be one road in and you'll have to come out on the same road.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The statement made by the First Minister to the Council. Is there any consideration given to putting a bituminous mat on the No. 6 highway south of Lundar?

A member: The darn thing's falling apart.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Are you suggesting that .....

MR. WILLIS: It might have a chance on the winter program?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a little further information with regard to the so-called heavier roads. I know that my honourable friend, the minister, would not be, considered it a compliment if I compared him to some extent to Jimmy Gardiner, whom he has mentioned. Because if Jimmy Gardiner created 5,000 miles of trunk highways all in one day, I think my honourable friend has a tendency - an admirable tendency, to make a program sound, very interesting and use pretty expressive words to define it. And, he has talked so much about these heavier roads, these better roads, these stronger roads - that they're going to build under this new regime, that I've been trying to find out where they are and what they are. Now, in answer to my question, the honourable the minister said that, as I would realize, that they depend upon the soil conditions and the traffic. Now, that's why I asked; that's why I used for illustration the three roads that I did. Can you get a road where the traffic and the soil conditions both require the heavy type of road more than this one down south from Waverley Street to Oak Bluff, or a large portion of 75 highway, or a large portion of the one between here and, between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie. Those are the heavy land sections and heavily travelled roads. Now, what I would like to ask him, is there there anything the matter with those roads? Is there anything wrong with the construction? Are they going to build heavier roads than that kind, and if so, where?

MR. WILLIS: I think it's true that a number of them have stood up very well, and there'll be a lot more roads built to that same standard. Let me declare, we're not going to build any roads better than 75. Just no roads, because that's now the strongest road in Canada, and we will not be building better roads than that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is 75 any stronger than these other roads I mentioned?

MR. WILLIS: Yes, definitely.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, I don't think so. I disagree.

MR. WILLIS: I could prove it to you.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'd like to have the proof.

MR. WILLIS: I'll give it to you now. I said to the Chief Engineer of Canada Cement Company, "why do you say this is the best road in Canada?" I said, "I doubt it". He said, "well, it's fairly simple," he said, "point No. 1," he said, "you have more steel in this road than any road in Canada; you've got heavier steel in this than any road in Canada; in addition to that, when you made your cement, your mix was crushed rock to a heavier extent than any other road in Canada". He said, "for that reason", he said "I would say to you - this is the heaviest road in Canada, and the best built road in Canada". And this is the Chief Engineer of the Canada Cement Company, who is their top man as far as planning is concerned who told me that. And he has repeated it several times, including in Montreal at the last meeting of the Canadian Good Roads Association. So, it's because it's got more steel in it; more reinforcing steel; 5/8 steel which is an unusual size, and it's got more crushed rock in the cement. For those two reasons, in his opinion, the man, probably better able to say than anyone else, has said that is the strongest road.

MR. CAMPBELL: But I wouldn't pose as an expert on the roads, but I think my honourable friend would agree that the base has perhaps more to do with the road than even the steel, and the cement, and the crushed rock, and I suggest to him that the base that's put in these new roads have been better than the one in 75. However, I'd like to hear some other expert's opinion on it. But would the honourable the minister tell us where these other stronger roads are going to be built?

MR. WILLIS: It's a simple matter, Mr. Chairman, that I have had a talk with our top engineers, and I've said to them that I think probably in places where you have planned these roads, you would be of the opinion that probably you should have spent a little more on them and that you should have had a better foundation on the road than you have. They said, "yes, that's probably true. But there's some of them that were doubtful about, as to whether they will stand up". And I said, "for goodness sakes, make them so they will stand up, whatever is needed". And they said, "well, it's mostly a question of base course". And I said to them, "well, make the base course thicker then, more substantial, even though it may cost some more money," but I said "on those roads, on any road which you're in doubt, increase the specifications for better roads, so they will last longer, because I am still of the opinion, the cheapest roads in Manitoba to build, in the end, have been the most expensive, because of upkeep".

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend, I think would have a list of the ones that he's going to do because surely he's not going to do that with all the roads. He's not going to build

Mr. Campbell (continued)  
that kind of a road with this, - on this one projected across the north and south road. And, Mr. Chairman, does my honourable friend really say that he's going out on a large part of this program to build better roads than the Trans-Canada? Does he suggest that the engineers of the department here have not been told all the time to build the best roads they can? Does he suggest that the Trans-Canada Highway, with the federal engineers as well, with Jerry Williams, who left here, and he himself told us that we lost our best engineer when Jerry Williams went away; and Jerry Williams has been in touch, - in charge of this job, - does he suggest that isn't a good road, and that he's going to build better? I don't think so, and Mr. Chairman, the thing that I object to is my honourable friend going around talking about what they're going to, - now that they're in here, - build these good roads, these strong roads, as though the ones that were built before weren't good roads. He's trying to suggest that there's something that has been lacking in the road program before, and I say, and so has my honourable friend the First Minister .....

MR. ROBLIN: Sure, and I'll say it again.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, you'll say it again, and you won't be right when you say it, and you're not right right now.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, yes I am.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, no, you're not.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, certainly I am!

MR. CAMPBELL: You've been saying it because you think it sounds popular and makes a big-shot out of my honourable friend himself to be talking about it. The road program here has been one that nobody needs to be ashamed of and I object to the tendency that my honourable friend the minister has of talking a whole lot of high-sounding phrasew about what they're going to do when they have no plans to do them at all.

MR. ROBLIN: Tell it to the voters.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm telling it to you.

MR. ROBLIN: ..... they'll give you the answer.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm telling it to you and you tell it to the voters and .....

MR. ROBLIN: We will.

MR. CAMPBELL: And if the voters knew how badly you're bluffing them on this road program, the voters would take appropriate measures. This program of the new roads is a bluff, Mr.

Mr. Campbell (continued)

Chairman; it's a bluff. That's what it is -- a bluff!

MR. ROBLIN: You wouldn't be so "hot" if it was a bluff.

MR. CAMPBELL: Look, I'm huffed because I don't like bluffers.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh! Go on and sit down.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, if we could just get a little order in here, I would like to say a very few words. The First Minister has said that he doesn't think our program will be better than the predecessor. We're going ahead and we're going to build our roads a little thicker and a little heavier than before and we're not going to build any more highways like No. 6 highway and several others. But we're going to build them just a little heavier, and only the future will be able to show as to whether the Leader of the Opposition is right or I'm right. But I should like to point to him, although he won't like me doing so, I should like to point, if I may, again, to highway No. 75, which was built properly and is standing up well. I would like to point again, in spite of the jeers and cheers, to highway No. 10 on which the upkeep has been just cutting the grass.

MR. CAMPBELL: And does my honourable friend say, (I know what he says about 75), does he say that No. 10 is a better highway than the Trans-Canada? And does he say that he's going to build that type of road all over Manitoba?

MR. WILLIS: No!

MR. MILLER: Well, where is he going to build them?

MR. WILLIS: In other cases, the Leader of the Opposition always says "does he say?" -- always thinks that I've never said it. And we're going to build better roads where better roads are needed, and the engineers will decide where they are going to be built and also they will decide the quality of the road, depending upon the location,--a simple engineering problem. We have instructed them, - they are capable, - they will do it. Those roads will be built. And because, suddenly, we raise the standard above that which has been ordinarily the case, that is not a crime. People who drive automobiles in Manitoba, will not consider it a crime. People here will say that is the right point of view. They will say it from the point of view of the taxpayer, that will save us money, as it has on 75, and as it has on 10. And in each location, we'll build the appropriate type of road for that location, depending upon the soil; depending upon the traffic which it carries; depending upon the planning division and the engineers' advice,--as simple as that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, may I ask what difference that is to what's been done all the way along? Just exactly the same

Mr. Campbell (continued)  
program that's been followed right along.

We've built some roads, of course, that are not of this standard,--of course we have. If we had built all the roads to the standard that my honourable friend likes to talk about, we wouldn't have had anything like the hard-surface roads as we have in Manitoba today. Because no legislature that has ever met here, - no legislature that has ever met here, would have appropriated the money to do that kind of a job, and there wouldn't have been the equipment available to do it even if we had the money. And you have to have a program that gives the most value for the money that you have available. My honourable friend, I repeat, that he's got a program here that's just exactly the same as has been put into effect in years gone by, which is gradually building better roads as more money is available, and he's just trying to make it out that it's something new. I repeat, there's a lot of bluff in it.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, if I understood the honourable minister correctly, when he asked as to where these better and bigger roads are going to be built, his answer was that the engineers will figure out where they are needed and that they will build the type of a road that's needed in that particular area. I'd like to ask the honourable minister how he arrived at the figure of 33 million dollars, when he doesn't know, and admits he doesn't, what kind of roads are going to be built where?

MR. WILLIS: That's strictly nonsense. The answer is very simple. The engineers sit down, and they say, well, for this location, for the traffic which is there, we require this type of road, that type of road. Judging by the experience of the past years, will cost us so many dollars per mile; put the figures opposite and then when they're through, it is 33 million dollars, - a simple engineering calculation done afterwards on an adding machine.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the minister gives a lot of credit to the engineers for the type of roads that are built, but he seems to think that the engineers are not quite so good when it's not himself that's the Minister of Public Works. It seems to me that these men are good men you have in the department, and we had in the department. They're good road builders. Mr. George Collins, and I believe he built good roads under Mr. Willis, the present minister; and he built good roads under Mr. Morton, under Mr. Bell and under Mr. Robertson; - carried on with the same policy just about. I don't think there was much interference with his work. He has made recommendations. He built good roads. We have a good system of roads in this province, and if I had the map here that we had ten years ago, and the one that we have today, you would see how many more miles of fairly good roads, good roads better than they have in Saskatchewan, - I've travelled there quite a bit, - much better. And I say that these men are the same under a minister or under another one, and that we have had the roads much better than the

(Mr. Prefontaine - continued)

Opposition, as the Premier and the Minister of Public Works has tried to lead the people of Manitoba to believe.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago, the minister said "we won't be building any more road like No. 6". Mr. Chairman, I'm not an expert on roads, but engineers, a number of them, have told me that the soil conditions in the inter-lake are the finest in the province for building roads and that No. 6 highway is one of the best in the province. They say all we need, all you need on the road now, north of St. Laurent to Ashern, is a bituminous mat. The honourable the First Minister, has just said it's falling apart. It's true that some of the double prime has cracked, but it was only designed and only put on there temporarily to lessen the dust and it's now in a position that you can lay a bituminous mat. You'd have the finest road in the province. Put the bituminous mat on there, - there's nothing wrong with the No. 6 highway.

MR. LUCKO: Mr. Chairman, all that argument going on. I would just like to give a little statistic of the highway branch, and here it is.

The following table shows that great growth in the various types of trunk highway systems between 1945 and '57, that is last year. All right, in 1945 we had a trunk highway system 1,975 miles. In 1957 .....

MR. ROBLIN: You know you'll have to table that. You had better be careful what you're reading.

MR. LUCKO: Yes, I'll table it. We have 3,547 miles. Now it goes a little bit further. Of this increased mileage of a trunk highway, over 2,000 or two-thirds has been built to a modern - built to a modern standard since 1945. This means that highway standards of at least 34 ft. top with shoulders, drains, dust-free surface, proper culverts and other safety factors. That is the difference in our highway system since 1945 till 1957. I think it's a good percentage and a good record of the other government who sat here and that's what we have in our province now.

MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chairman, I think we should have the question some time soon. After three days I think we have probably discussed this matter. We don't seem to be getting any closer together ..... (Interjection) ..... Just two days, was it? Well, the Honourable Member for Rockwood is a school teacher so I'll take his word for it.

This discussion is not very fruitful and I should like merely to say that the difference in our plans compared with those of the present government would be - previous government would be that while in many cases they built just a dust-proof road, which looked all right at that time, that we would be inclined to build probably a lesser mileage but one which would cost more and last longer. That is the difference in the previous policy and the policy which we shall bring in force.

MR. WILLIS - (Continued)

I recognize that the time when 75 was built, there was at least a minor outcry that any road should be worth \$90,000.00 a mile, but I think those times have changed. People now, I think, are in a position to say, and have said to me many times, whatever you do build your roads just a little better, put a top on them instead of so many dust-proof surfaces, which do keep down the dust, but build less roads and build them better. So what was lacking before was, I suggest to you, that the Ministers who followed in quick succession one after the other did not have exactly that idea, that we should have as many as possible dust-proof roads, but they did not have anyone to sit down with the engineers and say, we want you to build better roads. We're satisfied that you know how and if it costs more money that is all right. We won't complain too much, and if we have a lesser mileage we won't complain too much. We want you to build roads which will last longer, the maintenance of which will be much smaller, and we'll proceed on that basis, whereas in the judgment of the previous government, and they have a right to defend their position and some people would agree with them, they built a larger mileage. They brought into the highway system several hundreds, probably 15 hundred miles maybe, into the highway system since the day that I was here but a number of those roads were merely dust-proof roads, and I think that we experimented, even in my day, on Highway No. 2 and I don't think that experiment was a success - that was an oil test. I was Minister at the time and I wouldn't do it again. I think it was a mistake that it should have been done. I think at that time we should have built a proper asphalt road and it would have probably cost the taxpayers less money, but we were experimenting then and I suggest that the days of experimentation insofar as those roads are concerned should be largely over, and that now we should build probably a lesser mileage, but build a proper asphalt road which will stand up for 15 to 30 years.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, would he please clarify the remark about the No. 6 highway? What he meant by it - the construction of No. 6 highway.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think we've had a very interesting discussion here for some time. It seems to be that the members of the official Opposition have taken a very vigorous and active part in the discussion. I think almost all of them have spoken once. I dare say the majority have spoken twice. I am sure some have spoken three times and there are a couple that may have reached into the five, six and seven times, so presumably all the ideas that they wish to express are before the committee. I would think then that we could now consider the advisability of taking a vote. If my honourable friends opposite are still convinced that the policy of the government is wrong; if they think that our plan for improving the quality of the highways is bluff; if they are convinced that this is nothing but duplication or that there is any attempt to swindle on the amounts or figures or locations of the road plan that has been put forward; or any of those things which I think have been hinted at in some of the statements that

MR. ROBLIN - (Continued)

have been made; I now suggest that they put their convictions to the test and express their opinion in the vote. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it's been called for several times already - I have not been too anxious to curtail the debate but I think that everyone has had a very full say and there have been no new ideas put forth this evening that I am aware of, so I would suggest that we now put this question to the vote and those who disapprove of the government receiving this money or having the power to raise it can express themselves and the others can do likewise, so I call for the question.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend doesn't need to get in a hurry about calling for the question because we have a perfect right to debate this question as long as we feel that we should and I certainly resent the suggestion that we have been making any suggestions that there is any thought of a swindle. I say again that so far as this big new program is concerned, there's a great deal of bluff in it and when my honourable friend the First Minister himself starts to talk about roads that have been built here and which I still think are good roads falling to pieces, and when the Minister in charge of the estimates here is suggesting that he thinks that this program that we have been following should - could be improved upon by building a lesser mileage of what he calls heavier roads, it's perfectly in order for us to debate this whole question of road building because this is a \$33,000,000.00 road program, and I want to know what's going to be done as far as the expenditure is concerned.

I do not like the imputations that have been made here that there's been something the matter with the program that we have been carrying on in this province. There are so many parts of the province that would still be very, very glad to get a gravelled road - so many parts of the province still want a gravelled road - to get a gravelled road, to get a good market road and then the next thing, and that's a big improvement by itself, and there are many areas that are not yet served by gravelled roads. Then you get a demand because that gravelled road is getting a lot of traffic. The dust becomes an actual hazard and because it is a hazard to safety - actually a hazard to safety, there is a tendency to put on the cheap coat of oil in order to hold down the dust. And when a good many people that don't know very much about roads go out on one of these roads that have been oiled - and that's the considered program of the government which engineers have heartily approved - and then people go out and find on this gravelled road that has been oiled, that it starts to break up after a year or two, and then there are suggestions made that that's a poor road policy and the imputation is that the government has done a bad job because they have put that in as a considered policy, and I still maintain that's the right thing to do - that's the right progression. And if I get a little bit annoyed with my honourable friend the Minister for preaching across this province about his new big road program, better and better roads, as though we had not been giving the engineers free range. We had just as much confidence in the engineers as he has and he can't find a single



MR. CAMPBELL - (Continued)

engineer in this province, not one, who will suggest to him, I'm sure, that we in any way curtailed their activities as far as building the best roads that they knew how to build - not on all the mileage of course. And my honourable friends have very successfully, I know, presented to the people of this province a criticism of our road policy and that's all right, that's probably fair game - we let that go and I'm not complaining, but my honourable friend the First Minister says that let us vote against this program if we don't agree with it. We do agree with a good road policy; we want to see a road program; but we're wanting to get the details of it and my honourable friend the Minister has not yet given us the detail of how this program is arrived at. We don't ask him to give the estimates on each one of these individual items because that would perhaps be furnishing the expected - the potential contractors, with some information that we don't want them to have. But if this program has been built up to \$33,000,000.00 then if it's been built up there in the way that it should have been, it's been built up by estimates being made and if those estimates are made on the basis of these better quality roads that he is talking about, we don't ask for the items of expenditure, but I would like to know the roads on which those better roads are going to be placed, because surely they have to be intimated to the engineers in order for them to prepare this program. And if my honourable friend can't give it I'll still not - I've no intention of voting against the program just because of that - but I maintain that that's information that we should have. Where are these roads going to be built? The details must have been furnished to him by the engineers in order to arrive at this estimate. .... (Interjection) ..... Is the honourable Minister not going to answer it?

MR. ROBLIN: He gave you a printed copy the other day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question has been called for and we're all agreed. Resolution No. 3 - capital supply, estimates of expenditure, highways, roads and related projects, structures and facilities, construction and reconstruction and all works incidental thereto, including acquisition of rights-of-way, \$35,300,000.00; less recoveries from Government of Canada \$2,300,000.00; net \$33,000,000.00. Those in favour? ..... Passed ..... (Interjection) ..... Have a vote?

The Chairman then put the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps that it would be the best way if we do it as we do it in the committee and have it with the uplifted hand. Those in favour please signify.

After a vote by uplifted hand the Chairman declared the resolution passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee rise and report. .... Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that the rules of the House be suspended and that the resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I note that the motion that's been made requires unanimous consent and I rise only to say that I think in the light of the discussion that we've had, that it would be better that we go ahead now. I agree to the unanimous consent as far as this group is concerned.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$104,725.00 for legislation; members indemnity \$56,000.00; expense allowances \$28,000.00; travelling expenses \$1,200.00; Opposition Leader \$1,250.00; Speaker's indemnity \$2,000.00; Speaker's expense allowance \$1,000.00; salary, Deputy Speaker and/or Chairman of Committee of the Whole \$375.00; Sergeant-at-Arms \$300.00; sessional assistants, messengers and pages \$4,200.00; supplies, expenses, equipment and renewals \$2,400.00; legislative printing and binding \$8,000.00.

Resolution No. 2 - supplementary estimate. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$10,000.00 for executive council; gift re Springhill, Nova Scotia mine disaster \$10,000.00; for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1959.

Capital Supply - Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for capital expenditure \$33,000,000.00. For highways, roads and related projects, structures and facilities, construction and reconstruction of all work incidental thereto, including acquisition of rights-of-way \$35,300,000.00 less recoveries from the Government of Canada \$2,300,000.00 - total \$33,000,000.00.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might just rise to the point of order here. The next resolution on the paper is for the Committee of Ways and Means. I do not propose to move that motion tonight in view of the hour, because I will be making a statement on it and no doubt other members will wish to speak as well. And I intend to propose, if it meets with approval later on, that when we adjourn tonight we adjourn until 10:30 tomorrow morning, but in the meanwhile perhaps we could leave the motion for ways and means and continue with the other items on the Order Paper. Perhaps we could get some expression of opinion on that early morning hour.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, can we have some assurance now that if the work is not complete tomorrow night that we will not sit on Saturday.

MR. ROBLIN: I'd like to give that assurance. I hope that it may be possible. I don't want to bind myself completely because it might be that it's a matter of a very short time. I very much appreciate my honourable friend's reasons for asking this question and I assure him - I'll give him this assurance that I'll do my best as far as it lies within my power as a leader of a minority government, to avoid sitting on Saturday and go over to Monday if necessary. I can't give him a categorical promise, but I'll do my best.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I think that's as much as we could expect from the Honourable the Leader of the House at the present time. I think he should be left with some elbow room in connection with this matter because, after all, it is a bit of a problem in the closing day, and I hope perhaps it is at least the closing days of the House, that we have to maintain - certainly the government side has to maintain a certain nimbleness of action. I would support the First Minister in that. So far as meeting at 10:30 in the morning is concerned, that's quite satisfactory I think to us and I would suggest that unless those who are moving the resolutions are anxious to go on tonight, that in view of the hour perhaps it would be better, if we are going to meet at 10:30, for us to adjourn now.

MR. ROBLIN: I have no objection to that if it meets with the approval of my friends in the third corner there.

MR. SWAILES: Mr. Speaker, that arrangement is agreeable to our group.

MR. ROBLIN: In that case, Mr. Speaker, and if it meets with the approval of the people who are scheduled to speak tonight and I take it that it does, I will move, seconded by my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared it carried, and the House adjourned until 10:30 the next morning.