

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 18th, 1963

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery on my left, where there are seated 14 Boy Scouts from Manitou with Mr. Bray, their leader. This group comes from the constituency represented by the Honourable Member for Pembina. Also seated on my left in the second section are 12 36th Girl Guides with their leader, Mrs. Waschuk. This group is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Attorney-General. In the first section on my left, too, there are 30 pupils from the Dauphin Collegiate with their teacher, Mrs. Madsen. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Education. I would like to welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon. We hope that you have enjoyed your tour of the building. We trust that what you see and hear in this the Legislature this afternoon will prove beneficial to you in your studies, that it will be enjoyable and inspirational to you. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

HON. ROBERT SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to tell the House that the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg has prepared a display, an exhibit of current and future projects which are the responsibility of Metro. This display is set up in Room 200 and I would enjoin all members of the House sometime within the next few days to visit this display and see some of the things that Metro are doing or propose to do in the near future. The display features a variety of maps, charts, photographs and models showing such things as the major thoroughfares, the waterworks system, sewage facilities, park developments and the preparation of the master development plan. An exhibit of this kind shows better than many thousands of words the complex and comprehensive work which is being carried out by the Metropolitan Government. In order that members of the Legislature might see this work at their own convenience, arrangements have been made to leave the display set up there for several days, and Miss Chivers or some other member of the planning section of Metro will be present to answer any questions the members may wish to ask. I would advise the House also that if there are any other people in the area of this building or in the city over this week-end who would like to see this display, they would be welcome to attend at Room 200 to see what Metro is doing or what they propose to do.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. Would the Minister be prepared to give favourable consideration to a request that the muskrat trapping season be extended to the end of the month? I make that request on behalf of a number of Indians from the Selkirk district who, due to inclement weather, have been prevented from trapping during the greater part of this last week.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I'll be prepared to take that under consideration.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I rise to make a correction. I'm afraid I'm guilty of some misinformation yesterday when I spoke and I would like to correct the records. On Page 1304, I said that I believed that there were four bridges in a 25-mile stretch from Portage la Prairie to Austin. I was incorrect and I would like to correct that by saying that I should have said there are four bridges in approximately 45 miles from Portage la Prairie to Austin on the Assiniboine River, and there are no bridges from the 40 miles onwards from Austin to Brandon.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 89. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, might I have this bill stand by leave of the House?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, Bill No. 58, the one under consideration here, is amending Bill No. 101 that was passed at the last session in the Manitoba Legislature. This bill deals with the disclosure of interest rates. Bill No. 101 was passed last year but was never proclaimed, to my recollection, and therefore is inoperative. Now we have Bill No. 58 before us, which in my opinion completely changes the principle of Bill No. 101. Bill 101 requires the disclosure of interest charged and the rate thereof. The new Bill No. 58 changes that portion of the bill to, instead of interest rates, to finance charges that he is required to pay on any unpaid balance of purchase price or account. Interest rate was the heart of Bill No. 101, and it is being removed by this amendment proposed in Bill 58.

I am sure that the very people that reject or object to this feature in Bill 101 would require that any contracts they enter into in like manner would require that an interest rate figure be so stated. I don't feel that this is an unreasonable request to make, such as is requested by Bill 101. The principle in Bill 101, the interest matter, is not limiting in any way the amount they can charge. Certainly I would be the last one to have any limits imposed. This is not a feature that I would like to see because this would prevent some people from obtaining a loan or money when desired. Bill No. 101 is in no way regulating the operation of people in business in financing. All that it asks is that the interest figure be disclosed; and by disclosing the interest figure we are making people more aware of the charges and the interest rate figure that they are requested to pay in these contracts. I think it's very desirable that we have this feature in the bill. Subsection (5) of Bill 58 removes that portion in Bill 101 which states, and I quote: "The rate of interest charged and the basis upon which the interest is calculated." This is a very valuable feature in Bill 101, and the principle of the whole bill. Therefore, I feel that it's even improper to amend that bill in this fashion by eliminating that very part thereof.

There has been some mention in private discussions that I've had re legislating on interest rates as not being or coming within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature to deal with, and I certainly would like to hear from the Minister on this matter. Certainly we do legislate interest rates on provincially chartered organizations such as Credit Unions. I note that in Section 22(a) of the 1961 Statutes of Manitoba, Chapter 10, Section 3, and I'd like to quote the section: "The rate of interest chargeable on any loan made by a Credit Union shall not exceed one per centum per month on the unpaid balance on the loan." Certainly if that were the case they wouldn't be able to legislate Credit Unions not to exceed the interest rate on one percent per month. However, this might not apply to federally chartered organizations, and therefore I would appreciate hearing from the Minister on this very matter. I checked up on the Bill 156 in the Federal Act, an Act respecting interest, and I don't see anything in there that would in any way indicate that provincial legislation in this line would be ultra vires.

Then the second principle or new aspect in Bill 58 is Subsection (2) of Section 5. This has to do with the validity of Time Sale Agreements if they don't comply with the Act. In other words, the section reads: "The Time Sale Agreement is not invalid or unenforceable solely by reason of the fact that it does not comply with this Act." To me, it seems that this section more or less encourages contravention of the Act. If this section was only applicable to contracts made prior to the Act coming into force, I could see merit in this section; but if left to remain as is, it appears that we are inviting people to disregard or contravene the Act, unless there is a strict policing of the Act to make the fines applicable. To me then, No. 101, the one that was passed last year, is losing its value almost completely. Provided my assumptions or summations of the bill are correct, I therefore cannot support Bill No. 58 but will have to oppose it on second reading.

I note that the new bill takes care of the proclamation so that both the original Act and the new Bill No. 58 will come into force at the same time. Madam Speaker, I am sorry to see this bill before us because I feel Bill 101 was much superior to the present one, Bill 58, if the Act is so amended.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak today, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the debate

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd) be adjourned.

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

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XI. Item 3 —

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might get things back on the road again if I made a few comments following some of the remarks that were made yesterday afternoon.

If I could start, Mr. Chairman, by referring for a moment or two to some of the remarks that were made by the Honourable Member for St. John's. I am surprised at some of his remarks, Mr. Chairman, considering his experience on Metropolitan Council. However, I think that it would be only fair that in discussing the road program and the road work within the Metropolitan area, and referring to the streets on which Metropolitan Winnipeg qualifies for grants, that we keep in mind that the selection of Metropolitan roads was made by Metropolitan Corporation itself, not by the Government of the Province of Manitoba or by the municipalities. The Honourable Member for St. John's, categorically charged I believe is the words he used, that probably one of the main reasons for establishing Metro was to take the municipalities of the Greater Winnipeg area off the backs with regard to grants made — I'm sorry, I guess I haven't got it straight, but anyway certainly it was "getting the municipalities off our backs" with regard to grants-in-aid. This was one of his charges. I may have gone a little far but this was the impression that was left with me, and I apologize to the honourable member if I have erred in this regard.

However, I would like to point out that if this had been — and I wasn't a member of the Cabinet at that time — if this had been one of our purposes it has failed, because over and above the Metropolitan grants that are given by the Government of Manitoba, capital grants are still given to the municipal corporations within the Metropolitan government. There has been very little decline, very little decline in the grants that have been given to the other municipalities on streets that were not taken over by the Metropolitan government. Many of the streets which were not taken over by Metropolitan government had previously received grants from the Government of Manitoba and on these streets, and other approved streets, the Government of Manitoba continues to give grants to the municipal corporations within Metropolitan government.

The thought that there had been a substantial decline — well I haven't been able to develop all of the figures in the time that I've had. I think that if I just read the totals of the money that has been spent in the last few years, and for some of the figures I am merely taking some of the figures that were on the Order for Return which was presented in the House last year. In 1956-57 the amount of money that was spent by the Manitoba Government for roads and bridges was \$1,202,073; in 1957-58 it was \$684,271; in 1958-59 it was \$1,305,889; in 1959-60 it was \$1,763,738; in 1960-61 it was \$2,233,026; then in 1961-62 it was \$932,089.00. At this point I might add that grants-in-aid are considered in this figure to Metropolitan government and the main difference, I believe, is the fact that there was little capital work done on 100 percent projects by the province. A large part of this was on the 60 percent share that was contributed to Metro streets. In 1962-63, which is still an estimated figure and not complete as yet, there were \$2,644,800 in this category. Besides these figures I have a list that has been paid by the government to the other municipalities. I am not going to attempt to go through it all, it's quite large, but I would say that in almost all cases, some of them there has been an increase in what has previously been given. With the exception of the City of Winnipeg itself, there has been relatively the same amount of grants given. This has not been the case in the City of Winnipeg because the majority of the streets within the City of Winnipeg that the government had contributed to were taken over by the Metropolitan government.

Something else has been mentioned with regard to Metro's expenditures, and while it may be said by some that the province has been less than generous, I think that it is only fair

(Mr. Weir, cont'd) to state that in each of the years that there have been grants allowed for the Metropolitan government, Metropolitan government has failed to spend all of the money that has been provided. I don't say this critically in regard to Metropolitan government. Metropolitan government has had difficulties; they have had growing pains. They have had difficulties that they hadn't anticipated in the acquisition of right-of-way and many things have happened to make it necessary that they postpone some of their operations. Nevertheless, it is true that all of the money that had been approved by the Government of Manitoba had not been spent.

The honourable member mentioned a letter that the chairman has in his hands. I didn't go back through the files to find out what was in the letter of several years ago. I was not a member of the government then and I don't know, but I think that it's safe to assume that probably the Premier of Manitoba did indicate that there would be no reduction in provincial moneys in the Greater Winnipeg area streets as a result of the formation of Metro. I think that largely this is true.

A charge has been made that we haven't been paying our proper share of the street costs that Metropolitan Winnipeg needs to bring it up-to-date. I am not prepared to accept that charge at this time, Mr. Chairman, and again I am not being critical of Metro, but Metro planning has hardly reached the degree, I think -- at least if it has reached the degree the detailed plans have not reached me -- of what their anticipated expenditures are going to need to be so that we can go over their plans in detail and analyze completely what the provincial contribution should be to their over-all plans. It may be true that the Government of Manitoba could be spending more money, but with the information that I have at the moment, I fail to accept the charge that was made.

Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to pay tribute if I may, while I am on my feet, to the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg for the contribution that they are making to the streets in the Greater Winnipeg area. There has been a considerable improvement on some of the main routes, and speaking to people that use these roads every day, I know that there is a great deal of appreciation that can be extended to the Council and the staff of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch for a moment or two on the north perimeter bridge complex that is set up over here on the model. It qualifies to complete this project, Mr. Chairman, in our opinion for not just one, but for two reasons. First, that by the time this complex is completed, the traffic will be there to justify this full expenditure. This connection provides a means of connecting all of the highways, 59, 9, 4, 8, 7, 6, and by means of King Edward Street on the other side, down to No. 1 Highway. It is going to provide a means of eliminating to a very large degree that undesirable traffic that at the present time is forced through Winnipeg streets.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, is that a satisfactory economical design dictated the completion of the entire project because of the utilization of the waste that there would have been from bringing in materials to provide the ramps that are desirous for the bridge and the waste that would occur later on. There has been a balance worked out between the excavation and the need for fill on the approaches to the bridge, and any small savings that there might have been by doing this job in say two stages would have been used up largely by the additional costs of providing the ingredients that would be required later on and the increased cost of detours that would have been necessary to handle the traffic at a later date.

With regard to the crossings that there are further down, I think that it is probably fair to say that the government of the Province of Manitoba recognizes the need for bridges in the Greater Winnipeg area. They have already announced their responsibility by the announcement of the payment of three bridges within the Metropolitan area, one of which of course is completed now; the second of which the recommendation has only recently been received from Metropolitan Winnipeg, and all of the various facts and figures are being gone over again by the officials of the Department of Public Works to double-check and to make sure that the site that is chosen and the size of structure that is chosen and the streets, the other streets that are involved are in the location and are going to meet the need that we feel needs to be met in this particular area in the next few years.

I don't believe that the Metropolitan plans have been developed to the point that they

(Mr. Weir, cont'd) know the locations in which the bridges will be required north on the Red River. At least if they have, this information has not been provided to me. I think that once the agreement is completed on the three bridges in the Metropolitan area that it is quite likely — it is quite likely that the Government of the Province of Manitoba will continue to accept the responsibility that they will feel that they have to the provision of more structures and more approach roads in other areas of the Metropolitan area. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't know that I've dealt with those as fully as might have been expected, but I think it deals with the main points that the Honourable Member for St. John's mentioned.

I think I'd like to come now to the coalition as it was expressed by the three members of the House who spoke yesterday with regard to St. Mary's Road. This is not the first that I have heard of St. Mary's Road. As I think probably all three members know, there's been a good deal of consideration given to this stretch of road and I think that I might say that even though it is not on the program, even though it's not on the program, there is a reasonable possibility that it could be built this fall. One of the things that is bothering us is the weights that this particular stretch of road is going to have to carry in the near future for the construction at the floodway site, and the department has been keeping very close to see if they can come up with the recommendations as to what to do with this particular short stretch of road. I spoke to the St. Vital Council about this stretch of road and, as we all know, they are anxious to see something done with it. One of the things that I don't think any of us want to see done is to see black-top put on and weights put on it that will damage the surface that is put on. One of the other problems is that if it was gravelled, is the dust preventive for the amount of traffic that is carried on the road. The possibilities are being examined as to whether or not the grading, if it was done this year, could carry the traffic that it will be required to carry and have it ready for black-top next spring or whether the weights are going to be such next year that it should be carried over as gravel for a second year, or whether it should be gravelled for the two years, if it would be in the interests of everybody to leave the surface as it is until such time as the road can be completed. So while it's not on the program, there is a strong possibility that the department will come to the point where they can make a recommendation. At the present time they feel that they can't make a recommendation on this particular stretch of road.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks mentioned the six miles of river road, requesting calcium. It shall be done.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone made several requests. He suggested, I think, that these roads that are put through quite light lands should be developed all the way at one time; that they should receive their surfacing. Well I don't know, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in the Province of Manitoba we have quite a number of areas where the light land is fairly widespread, and I think that this would be a problem to accept this as a policy to work from. In my opinion, the requests that he has made still do not reach the priority level for construction under the funds that we have available this year, and at what point they will, I'm not in a position to say. Certainly there are more roads with greater demand even with the light nature of the soil than the one that he mentions in the Waldersee area. I've been over the road; I know what that one is like and I realize the problems, but this happens, I'm sorry to say, in the roads in quite a large part of the Province of Manitoba.

The Honourable Member from Gladstone mentioned the maintenance costs on No. 5. They are high but they have still not reached the point, Mr. Chairman, where they would cover the interest cost that would be required to build a road let alone the depreciation that must be taken on the road once the road is built. I know that at certain times of the year it's annoying driving over a road in the condition that No. 5 is from Neepawa north to Eden, but during other periods of the year they have a relatively good surface and there are other areas of the Province of Manitoba where the same cannot be said.

He requested some information on access roads. I would like to say that the policy of access roads has not been changed, certainly since I've been in this chair, and I mentioned last year that it was five miles — it remains at five miles. As to the size of the communities, I think that there has been a great latitude in picking out the communities that qualify for an access road. They qualify it for various means. Sometimes it is school purposes; sometimes it's elevator purposes; and any reasonably-sized community at all qualifies for an access road

(Mr. Weir, cont'd) if and when, or when its priority can be reached, but there are some no doubt that have been put in where the communities have gone down-hill. There are probably some that are going to be put in yet. The community itself may go down-hill but I don't know that we want to be in a position of encouraging the downward trend in the smaller areas, and it's hard to pick and chose those that are not going to grow.

I think that he asked what the number of miles was on access roads. I think I could tell the Honourable Member for Gladstone that at the end of 1962 there were 133.8 miles of access roads that had had construction on them. Some of these had had varying amounts of construction. Some were grade and gravel; some were grade and gravel and asphalt surface treatment; some were grade, gravel, calcium; some were grade, gravel and black-topping; but there were 133.8 miles that had received construction. Last year there was construction on 65.7 miles, and in the coming year 38.2 miles is the number of miles of access roads that will receive work.

He enquired as to the amount of carry-over, cash and authority carry-over at January 31st, 1963. I don't have the figure, Mr. Chairman, for January 31st. I have it for February 28th if that is acceptable, and it's \$26,765,499.00. He also enquired as to the formula on grants for municipalities and towns. There has been no change in that particular formula, the 10-5 in the grants to towns. I don't anticipate any change, certainly not until after there has been some word from the Michener Commission.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone also requested the number of miles of 100 per cent provincial roads in the province. There were -- I'm not sure of the date that this was but I presume it was March 31st, '62, Mr. Chairman -- 1,659.8 miles of provincial roads and 833.5 miles of natural resources and development roads in the province.

The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie has been doing his homework. He had been looking at pages 117 and 118, I believe it was, in the annual report, and he sure stirred up some excitement, because it was found on looking over the annual report when they got it straightened out that two pages of the highways report had been stuck in with the bridge report, strictly by accident, and there were two full pages that should not have been in that location at all. They shouldn't have even had the pages 118 and 119 on them. They should have had the numbers 88 and 89 on them. Now 88 and 89 I believe are numbered the way they are now as 88 and 89. I don't know that they are missing but I have a memo here from the Queen's Printer saying that he has examined the copy prepared for the printing of our annual report and finds that the pages which were numbered and printed as 118 and 119 should have appeared between pages 88 and 89 as printed in the report. He also says that it is hard to determine just where and how the mistake was made. However, in examining the copy material and the printed report, it is quite evident that the material on pages 118 and 119 should have appeared between pages 88 and 89, so that would leave the total as it stands within the annual report as correct, and the total of the pages of \$560,864.70, the difference between the figure quoted by the Honourable Member from Portage and the right figure in the book, should not have been in there at all.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I also think that the Honourable Member from Portage indicated that he had been traffic counting one day in February at a bridge in the Rossendale area and he had counted two in two hours and a half. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that there are quite a number of places that you can go on a Sunday in February and find that the traffic count won't be too high. He wanted to know the reason for the building of this bridge in that area and I don't find myself at ease in finding this information because I wasn't in the department at the time the bridge was built. But one of the main reasons I presume would be that the Hertz Ferry was in very, very bad shape. As a matter of fact, I've got a note here that it was quite heavy and in periods of low water was very troublesome. It also says that while the bridge was under construction the Ferry went downstream and is now at the bottom of the river. As far as being built there, I think that there is every indication that the Province of Manitoba, in building this bridge, has indicated that the road on either side is to be improved over a period of time and that this will become a relatively busy north-south artery.

I also would like to point out that in crossing a stream like the Assiniboine River it is not easy to build a low-cost structure. He asked for the total price of the bridge and we have dug it out for him. The price was \$200,832.98 and the cost of the approaches was \$22,604.00.

(Mr. Weir, cont'd) Now the reason for the price not being the same in the annual report is that some of it will show up in next year's annual report. The construction was carried out over the period of the two years that are being reported on.

While I can't vouch for the tone of his voice at the time that he was mentioning it, he indicated that that particular constituency was well represented. I'd like to, Mr. Chairman, agree with him and make sure that the tone of my voice is entirely sincere and that Cypress constituency is well represented. I don't know whether she had anything to do with it or not but if she did, God bless her.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that brings me over to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Rhineland and his "not a nickel for Rhineland". I didn't make -- (Interjection) -- "Not a dime" was it? Well, whatever it was, nothing for Rhineland. I guess he didn't use it -- it was one of his predecessors that used the term and I'm quoting him falsely. I didn't make much of a note when he was speaking because

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, it was me that made that quote and I was referring to Gladstone constituency. I made the comment, as you know, that Wally Miller had made that and I quoted it as applying to Gladstone.

MR. WEIR: I appreciate the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Member from Gladstone used it yesterday. It was the Honourable Member of Rhineland that you just quoted that I was referring to as his predecessor. The two items that he mentioned were Highways 14(a) and 32. Again the only reply that I can give, Mr. Chairman, is as I did, I believe it was last Thursday afternoon, in saying that it would be expecting too much if I was to come in with a highway program and expect that the priorities that we had established would be the priorities that all of the members of the House would establish. In our opinion, the priorities of the roads that he has mentioned have not been reached and therefore they do not appear on the program this year. You will note, however, that there is an access road at Gretna. He said he wasn't in the House -- I presume he's read Hansard -- and that this in itself is a pretty good-sized project for this year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that's all I have to say for the moment. I will be happy to hear from some of the other honourable members.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, the other day the Minister took some objection to some of the statements I had made and felt that what I had said, at least in part, was unfair criticism and he very much disliked my reference to this first Plan for Tomorrow in connection with highways, because he thought that I was misrepresenting the figures. Well, Mr. Chairman, looking at Hansard, which reproduces I hope quite accurately what the Minister had to say, I find on page 1260 that he said: "Now, Mr. Chairman, we have a capital road program this year, the estimated total of which will amount to \$23,523,000.00". Then he goes out to show how this \$23 million is made up, and in this \$23 million he has \$1 million on provincial roads -- I'm just giving the round figures -- \$2 million on roads to resources, \$3 1/2 million in Winnipeg area perimeter highway, etcetera, and a carry-over from last year of \$4,275,000.00.

Well, Mr. Chairman, either the Minister didn't read this Plan for Tomorrow or, if he did, he overlooked the most important statement of the whole lot that appears in this particular study and report. If he looks on page 33 at the second paragraph, he will find this, and I quote: "This exceeds the average annual amount spent from 1954 to 1959 by \$8 million and from 1949 to 1959 by \$12 million." Well what does this refer to? It refers to the immediately preceding paragraph which I'll read again for him, and I quote: "Over the next 20 years an average annual expenditure of more than \$27 million is required to fulfill provincial trunk highway system needs." But if he goes back to the second paragraph, what does that \$27 million include? And I quote: "All figures exclude municipal grants and work on secondary roads, 100 percent roads and highway routes in the City of Winnipeg." So I suggest to him, Mr. Chairman, that in arriving at his \$21 million he took in at least close to \$10 million that are not rightfully in their place. So when you come down to the actual facts, the \$21 million figure he gave us is not accurate as compared to the figures given in this particular document.

But there is one other item here that he has used, and I think that on second thought he will probably say he was sorry he did because it certainly didn't belong here, and that is the statement that follows, and I quote: "Then we have a work carry-over from last year of

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd) \$4,275,000.00." Well that indicates to me at least, Mr. Chairman, how this government operates. Last year they used this figure to show how big a program they had. They didn't spend it so they put that same figure in this year's program, leaving the same impression. That \$4,275,000 should not appear here at all in this calculation because if they spend it this year -- if they spend it this year, they will have spent \$21 million. What I want to point out is that's what they told us last year, that they would spend it. They gave us a figure and the figure turns out to be \$4,275,000 less than what we were led to believe that would be spent. So I say to the Honourable Minister that, after all is said and done, I think that if he really sits down and does his homework he'll find out that they're spending the money that I claimed they were spending, and that they were far below what was estimated and what the people of the Province of Manitoba were led to believe that this government would be spending and had to spend on the highway system in the Province of Manitoba.

Now as to the quality of the roads, the Minister's answer was that these cracks and breaks were appearing in the highways that were constructed prior to 1958 as well as those that were constructed after 1958. Well not on the roads I've travelled on. There is no doubt the odd crack on the old roads but I take this stretch from No. 1 and 4 down to Gladstone and I say to him that he won't find these cracks in that road. The Honourable Member from Brandon says there's something wrong with the highways in his area. Well he's had so many of them built in the last few years that he's one that hasn't got too much to complain about, and that applies pretty well to most of the members of the government.

Following up that statement I'll, just for your information, Mr. Chairman, just give you a few figures, because this seems to be a point that goes home and it should go home very well. I have here, Mr. Chairman, a clipping from the Free Press of December 10th, 1962, and this is a very good indication of the way this government operates. I'll come to the question of priorities in a moment, but just listen to this, and I quote: "But both Mr. Hutton and Dr. Johnson can rest a little easier than their Liberal predecessors, for under the Conservative administration both constituencies have done well by the way of provincial money poured in to build roads, schools and other projects." I could very well add the Honourable Minister of Education to this too, which I'll come to later -- (Interjection) -- The Free Press of December 10th, 1962. -- (Interjection) -- Well that's quite all right. I didn't hear her. I didn't hear anybody object to it at the time it was published and I think that was the time to object, not here.

I'm going to continue reading from the same article and I quote: "As far as the Honourable Minister of Labour" -- he's no longer Minister of Labour incidentally -- I'm sorry -- the Minister of Welfare, he hasn't done too badly either under this government -- and I continue to quote, Mr. Chairman: "As one Rockwood farmer put it, in Winnipeg they have one-way streets. Out here we have one-way highways." He was referring to the twin highways less than a half a mile apart which connect Stonewall and Warren. "The population had asked for improvements to the road but got an entirely new one instead. The only catch is that the new highway serves only five farms along its entire nine miles compared to some nineteen farms served by the old one." Two-way highways in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

Now we talk about priorities, Mr. Chairman, and the fact the Minister is trying to make the point that this government is running according to certain set priorities based on traffic count and diagraphic maps and so forth. Let us take a look at that map. In the first place, that map is not a true map of what this government has done because it shows the roads that have been built since July, 1958. I want to point out to the Honourable Minister that if not all the roads, then most of the roads built in 1958 were contracted for before this government came into power, and I think they have no right to take any credit for those roads. If I am right in my argument, then the roads that were built in 1958 should be deleted from that map, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if they are deleted that map will look considerably different than what it does. But in spite of that, let's take a good look at that map. The Honourable Minister says, well the distribution is throughout the province. That is correct, but it so happens that distribution falls within constituencies that are represented here by the Conservative Party.

Now the honourable gentleman for the constituency of Roblin probably has a reason to complain. He hasn't been treated as well as the Ministers have, but if he behaves himself he'll

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd) probably get the same treatment. Now if we look over at that map we see where this article came from — it's quite plain. Look at the constituency that the Honourable Minister of Health represents, and there isn't room for any more roads in that constituency. They've just about got it plastered. Now if you look down in the stronghold of the Conservative Party, down in the southwestern part of Manitoba, why that looks like the myriads of rabbit tracks that we have through the bush up in my country. Overlooking the fact, Mr. Chairman, that this is road work performed by this government, I want to point out that the former government did not follow that kind of priority. The roads were really evenly distributed across the Province of Manitoba, and if this map was superimposed upon the roads that existed as of the end of December 1958, then you would really have something to look at and something to compare. The only thing it lacks is the true picture, that's all.

Now, what about these priorities. We all agree of course that there certainly are priorities, but the priorities are not on the basis of need but are on the basis of where a member comes from in this House. Well we were told — oh yes, seeing the Honourable Minister of Education really wants me to say something about Dauphin, I think I'd better. In this last report we've had, I have gone to the trouble of adding up what was done in the Dauphin constituency in that last report, which is of course not the '62 working season but the one before it, and I find that there is over \$700,000 spent in that constituency. Now I can see what the Free Press article was referring to, because in addition to this the honourable gentleman has a new hostel worth \$2 million in his constituency. He was capable of interpreting The Public Schools Act in such a fashion that he was able to give a \$10,000 present to the school board — (Interjection) — Oh yes. In my way of thinking the publicity is anything but good publicity, because you gentlemen who are in those front benches are responsible to the people of the Province of Manitoba, not to the Conservative Party. I have said this many times and I repeat it, that if we really want the people of Manitoba to respect us in this House, we must show that we respect our responsibilities as representatives of the Province of Manitoba and not of the Conservative Party.

Now — (Interjection) — I'm sorry that I can't give you any credit for getting anything from this government. I'm not speaking personally now, I'm talking about road work. Now insofar as following the lines set out in this very important document, in 1959 the total project miles were 1,266. What have we for 1963-64 — 502 project miles, Mr. Chairman, which is approximately 40 percent of what was done in 1959, immediately after this particular document was put into print. So if the Honourable Minister wants to convince me and the other members of this House that they are actually continuing with the plans set out in that document, then I say to him that he is wrong, because the mileage itself proves that.

Now what about priorities. Well this may sound impossible, but it's correct. All the Liberal rural members just received a fraction less in the last annual report than the Honourable Minister of Education did himself. And I think that if I added up what was the road construction in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health, then I'm quite sure that all of us put together received less than he did himself. So I say to the Honourable Minister if he really wants to go down in history as a fair-minded Minister, one who had the best interests of the Province of Manitoba at heart, he'd better change his ways and really start to build roads where the need is, immaterial of political expediency, build them on the basis of traffic count, and he'll receive every support from us and the thanks of the people of the province.

MR. CHERNIACK: I listened with interest to this last speech and to the reactions from both sides of the House. I realized what appeared to be amusing to the members present, but I must admit I did not find it amusing at all. To the extent that anything that was said by the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains was true in its implication, it is a shame; and to the extent that anything he said that was unfair, it is equally shameful. I am not the conscience of anybody but myself, Mr. Chairman, but I must admit that as an onlooker through the years gone by of reports of debates that have taken place in this House on the question of roads, I have often felt that the emphasis was one which was neither healthy nor redounded to the prestige of the people who participated in it vociferously.

I must admit that I was a little bit ashamed for the Honourable Minister of Public Works when I heard him say in a casual and joking manner that if the member from a certain constituency — I wasn't paying too much attention but it was a "she" — if she was responsible for

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd) certain work being done, then good for her. The suggestion that a member influences the work that is done in his or her constituency is to me one which I would be ashamed to participate in. But I am in the minority here. -- (Interjection) — Well, I think so. I don't think it should be the duty of an individual member to demand roads on behalf of his or her constituency, except to see to it that the work is properly being done by the department in charge, and properly being done is not done on the basis of guesswork, estimate pressure or the power of speech of the member who represents any constituency.

I realize that roads are a most vital factor in the development of this province and it should be done in accordance with one or two of the last sentences of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains when he spoke about the fact that roads should be built on the basis of need after proper studies. And that is why I come back to something I had asked of the Honourable Minister before, and that is some indication of origin and destination studies and traffic counts to justify the display that we have here for the North Perimeter Road. I'm sorry that he did not give us that information, because I would hate to think that when he made the statement that one of the prime purposes for doing the work now was that by the time it will be completed the traffic will be there. I hope that that is not based on guesswork, but is based on actual statistical counts with knowledge backing it rather than the thought that this might happen.

I'm inclined to think that when any member gets up in this committee and says, "Why do I not find my constituency adequately represented", that the question should not be asked. The question may be asked, I believe, in terms of "does not this and this particular highway demand certain expansion or improvement because of traffic count or other statistical studies?" So I would hope that before we leave the estimates the Minister will give us information on origin and destination studies, particularly when one speaks of a diversion such as is contemplated in the North Perimeter Highway. Failing adequate origin destination studies, then I would like to see something about traffic count to justify the overpass and the graded work that is planned over Highway No. 4, I believe it is. This I think is something that we are entitled to have, to judge the basis on which decisions of this nature are made.

Now the other reason given by the Honourable Minister for doing that work now and in the next three years was that satisfactory economical design dictated this. Then he spoke of certain wastes as the result of excavation and the need of having fillings for approaches. This is technical talk of which I am not competent to deal, but I assume that the Minister too feels that either he is competent to deal in that type of talk or does have sufficient figures to back up his statement that satisfactory economical design dictated this, because it is my suggestion that the need may not arise for possibly 20 years. I would like to see a saving related to my forecast, and I may be wrong because I'm not an expert. But surely the figures which the Honourable Minister may produce to us will indicate the expected time, based on statistics, when this will be needed, and relate that to costs as they are today and the interest that will have to be paid on those costs, and the question of priorities which the Minister has already referred to in relation to work projected in various other constituencies.

Now I was interested in the figures which the Honourable Minister gave us in relation to contributions to Metro on Metro streets. I have some questions to ask which I hope he will be able to deal with. I didn't quite get clear whether he meant that this was contribution to Metro projects on Metro streets, or total costs of the Provincial Government on Metro streets. I did hear him say that these figures included bridges, and I remember asking that we get figures exclusive of bridges because I felt that bridges were large amounts which would not be related to progressive work done by the province before the creation of Metro except, I believe, for the Disraeli Bridge. I hope that he will be able to give us this and that he will be able to furnish this committee, or if the committee isn't interested at least furnish me, with the figures he has given to us broken down in such a way that a layman can understand it. Maybe I should omit that last qualification because I would like to see figures that an expert could understand.

I had quite a bit of intimate working relationship with the civil service of the Metropolitan Corporation and I was greatly impressed with their ability and their qualifications. I believe I have every right to say that from what I hear the Civil Service of this province is equally deserving of recognition for its qualifications and capabilities, and yet for some peculiar reason there seems to be a difference of opinion between the two sets of Civil Servants as to whether the contributions by the province on these projects are increasing or declining. I made the

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd) statement that they were declining and I based that on a number of reports which I heard as a member of the Metropolitan Council as late as last November. The Minister has made the statement that they are not declining and has indicated what appears to be an increase. I'm sure he is basing that on information which he has received from his staff. It seems to me that two sets of competent qualified people ought to be able to agree on dollars and cents and I think it's a pity that they haven't done so to date, to my knowledge, and if they have I would very much appreciate knowing that so that I would for myself have these doubts resolved, because the statements that I made about declining were those based not on my personal investigation but based on information given to me as late as last November by people in whom I have confidence. So I hope that the Minister will be able to give us a breakdown which will be understandable and possibly might stop the discussions that have taken place in the past between the two sets of Civil Servants wherein I feel they failed to agree.

Might I also ask the Minister that if and when he gives us these figures he indicates whether those figures are estimated, budgeted, projected or actual, because as was pointed out by him, there are times when you project certain work which you cannot complete; and not having completed it, you obviously didn't spend the money in that year. The Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains did suggest that there is a possibility of doubling-up figures when you indicate work intended to be done in one year and, because it wasn't done, repeated in the next. So I am looking forward to hearing from the Honourable Minister — to receiving from the Honourable Minister a statement such as can give us a breakdown which is measurable. The main reason I do that is to continue the efforts which the Honourable Minister made just this afternoon to establish a rapport and understanding as between the province and Metro, and through that with the people, in recognition of the contributions of each and the contributions that they will be able to make, and do this in a positive way so that there shouldn't be these charges and counter-charges that are being levelled and to which I was party only yesterday.

I do appreciate the fact that the Honourable Minister indicated that the government is deeply conscious of the need for increased bridges within the Metro area, and he indicated that Metro didn't seem to be ready to produce the plans. I must again remind the Honourable Minister that, to my knowledge, Metro was informed that once the St. James Bridge was approved, it should not come back with another project until it was completed. I believe subsequent to that and after further representations it was agreed that the preliminary work could be commenced by Metro and submitted to the province, so that by the time St. James Bridge would be completed, at least the province would have completed many of its studies. But this was not the original instructions to Metro, and to the extent it was varied is again an indication that the province may be assuming and recognizing its responsibility to the creature which it created.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. JOHNSTON: I'd like to thank the Honourable Minister for some of his replies to my statement the other day. I must say he did a very good job in explaining the book work and the missing pages and so on. I'm reasonably satisfied with those answers but I must say I am not satisfied with what he had to say about his justification or his department's justification for building bridges in this province. I'm going to suggest that it's quite normal, I suppose, for a member of a constituency to try and get extra things and get work done in his or her constituency, and I think probably everyone in this House at some time or another gives way to that temptation and works towards the good of their constituency possibly a little too zealously, but when we hear from a Minister who has been charged with the important job of the whole province, the Minister of Public Works to give the answers that we just heard — and as the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains points out how he distributes the highways and works around this province — I think perhaps the name of this department should be changed from Public Works to pork barrel — yes, pork barrel — because I believe that's the kind of building we are getting in this province. As has been well documented by the Member for Ethelbert Plains, the work is going where the right members come from. The government appears to make no bones about this. They laugh — like the Honourable Member from St. John's says — they laugh it off, they think it's a big joke. Well I don't think it's a big joke for Cabinet Ministers to take this approach when their responsibilities are for all of Manitoba.

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd)

I asked the question, like for instance, what was the traffic count at Hertz Ferry to justify a \$233,000 bridge, and this question wasn't answered. I would still like to know what the traffic count was to justify that bridge. I feel the people of Manitoba deserve this information. If they feel they have a similar need and a similar qualification, then they can come forward and ask for a project such as this. I'd also like the Minister to justify his department in how on the Assiniboine River from Portage la Prairie to Brandon, about 85 miles, there's four bridges in the first 45 miles and in the next 40 miles there are no bridges.

I'm also going to suggest, or perhaps I should ask -- does the Minister run his department by pressure from the members or is he doing a job for the province as a whole? It would seem to me that in the philosophy of this particular bridge that we were discussing the other day was that a bridge is dropped in there, and after the bridge is there, there is a sincere hope that there will be enough traffic to justify this particular bridge. I would still like to hear from the Honourable Minister the justification for this bridge. If he says that it was put there before his time, then I would suggest that he look through his records and give us their reasoning for bridges of this nature and in that particular place.

MR. WEIR: I can't let a speech like that go by without getting on my feet. I deny unequivocally the charges that the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie has made with regard to the way roads are established within the Province of Manitoba. I let the remarks of the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains go by for the simple reason that he's made those charges before and that's all there is to it.

In my opinion that map shows -- that map shows how the roads are established in the Province of Manitoba. There is every effort being made to provide the best possible network of roads that the Province of Manitoba can afford. The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie will probably find out in due course -- he'll probably find out in due course that it is his responsibility to make sure that the Government of Manitoba knows the needs of his constituency, and this is what I meant when I spoke of the Honourable Member from Cypress. If she was responsible in proving to the Minister of Public Works that that bridge was required; if she assisted in getting this thing there; then this is a part of her responsibility. She is here to make sure that her people are served the same as the Honourable Member for Radisson and the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and all of the other honourable members in the House. I did in no way, I think -- I certainly feel if I did, I certainly want to correct it -- imply that there was anything wrong in any member attempting to see that their constituency was properly served.

He talks about "pork barrel" -- he talks about "pork barrel". Little has been done to try and find out where the roads have gone or there just wouldn't be charges of this kind. They are completely irresponsible, completely irresponsible charges. He talks about the bridges between Portage la Prairie and 34, and then lacking between 34 and Brandon, and the answer is ferries, that there are existing ferries there that are still carrying traffic. For his information there will have to be a couple more bridges built between No. 34 Highway and No. 10. He asks for traffic count, and this is information that is provided by the department. We have fairly accurate traffic counts; we have consistent traffic counts; and they are used as a guide. The road program is developed from the traffic counts and under the recommendations of the members of the staff. We have a good staff, so I just don't accept any of those statements at all.

While I'm on my feet, I might as well say a word or two in reply to the Honourable Member from St. John's. He talks about the figures from Metro. The way I would suggest he get them is -- they're terribly confusing for me to try and talk about them and I think that if you would put down for an Order of Return the exact figures that you want, they would be much easier to get. To do it this way we only, I feel, add to what confusion might exist. I would be happy to do what I can to get the figures for the honourable gentleman but I think that that would be a better procedure.

I don't think that I'm even going to make reference to the remarks that were made by the Member from Ethelbert Plains. We've been over that before. If I say it over again, he'll say it over again; if he says it over again and I say it over again, first thing we know my estimates will be just the same as the estimates for the Department of Agriculture.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, I'd protest, but he's bigger than I am.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, since I first came to this House I've heard these arguments over and over and over again. I can remember, I think the very first speech that I made on Public Works in 1959, I mentioned that there were no highways that were needed in Elmwood because it was an urban constituency but there was a very great need for a subway between St. Boniface and my constituency. I would like to think that I was responsible for that subway being built, but I'm quite sure I wasn't.

But I would like to ask the Minister a question at this time with regards to another subway that the people in the eastern end of my constituency are quite concerned about. I don't know if it's the responsibility now of this government since Metro has taken over, and I believe that Nairn Avenue is the problem of Metro or probably a joint effort with the Provincial Government, and I know that this issue has been raised in City Council because the people have had meetings there. They are quite concerned about being cut off by the main line of the CPR running through the constituency and there have been times when ambulances or fire engines have been held up for as long as five minutes, which could at times bring on serious consequences. It has also been brought up in Metro. Now what I would like to know from the Minister is this, did either the City of Winnipeg or Metro approach the Provincial Government with help to build -- it will have to be two subways, not one, or an overpass -- could he tell me if he has been approached by any of these bodies for help with whatever is needed there, overpasses or subways?

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the speech made by the Minister of Public Works this afternoon. I notice, however, that apart from speaking loudly, he did not give any direct replies to the questions that were asked. The Member for Portage asked, for example, for the traffic counts of the bridge that was built. The Minister said, "Yes, sure we operate from traffic counts; this is the basis of our work." -- but he doesn't produce the traffic counts, Mr. Chairman. He says it's there, but when the question is asked there is no answer and no offer of information. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if the Minister is operating on traffic counts, then let him produce the traffic counts in this House.

Here is what the previous government did. There are the traffic counts under which the province operated previously. There are the indications. These were available to members of the House. They could see what the traffic count was on highways across the province. This was the basis of planning. Now if my honourable friend is using traffic counts so very much now, then I say to him, produce them. I'll be very interested in seeing, Mr. Chairman, what the traffic count is on the bridge that the Minister says so blindly, "Well if the member is able to put enough pressure on the government to get this, this is fine, in fact it's commendable." Is this the way that he builds highways in the province or does he build them on a planned basis? Let him bring out his plan if he's got one. The time has come for less talk and more action. Let's give the members of the House the information on these subjects.

Now my friend says there is no politics involved in his highway system, none whatever. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a couple of clippings into the record at this time. One, for example, September 21st, 1962: "Roads for Votes". Now does this come from a member of my Party, Mr. Chairman? Not at all. "Metro boss says province trades favours. R.H.G. Bonnycastle, Metro Chairman, said Thursday the Provincial Government was really eyeing votes when it authorized grants to the municipalities for minor road projects at the same time it was reducing Metro's road fund allocation." He's quoted later on as saying: "The trouble is that there are votes on those streets, said Mr. Bonnycastle."

I want to read another clipping, Mr. Chairman, from another part of the province, June 8, 1962: "Pot-hole Tumbles Truck. A pot-hole on the government's new highway No. 3 west of Boissevain, Manitoba, has dumped a Manitoba Hydro truck on its side in the middle of the road, damaging the truck and bruising the two-man crew. The truck was picking its way through the holes in the road about ten miles west of Boissevain when it had to swerve to the left to miss a large one. A trailer being pulled by the truck hit a soft shoulder on the side of the new highway, skidded the truck sideways and turned it over on the centre of the highway. The two men in the truck were bruised."

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)

Mr. Chairman, for two years prior to this the then Member for Turtle Mountain had spoken in this House about that piece of highway and asked the Minister about that piece of highway, and indicated the bad condition that highway was in. Last year he wrote letters to the Minister on this subject. There was a considerable exchange of correspondence, much of which was in the newspapers. Mr. Chairman, do you know what the reply of the Minister was? — Non-political at all. The Minister replied to the Member for Turtle Mountain, you voted against more money for roads last year and he used somewhat the same argument that his Leader used in the TV debate — completely in error. He pretended that the Member for Turtle Mountain and myself had voted against capital for roads last year, when he knew full well that when we voted on that issue we said here in the House what we were voting against, and why. The Minister said, because you stood up in the House and voted, not about roads — he pretended it was about roads — we're not going to bother with your highway. This was the virtual statement he made in his letters. Well produce the letters then, Mr. Chairman. Produce letters; produce the diagram. Let's get down and give the House the information and let's quit pretending the way the Minister has been.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak at this time I'm rather amazed that the Member for Ethelbert names me as one of those more fortunate in the House who . . .

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I didn't blame the Honourable Minister for anything.

MR. JOHNSON: Well you were pointing out I had

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Oh, but I didn't blame you for it.

MR. JOHNSON: Beg your pardon?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I didn't blame you for it.

MR. JOHNSON: I see. The the Honourable Member for Portage followed up by saying that the Ministers sit on the front bench and laugh and smile when these things are being said. I want this to go on record in this House. I want to clip out what was said this afternoon. I'd like some of the people in my area to read what has been said about the road situation in rural Manitoba. I represent a constituency that, this past summer for the first time, saw a good highway reach the Town of Rivers. For 80 years the people lived along that lake north of Winnipeg Beach and didn't know what roads were. I practised there. I took trains in the spring to get from Gimli to Riverton to see patients. I took boats down 68 highway. I saw terrible fatal accidents between Gimli and the Airport on that very busy highway where there was quagmire, mud, pot-holes — heavens they're a rarity as the Leader of the Opposition points out today. They're unfortunate and fortunately they are a rarity. They were a common thing in my time along No. 8 and 9.

Certainly, and I can honestly say, and the people in my constituency will back it up, that I never promised a thing during elections at any time concerning roads. I never promised specifically anything. I said I would work for those things which were most important to my community, and in doing so, I did work hard to bring to the attention of the government, through the municipal representatives in my area, the great need of the people in that area who for 80 years had not had roads. It was a pilgrimage a few years ago to go up to my constituency — pilgrimage — when you hit Gimli you were half way there. We needed an access road along that lake for the fishing industry to Matheson Island which we shored up. The previous member, a very close friend of mine and very able member of this House, prevailed upon his colleagues to get busy with the roads up there and the start was made, but it was coming along just a little too slowly. The people demanded some action. They were losing out in tourism to other centres because people wouldn't risk their necks on the roads to areas as close as Winnipeg Beach and Sandy Hook. This was known as "pot-hole alley" and many were the terrible accidents and so on along this way.

No, Mr. Chairman, I think it's unfair to sit and listen to some of the things that have been said here today. I think we are losing perspective. We're losing our perspective of what we're trying to achieve. There are certain constituencies in this province that are behind others in road development. I don't know what went on in the past or the politics of it or what not, but they were more inhabited areas; they were probably older areas; they didn't have the drainage problems that us less fortunate constituencies do have in the sense that we have

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd) tremendous drainage problems and difficult road problems.

But I have to speak up in support of my government and the Party which I represent, and the government of the day, for their concern and interest in not only the economic values but the human and other values, and the need for roads, both for tourism, fishing and the many things that have served to completely change the constituency I represent -- completely changed it. Lord Harry! I lived on the main drag in the biggest town in my constituency and I ate dust -- boy I've eaten my share of it! We had to leave the storm windows on all winter. Those days are gone, and Manitobans as a whole share in the joy of the rest of us. I go to other towns and I see they're just as far ahead as we are. We have no special concession on roads. In this last election I definitely told the people of my area that I promised nothing but to do my best on their behalf, and I'll continue to say that and do that. To infer that I have received some special treatment or have some -- it's amazing how the Minister of Health has a real complex of roads coming up in there. You're "doggone tootin'" and I'm going to keep on working for it as long as I can draw good Manitoba air. I want to see my constituency keep up with the rest of Manitoba in her economic and tourist development and fishing industries and so on.

But these roads are not just Gimli roads, they're Manitoba roads. They're for all of us to enjoy the benefits, and I would welcome you this summer to come up for a quiet drive and visit along our No. 9, which the former government abandoned the year in which I came to office. I've managed to prevail upon my colleagues to develop this as a tourist road, and in the last three years we're seeing a tremendous mushrooming and re-awakening in the interest in the wonderful sights and the things which will attract the tourists, and the development of the numerous cottages north of Gimli, between Gimli and Hnausa.

But I just want to say firmly that, to this implication, we're not going to get anywhere in this House trying to insinuate or talking about the political aspects of roads. I'm one of those -- I may be a little off-base to believe that road counts alone aren't too meaningful. You build a road and people will explore that road. Your count will go up if you've got the people there. You take the Town of Arborg, that little jewel right in the middle of the Interlake. You build some roads up that way and the people of Manitoba will flock up there to see some of the finest farming country. They can't get there now -- it's a pilgrimage. Let's get off this nonsense and let's talk about building roads for all of Manitoba.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister just made a statement that the previous government had abandoned No. 9 highway. Is that the correct statement that he made? I would like to read to him from the list -- a different colour, that's all, but the same list that was produced in this House in the session of February and March 1958, which was the last session the previous government sat, and here's what it has for No. 9 highway: 5 miles on the Selkirk by-pass, grading and gravelling; 4 miles, Lockport and Selkirk, seal coats; 20 miles Selkirk-Winnipeg Beach, seal coating; 9 miles Winnipeg Beach to Gimli, additional base bituminous mat; one mile Henderson Highway, East and North Kildonan, widening existing pavements. I don't see, Mr. Chairman, that this is abandoning the highway that my honourable friend was talking about. In fact, it is in large part building it, or completing it to Gimli.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, the Highway No. 9 was abandoned between Gimli and Hnausa by Order-in-Council in May of 1958. I correct myself on the rest of the highway which is in my honourable friend from Selkirk's constituency.

MR. MOLGAT: Could my honourable friend, could he tell me how Winnipeg Beach to Gimli is in Selkirk constituency? It must have moved recently.

MR. JOHNSON: Between Winnipeg Beach and Matlock, rather, and Sandy Hook, and Gimli is my constituency. I'll have to be more specific in the future. However, No. 9 was abandoned between Gimli and Hnausa, that beautiful stretch of Lake Winnipeg was threatened with abandonment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Member from Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the Honourable Minister replying to what I had to say yesterday, and certainly if roads are built on a priority basis, then I feel that 32 should be entitled to some improvements: After all, this is the most densely populated rural area in Manitoba, and I would like to know from him what the traffic count is on 32. No doubt counts have been made, and I think a good deal depends upon where the town

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) is located, whether it's right at the U.S. border or whether it's located half-way between the Town of Winkler and the U.S. border, because the road is used very widely to go into town and used as a market road as well. The total number of miles of highway in my constituency, in the constituency of Rhineland, is somewhere around 45 miles. Out of this 45, we have Highway 32 which is some 13-14 miles, and this is in such poor condition at the present time that people are avoiding going on the highway and taking to the dirt roads because it's in such poor condition.

I also would like to know the cost of maintenance on that road for the last year or two, because this must be very high in percentage to the miles of road consisting of Highway 32. I'd like to get this information from him because this is, as shown on the map before us, you practically have a clear map indicating no road work in Rhineland constituency. The only one listed there is Highway 32, and I'm wondering whether that was built by the present government or whether it was built by the previous government, because when discussing this matter with the Minister he thought that the base was too poor and that the whole road would have to be re-constructed before a hard surface could be put on. I wonder if he could give us this information.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I think that I can speak as the only one in the House at the present time, or at least this afternoon, that can stand up and affirm that the road that I'm going to speak about is a joint political road, namely the piece of road in my constituency of Radisson from the Perimeter Road south to the boundaries of the Municipality of St. Vital. I was very happy to know that the Honourable Member for St. Vital and the Honourable Member for La Verendrye and myself were able to unitedly make a request to the government for this road. I think I'm rather unfortunate that possibly this road did not also lead into the constituency of Rhineland, and then I might have had the four political parties in Manitoba united behind me in the piece of road for my own constituency.

I listened with interest however, Mr. Chairman, with some disappointment to the reply of the Honourable Minister of Public Works. He said that there is a possibility that something might be done on this road this fall, that the department, as I understood him, was taking cognizance of the fact that something has to be done or should be done on this particular stretch of road; but he also tied it in with the question, if I recall correctly, of the building of the Floodway. He doesn't know, or the department doesn't know at the present time what type of road will be required, based insofar as the construction on the weight loads that might have to be carried on this particular stretch of road. I want to say to him, and I don't know what the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture thought, but the first impression that I had while the Minister of Agriculture was telling us in this House that the construction of the Floodway is proceeding at a rather steady pace -- I believe that he said that he hopes that the Floodway will be completed in the year 1966 -- '65 or '66 -- and I would respectfully suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Public Works that if this is the case and this stretch of road is going to be used in conjunction with the building of the Floodway, I wouldn't like to be in his shoes as Minister of Public Works if the Minister of Agriculture turned around to me and said, "Well now look Buster, you held up the completion of the Red River Floodway because of the fact that you haven't built this piece of road in the constituency of Radisson.

Now I would suggest to the Minister that irrespective of the type of construction that has to be made on this particular piece of road, that there at least is preliminary work that can be done. Now I recall going down this piece of road over the last few years, in election and out of election, and noted that the road -- or at least it seemed to me that stakes had been driven into the road indicating that construction would be done within a reasonable period of time. And I would suggest to the Minister -- he has told us in this House that something is going to be done, he doesn't know exactly what it will be but it may be done this fall -- but I would suggest that in the meantime, in the meantime, that the road is in a dangerous condition. The stakes are there. I believe, as far as my knowledge is concerned, that surveys have been taken of the road itself, and I would respectfully suggest to the Minister that notwithstanding what he told us this afternoon as to the type of road that is to be built, that at least work can proceed at the present time in overcoming the dangerous condition of the road at the present time.

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)

And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I want also to mention to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works, and on this I'm possibly being selfishly political, is the condition of St. Anne's Road south of the Perimeter Road. This road is very, very rapidly falling apart. It might be that in the department when they're considering the road to be used in connection with the construction of the Floodway may decide that St. Anne's Road rather than St. Mary's Road will be the one built up in order to take the heavier traffic. But I appeal to the Minister that insofar as St. Anne's Road is concerned, the same situation prevails at the present time insofar as the dangerous condition is concerned with that of St. Mary's Road. Now I have been informed that there have been one or two crews out this spring patching up some of the holes at present in St. Anne's Road, but just as soon as there's a little rain like we had the other day the fill is washed out of the holes. And I appeal to the Minister also in respect of St. Anne's Road -- and in this, Mr. Chairman, I hope that I have the support of the Honourable Member for Springfield, because St. Anne's Road -- and I'm not talking of the road to Ste. Anne's, but the extension of St. Anne's in St. Vital -- that St. Anne's Road links up Grande Point which is in the constituency of my friend from Springfield. It's also a very important road in the Greater Winnipeg perimeter area.

So I appeal to the Minister to reconsider the possibility or maybe of doing something to St. Mary's road this year, in the light of the construction of the Floodway, and also that the matter of the St. Anne's road be given serious consideration. I appreciate, Mr. Chairman -- this may be strange coming from somebody on this side of the House -- I appreciate the fact that the Minister and the Department of Public Works can't build every road that they would like to all over the whole province at the same time. However, I do say to him, that if he can't build these roads at the present time, that both of them should be put in safe condition which they're not in at the present time.

..... Continued on next page

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): No doubt we're not through with the subject of roads, but there seems to be a temporary lull in the subject of political roads, and I would like to take the opportunity of this lull to introduce a different subject. And I might say before I go on that despite what has been said about the propriety of a member endeavouring to get work done in his constituency -- despite that -- I do not withdraw from the coalition that I entered into with the Honourable Member from Radisson and the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye and including the Honourable Member from Springfield.

However, I would like to deal with the subject of bridges, and this bridge that I'm going to talk about has been a controversial subject in the past few months, perhaps almost as controversial as roads have over the years in this House. And it's because of this controversy, and particularly because of the controversy that arose over this bridge during the election campaign, that I feel as a member for this constituency that I should place on record some of my views and some clarification of the situation insofar as the constituency is concerned.

Since the opening of the Trans-Canada Highway, all the traffic from the east, and particularly from the resorts in the Whiteshell, mostly traffic on weekends that has been causing the trouble, entered the City of Winnipeg through the City of St. Vital. Traffic on this Trans-Canada Highway enters St. Vital on St. Anne's road on the corner of Fermor, and this traffic most of which is bound for Fort Garry, Fort Rouge, West Winnipeg and even St. James, uses eight residential streets in the City of St. Vital to cross over from St. Anne's to St. Mary's road. From St. Mary's road it moves along either Fermor or Dunkirk, hence to Kingston Row and Kingston Crescent to get to the Elm Park bridge. This creates a very serious situation on these streets that lie between St. Mary's and St. Anne's roads, and an almost unbearable situation on Kingston Crescent, and constant pressure has been put on the City Council of St. Vital by the residents of this area for relief from this bad traffic situation; and I must say that I'm in complete sympathy with these people. I support their cry for relief and I support the fact that relief from their traffic dilemma depends on a new river crossing between St. Vital and Winnipeg, and that this river crossing would discourage the use of Elm Park bridge and these residential streets for through traffic.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister, earlier this afternoon made a statement in connection with this bridge and I accept that statement. That statement was to the effect that this matter was now in the hands of the Provincial Department of Public Works and that it was being given serious consideration and all the facts in connection with site, design, etcetera were being investigated. I accept that from the Minister but nevertheless I feel, as I said earlier, due to the controversy that has arisen over this bridge, that I must as the member for this area at least put my views on record.

At the moment, however, despite the problem that I recognize of the people in the area that are affected by this weekend traffic, because of lack of information from Metro on alternate sites, another large body of people in St. Vital cannot agree with Metro's proposal to build such a river crossing at Edinburgh Street or the foot of Osborne. It is my hope that both of these groups, who are at the moment most vitally concerned about a bridge link with Winnipeg that will alleviate this foreign traffic problem in the City of St. Vital, that they will co-operate in obtaining from Metro, and from the provincial government, the assurance that the site, design, utility and appearance of this bridge will be such as to improve and upgrade the City of St. Vital and be designed to serve the community's best long-term interest. The government is committed to pay 100 percent of the cost of this bridge and we are assured that this bridge will continue to have first priority and we are assured as well that there will be no undue delay in proceeding with the construction of such a bridge as soon as the necessary investigations are completed. The committee that I referred to earlier that doubts, because of lack of information from Metro, the decision to put the bridge on the proposed site, are a group of sensible people that are genuinely interested in the future progress of our City. Metro's general attitude however, to this group during the period of the last few months has been very disappointing, although not unexpected. I feel that with proper handling of this matter that the views of these groups can be reconciled and that the best interests of the future development of the whole area will be taken into consideration. I am equally convinced, however, that improper handling of this matter, including any move on the part of the government towards favouring either one or the other of these groups, or being hurried too much either by the Metro Council or by the

(Mr. Groves cont'd) Council of St. Vital, could do irreparable harm to the district directly affected. During the course of the last few months Metro has been asked by one of these committees many questions -- two foolscap pages of questions in fact -- and here are some of the questions that were asked of Metro and the answers which these people received. Question: What are the reasons, economic and structural for choosing Osborne Street over St. Mary's road or St. Mary's-St. Anne's site? Answer: Reasons to date are traffic demand primarily, not economic or structural. Question: What is the future of the Elm Park bridge? Answer: It will be retained for some time and the length of time depends on its condition.

The plan which Metro proposes at the moment, in my opinion, will not entirely eliminate the weekend traffic from the Kingston Crescent area. Many people going to Fort Garry and River Heights from resorts on the Trans-Canada Highway will still use the Elm Park bridge because it's a shorter route. So this plan then will not, in my opinion, solve all of the problems of the residents which at the moment are pushing for a fast decision on the site recommended by Metro. Another question that was asked by this group of Metro: Any idea primarily which people use the Elm Park bridge and where they come from? Do people who use this bridge come from places other than St. Vital? Elaborate on full traffic survey in layman's language. Metro's answer to that question was: From our license plate origin-destination studies during the morning and evening peak hours -- and I emphasize, during the morning and evening peak hours -- an approximate breakdown of where people live who presently use the Elm Park bridge on an average week day is as follows - St. Vital, 58 percent; Fort Rouge, 12 percent; St. Boniface, 11 percent; Fort Garry, 7 percent; south Winnipeg, 12 percent. And then they add -- and I want to emphasize this part of their answer -- "this, of course, would not apply on summer weekends when heavy holiday traffic uses the Elm Park bridge to and from the Trans-Canada Highway." Metro has gone to the trouble of preparing this traffic survey and they say in their answer to this committee, "This, of course, would not apply on summer weekends when heavy holiday traffic uses the Elm Park bridge to and from the Trans-Canada Highway." And this, Mr. Chairman, is the most important consideration of all because it's this heavy weekend traffic that's causing the problem. This is what's causing the trouble and this is what these people have been complaining to the Municipal Council about for years and yet Metro says to one of these committees that this of course will not apply on summer weekends.

Metro also have a report called the "Progress Report" on the location of a bridge across the Red River in south Greater Winnipeg and I would like to quote one short paragraph from that report. "Within the general terms of reference outlined above the traffic planning section of this division proceeded with traffic surveys in October and November of 1961. These studies consisted of morning and afternoon peak hour traffic." -- and I want to repeat -- "These studies consisted of morning and afternoon peak hour traffic, and licence plates directional distribution studies at the Main Street, Norwood and Elm Park bridges and at key major intersections in the study area which could give us information pertaining to the peak hour travel pattern necessary for studying problems associated with the location of a new bridge. Following this the existing major street system and the proposed or possible extensions or additions to the major street system were studied with relation to the new river crossing, and after reviewing this information it appeared that four alternative sites could be considered for a bridge in this area." And they go on to list the four alternative sites. And on the basis of these traffic studies which Metro did they prepared this chart, showing how the traffic volume in the -- I'm sorry but anyway just take the pink line that goes down the middle -- was made on the basis of their traffic. On the basis of these traffic studies which I just quoted then, Metro drew up this chart and on the basis of these lines like pink marking the map, indicated either the east-west or north-south flow of traffic and it's on the basis of this chart that Metro made its recommendation for the proposed bridge to be at the foot of Edinborough Street joining up with Winnipeg on Osborne.

Quoting further from this same report, they go on to say, "It should be realized that all figures quoted refer to 1961 traffic volume and that the Metropolitan origin-destination studies indicate present or 1962 person trips. It has not been possible at this time to expand this data to estimated movements in future years as considerable information and work is still required in this regard. They say, and I repeat again, "that it is not possible at this time to expand this

(Mr. Groves cont'd) data to estimated movements in future years as considerable information and work is still required in this area." And I say that if Metro is properly planning this bridge and any other bridge in the Metropolitan area that they must take into consideration the estimated movement of traffic in future areas, because there is in the south end of St. Vital and in the east end of St. Boniface large tracts of land that will in a few years time be suitable for residential development and these areas and the residential development in them will generate more traffic and consideration of estimated movements in future years is a must when considering the location of such a bridge. Metro also, in this submission is contradicting itself, because in an article which appears in the Winnipeg Free Press, when they were discussing the Moray Street bridge in St. James as against the Thompson Drive river crossing, here's what Mr. McDonald, the streets and transit director of Metro said, and he's referring here to the crossing at Thompson Drive -- "It is to be a limited access highway with speed limits of perhaps 40 or 50 miles an hour. These speeds would not be possible on Moray Street which has homes on both sides. Mr. McDonald, in the first public explanation of what is planned for the route said that the proposed Thompson Drive bridge site would be better because it would allow a grade separation, underpass, overpass and clover-leaf for east-west and north-south traffic at Portage Avenue; that it would be better because -- a buffer zone by putting the road through an under-developed area to keep the noise away from housing developments and major traffic flows to avoid the Birchwood Heights School area and a nearby supermarket; the elimination of a potential bottleneck at Portage and Moray and better access to future St. James and Assiniboia industrial areas north-west of the Airport."

So this is what Mr. McDonald said at that time, guided Metro in its decision to put this bridge across the Assiniboine River at Thompson Drive; and it's interesting to note that despite what was said at that time, that Metro has now reversed its decision and according to a clipping in the Tribune, it says, "St. James bridge decision reversed; now on Moray. Logical site says Metro." Now, let's apply Mr. McDonald's reasoning, despite the fact it subsequently changed, for putting a river crossing at Thompson Drive, with what he proposes in the City of St. Vital. I'd like to point out that the whole of the proposed freeway from the time it leaves the Trans-Canada Highway until it hits the business section of Osborne Street goes through a residential area, and I wonder -- referring back to this newspaper clipping -- if they are also proposing speed limits of 40 to 50 miles an hour for this area. In order to provide right-of-way, underpasses, overpasses, etcetera, which Mr. McDonald thought necessary in connection with Thompson Drive site, choice residential property in the City of St. Vital and also, I understand, in the City of Winnipeg, has to be expropriated and demolished. I would also like to point out that there is no consideration of a buffer zone in St. Vital to keep noise away from housing developments, and not to keep noise away from proposed housing developments, but from housing developments that have been there and that have been there for many years. I would also point out again in reference to this article where he says, "Major traffic flows to avoid the Birchwood Heights School area and a nearby supermarket" and would point out that major traffic flows in the area where Metro's proposed bridge is to be, will in fact, avoid nothing because it will pass through three residential areas, will pass by three schools, a library, the YMCA, the Memorial Park and will also result in the closing of the Winnipeg Canoe Club.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that there is really no need for controversy that has gone on over these past few months. All Metro had to do, and it appears now that the province is going to have to do this, was to prove to the people concerned, beyond any shade of doubt that the recommended site is the proper site from the point of view of first of all, cost, design and effect on the immediate area and utility and future use of this bridge and also to take into consideration the general upgrading of the area concerned. If this were done I'm sure that there would be no argument; but until this is done, and good reasons given for the abandonment of the alternate site, a large body of people are not prepared to accept this as being in the best long-term interests of the City of St. Vital and the people that will be served by this proposed river crossing.

I also wonder, Mr. Chairman, in my considerations of this subject, why it is that not only in connection with the proposed St. Vital bridge but in Metro's whole plan of street and river crossing development in the area, that they have, in the course of a few months, been able to devise plans and to almost completely ignore a very thorough report on traffic that was prepared for the City of Winnipeg by Wilbur Smith and Associates some years ago. In this they have a summary in addition to the big report and I'd just like to read very briefly a few of these things.

(Mr. Groves cont'd) First of all, on page 1 -- and they're dealing now with traffic improvement in the Greater Winnipeg area -- the Wilbur Smith report says, "Comprehensive traffic and highway planning requires consideration of future population, land use, vehicle use and the relationship between these and present traffic patterns." Metro apparently have not been following this rule, particularly as it applies to future population and land use insofar as the St. Vital bridge and freeway are concerned. On page 2 of this same report, and again I quote, "In the suburbs daily flow variations are dependent upon character of route, with recreational facilities handling high weekend traffic and industrial facilities light traffic on Saturdays and Sundays. May and November represent average traffic months in Winnipeg." Metro admits in its submission to the interested people that it has not taken into consideration weekend traffic in determining the proposed site of the St. Vital bridge. Again on page 10 of this same report, Wilbur Smith and Associates say this, "With regard to some facilities, such as major bridges, it is desirable to extend the planning period beyond 1981 and it has been suggested that the year 2000 would be a more appropriate goal." Metro admits again, in one of their briefs, that they have not gone too far into the future in their studies. Again on page 11, "Arterial streets and highways -- Portage Avenue, Main Street, Pembina Highway, Henderson Highway, Kelvin, Notre Dame, St. Mary's and St. Anne's Roads, Osborne Street, McPhillips and several other key arteries are of major importance in future traffic planning. These streets will continue to carry substantial traffic volume notwithstanding the existence of the expressway system. It will be necessary to improve capacities on nearly all these streets, through pavement widening and traffic regulation if they are to function properly under 1981 traffic." I would remind you that St. Mary's and St. Anne's Roads are mentioned in this list of streets. These streets are arterial highways and they are being almost completely ignored in Metro's present plan and they propose rather to bypass these existing arterial highways and pass their freeway through a residential district and past schools, YMCA's, libraries, etcetera.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that everybody in the City of St. Vital recognizes that there must be a bridge -- there must be a river crossing to connect St. Vital with Greater Winnipeg -- and I honestly believe that everybody in the City of St. Vital believes that we must have this bridge soon. One group wants it right away because they are afraid that if they don't grasp it now that they will not get one at all or that more time will be spent on investigation. The other group -- and I sympathize with this group because they have had a serious traffic problem to contend with for some years -- nevertheless there is another group that wants to be satisfied that Metro has made the best selection of sites possible; that the provision of the information which they request surely cannot delay the project too long because the province has, I believe, most of the traffic information and certainly the engineering know-how to be able to decide in the shortest possible time whether Metro has proposed the best method of solving our municipal traffic problems or not, particularly as it applies to the future development of the City of St. Vital; and whatever delay there might be in getting this information surely is insignificant when compared to the length of time that we have waited for this bridge. The province must, and will, satisfy itself that provincial money is being spent wisely and in the best long-term interests of the area or areas to be served. We have been assured that this will be done and that there will be no undue delay; this bridge will be built and those who are anxious for a bridge are going to get one and those who want proof of the wisdom of the selection of the site will also be satisfied. So I say, Mr. Chairman, that although I sympathize with the group that are pressing for the immediate construction of this bridge on the site proposed, that I must also be sympathetic towards those who want their public representatives, firstly in Metro and secondly in the provincial government, to be satisfied beyond any shadow of a doubt that the -- particularly the site and also the design and utility of this bridge is going to be in the best interests of all of the residents of this area.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I fail to see the logic of the last speaker. I think that this speech of his would have been much better prepared as a brief for Metro. If I remember right, this was the honourable member that spoke first of all about Metro a few years ago on his famous Throne Speech where he told us so much about the happening in the Conservative caucus, and since that time some members -- in fact his Leader -- has abandoned Metro. But at least he's left it alone, where this Honourable Member from St. Vital has accused Metro every chance he's had. He was all for Metro, he told us how wonderful it

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) would be and he hasn't stopped speaking on Metro. He's telling us that there's two groups and he sympathizes with both but he wants Metro to make up their mind. Now he also tells us that the province must make a decision on that and help financially. But where is that leadership coming from? No, Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's fair to come here and try to knock Metro because Metro is not very popular. I was one that fought as much as I could and as far as I could go on this Metro and I think that now that it was accepted -- and it's still not popular -- but I think that if we're going to give it a chance to work we should at least, if we're not going to assist it like the Premier of this province, at least leave it alone. I think it would be a little better to try that for a change -- give it a chance to get its feet wet. If he has a good recommendation to give us, or to give Metro, let him come ahead and say so, and not say "Well I'm for this group and I'm for this group too. Let Metro decide. What the heck's the matter with Metro?" This is exactly what he's been telling us for the last half hour.

It is also fine for the Honourable Minister of Public Works to get up indignant -- or I should say to pretend that he's indignant, because that's all it was -- just a big act -- because he knows that he's not so much on solid ground. He's a little touchy when they talk about pork barrel; I think that he knows a little bit about that, even before he was the Minister of Public Works.

Now I see my honourable friend the Minister of Health is back from his pilgrimage from Arborg, or I think he might have been maybe changing the storm windows in his constituency or something to that effect. It's very nice. I admire him for getting up and standing and fighting for his constituency but I think that he should realize there are 57 constituencies in this province and if it's good for him it's good for us also to fight for this constituency.

MR. JOHNSON: That was the point of my speech.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's the point of your speech -- well, I'm very glad that this was mentioned because he got up and was telling us that we should not make any accusation and all he did is accuse -- he was proven wrong twice in five minutes -- but all he did was accuse the former government for work that was abandoned. He mentioned that two or three times. Now it's fine to say this and lecture others when we've got everything we want, but as I say there are others here that are doing exactly the same thing as you did -- exactly the same thing as the Honourable Member from Cypress when the Minister said "more power to her." That's all they're trying to do.

Now the Minister of Health told us that he doesn't believe in traffic counts. --(Interjection) -- I beg your pardon. Well, we'll read Hansard tomorrow and we'll see if you didn't mention that.

MR. JOHNSON: If you'd take time to read or listen you'd know better.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right, well we'll read tomorrow. I can't read now. I can't read now because it's not here yet but we'll see tomorrow if you didn't mention that you were not too much in favour of traffic count; that the new road would be pioneer and it would be a development and so on that people would use the road if it was there. Pretty well like the bridge that my honourable friend here from Portage has mentioned I guess -- that eventually they'll use it once they know where it is.

In the meantime, I think that it is clear what's been happening -- let's be honest, all right; but not only from one side of the House -- I think it's clear what's happened here this afternoon. The Minister told us "fight for your constituency." He's right, and God bless you if you get anything for your constituency, that's fine. The Minister of Health got up and told us that he'll keep on fighting for his constituency also. That's fine; but remember that there are 57 constituencies and if we're all, if we're sincere we cannot always get the same answer, well we're not up to that one. We talk about the Leader of the Social Credit, well this is coming, maybe in twenty years from now, but take your time, take your time. All right this is what's being said quite often, and then when you answer, when the Honourable Minister answers the member from Ethelbert Plains, "well it's no use answering you because you'll always come back to the same thing." In other words, don't fight for your constituency because you're on the wrong side of the House. This is what he's saying in effect.

Now if I'm wrong, and if the Minister is sincere and if the government is sincere, what is the matter? And don't forget Mr. Chairman, that this group has always asked us for constructive criticism and that's all we can give here. We can't force their way; they don't commend

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) anything, we're always second best because we haven't got the knowledge in this House, in any other investigating committee, anything. Now if these people -- I didn't understand the remark from the if he has a remark I'll sit down and then I'll get up again, but I'd like to hear. He told me I wasn't listening. So I'd like to listen to what he's saying then I won't have to wait till tomorrow until I read it.

In the meantime if the Minister is sincere I would say this, Mr. Chairman, what is wrong with what this group has proposed of taking this business of highways -- I don't think that he should blame -- it's only natural that you'll always try to get something for your own. It's only natural and it doesn't matter what some criticism he might have it coming, and I'm saying that all of us are sincere when we criticize, but we're always looking at our own constituency, that is admitted. And that is why this group, the Liberal Party is advocating the establishment of a commission to take this road business away from politicians out of politics. Now, I would like the Honourable Minister to tell us something about that, to tell us why this is not good constructive criticism -- it's not criticism, it's a suggestion -- why this is not constructive suggestion; what would be wrong with this? I can see that he's getting help from the Leader of this House, that's fine, that's what I'd like to see, because this is very important. -- and the Minister of Education too, that's fine, they'll all have a chance to stand up. I hope they do. Not all together though. I hope they give us an answer to this. What is wrong in taking this out of politics? We've had the best example today. We're talking about Metro for half an hour, somebody that's been building Metro then knocking it, trying to force all the troubles of Manitoba on Metro, and then we're told if you get something, if a member gets something, God bless him, or bless her. Well it's no use answering you, because you'll come back again and ask me for the same thing; and you, well twenty years from now it'll be your turn, we'll come to you.

Now, I would like the Minister to tell me is he considering this? It'll take a while to maybe name a commission. Mind you, this government has not been afraid or shying away from naming a commission, we know that, and this is one that we feel would help. It would take this thing, because if there's any way where you can pay off election promises or anything like that -- I'm not saying the Minister, I mean anybody, any government, this is the department -- and I think that he would welcome, I think that he would welcome -- (interjection) -- it's spring again; the chipmunk is out I guess. In the meantime, I would like the Minister to -- (interjection) -- he shook the flu bug I guess. Well it's interesting to see it'll make a more lively session. It's a fine thing to get worried about which -- behind which fellow he's going to hide; this is always interesting. In the meantime my question was not directed to him, it was to the Minister of Public Works and I'd like to get some answer on this because I think it's something valid; I think it's a very constructive suggestion.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, I was interested some time ago after the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains had spoken that the Honourable Member for St. John's was quite pained at the mirth with which his remarks were met over on this side. Of course, when he has heard that speech as often as we have, and knows how little substance there is in it, he'll understand why we laugh, and will continue to laugh in future years. But the Honourable Member for St. John's advanced an interesting principle, somewhat like this, that once you are elected, you should not under any circumstances undertake to advance the causes of your constituency or your people. Now, of course that would be a rather interesting theory, but I would like to suggest to the members of the committee that it is indeed the responsibility of each one of us, aside from our responsibilities as members of the Legislature of Manitoba, and indeed that is a responsible position, but we do have a responsibility to our respective constituencies, to advance those matters which we consider to be in the interests of our constituency and of our people, and we have to take our chance on having them accepted in the total picture for the province. But, Mr. Chairman, if I may say, the honourable member doesn't believe that theory because he himself advances in this House and in this committee things which he wishes for his constituency. I recall quite clearly, that in the Throne Speech debate, he spoke about the constituency of St. John's, and said what was necessary for, as he termed it, his constituents. He asked that we have a new system of supporting education that would receive his constituents, who he explained were unable to pay the local taxes associated with education. Now I'm not criticizing him for that; I'm merely saying that he would be unable to accept the principle that he was advancing

(Mr. McLean cont'd) to us for our consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a word about the speech of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, and the subsequent comments of the Honourable the Member, the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Chairman, I've been living in Manitoba for some years, I happen to live between the two constituencies represented now for some time, by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains and the Honourable the Member for Ste. Rose, and I would think, Mr. Chairman, that if there are any two members in this Legislature that should not venture upon that subject it must surely be them. --(Interjection) -- I wonder if the member for Ethelbert Plains has forgotten about the road program in the Duck Mountain. He's the best worker of the Public Works program that I ever heard of or saw. And the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, he's got roads, not highways, provincial roads starting nowhere and ending up nowhere and serving very few people -- and I don't make any criticism, if they were successful in being able to bring that about, that is I presume, what they consider to be in the interests of their constituency. But surely, surely Mr. Chairman, they must be the last people the very last people to bring this subject up in this House. May I remind them, may I remind them, that since this government has been in office, there has been some very substantial road work done in their respective constituencies. The Honourable the Member for Ste. Rose, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, representing the provincial constituency of Ste. Rose, must surely acknowledge that a very fine access road in McCreary, which is in his constituency, was constructed and built by the present administration. That an access road two miles long and streets were constructed by this administration in the Village of Laurier, which is in his constituency, and that the same thing was done in the Village of Ste. Rose du Lac -- all under this administration. Not to mention, Mr. Chairman, the work that was done on number 5 provincial trunk highway running through his constituency and the work of course that was done on the same highway running through the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains. Indeed if you want to travel over that highway, at the point west of Dauphin, where the road ceases to be rough and gets to be pretty good that point, Mr. Chairman, is the beginning of the Ethelbert Plains provincial constituency, and that I would be glad to suggest to the members might drive through our fair town of Dauphin in order to observe that interesting situation. This is all nonsense, Mr. Chairman, as these members to whom I have made reference well know, and they have been -- their constituencies have been well looked after by this administration; and indeed were well looked after previous to the present administration, and I think that all this talk might well come to a very graceful end.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I was just absolutely intrigued by a couple of statements made by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. He got up and complained because their group was second best in the House. Well it is. It's second best in Manitoba, and he'd better get used to the fact that they're second best. If they were first best in Manitoba, they'd be sitting over here.

MR. DESJARDINS: I thought there was no such thing as a second class citizen, Mr. Chairman. I'm very glad to hear that.

MR. HUTTON: You're not a second class citizen, but you're second choice to the people of Manitoba, and when you start dictating the way things are going to be done in Manitoba, first you get elected over here, and the people of Manitoba make it plain that you are their first choice as a group. --(Interjection)-- You've never gotten over the fact that the people of Manitoba decided that you were their second choice. --(Interjection) -- It's a big jump, it's a big jump. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I have a little bit to say. And the second thing that intrigued me was this talk about a commission. Now of all the people to advocate a commission, an independent commission, this group is the last group that should open their mouths on that subject after their performance the last week or so here in this Legislature. --(Interjection)-- Well if they really believe what they're saying certainly their performance would have been something else than what it has been in the past couple of weeks. We've seen what they think of commissions. If they think that they're going to make anybody in Manitoba believe that you're going to do away with arguments and clashes if you set up a commission, why they're only kidding themselves, because they don't have any more respect for a commission than they have for the rest of us -- not if it's to their political advantage to ignore the independent structure of a commission. We've heard a lot of talk here about needing ombudsman. The only time we're

(Mr. Hutton cont'd) ever going to need an ombudsman, or need commissions, is to give them complete independence the day when a Liberal Party gets into power in Manitoba.

They talk about building roads on a scientific basis, but they refuse to accept the evidence put forward by a commission which tried to prove that the decision that they made was made on a sound basis, on the basis of information at it's disposal at the time when it had to make a decision. They're not interested, they're not interested in facts, they're not interested in a scientific approach -- the only thing they're interested in is "rag-picking" -- "rag-picking"-- (Interjection) -- I know a lot of good Liberals in Manitoba and it must be their shame today to be represented by a party that is satisfied to indulge themselves in the activities of "guttersnipes". And if this is what they are saying . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege. I don't like that kind of a name applied to the Liberal Party, and I'd like a retraction to that. Mr. Chairman, is it in the rules to call names like that? --(Interjection) -- I ask for a ruling. Is that name in order?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I say, Mr. Chairman, coming from a guttersnipe, it's in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carry on.

MR. HUTTON: That's just about all I had to say. I was talking about the activities of the Liberal Party, and not any individuals.

MR. CAMPBELL: You've been asked for a ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wouldn't say it was out of order.

MR. HUTTON: I was not referring to any individuals -- I want to make that clear. --(Interjection) --

MR. MOLGAT: I think, Mr. Chairman, though in view of your ruling that the member must retract his statement. --(Interjection) --

MR. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it is correct to say that you must withdraw any characterization that is directed to a Party. It is not permissible -- (interjections)-- I wonder if my honourable friend will kindly -- (Interjection) -- I have the floor. If the honourable gentleman will sit down, I'll finish my speech.

MR. MOLGAT: But the Chairman has ruled. There is no debate.

MR. EVANS: I am debating the ruling on this point. --(Interjection) --

MR. HRYHORCZUK: The Chairman's decision cannot be debated. I think that the Honourable House Leader knows this rule. Why break it himself.

MR. EVANS: I simply make the observation that my honourable friend did not direct his question to an individual. He directed it to a party.

A MEMBER: Order, order.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my statement, but I would like to draw to the attention, speaking on the same vein, I would like to draw the attention of this committee to the fact that we have a double standard in Manitoba today. It is a -- most of us thought that the principle of the double standard died with Victorian concepts. Of course about the only Victorian carry-over that we have in Manitoba -- the only vestiges that are still apparent is the Liberal Party in this province, and I draw to your attention the fact -- speaking about the double standards, that it appears to be quite in order at any time for a member of the Liberal Party to stand up in this House or anywhere in Manitoba, to indulge itself in character assassination of individuals, attack the integrity of individuals and the party, but it is completely unfair and unparliamentary for anybody else to get up and suggest that there is anything wrong in the tactics that the Liberal Party has been indulging in for some time. And it could be well documented -- the charges that I am making now can be well documented, because we have seen scandal, scandal, scandal, in respect to the civil service, in respect to the road program in Manitoba, in respect to the operations of one of the Crown corporations, and there is nothing left that is sacred in Manitoba, not even the private affairs of innocent third parties.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I think it is one rule of the House that we discuss the subject under consideration, and this is highways. I think that the Honourable Minister has forgotten that we're in estimates in the Department of Highways.

MR. HUTTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, how is it that we hear this charge of "pork barrel" then on the subject of highways?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: The answer to that is that that's where the "pork barrel" exists.

MR. HUTTON: The double standard, Mr. Chairman, --(interjection) -- It is fine for the

(Mr. Hutton cont'd) members of the Liberal Party in this House to say anything they like but it is entirely unparliamentary and out of place for anyone else to retaliate.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister is wrong. I'm only asking that he stay with the subject matter, that's all.

MR. HUTTON: I'm staying with the subject matter, and we're discussing public works and the charge has been that the government is not doing the right thing in building roads in Manitoba -- that they are building them -- showing favoritism, that is what the talk has been, and that we're not building them where they should be built. This is the charge -- (interjection) -- and I come back and I say on this proposition that your party has made in this House that we should have a commission, that as long as the Liberal Party in Manitoba insists in engaging in its present tactics of trying to serve their own interests instead of those of the people of Manitoba, it wouldn't matter what you did, it wouldn't remove this type of useless wrangling that we find ourselves consuming the peoples' time and the peoples' money. --(Interjection) -- I am talking on this idea of a commission, and how the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has the gall and the face to lead his party in the kind of ridiculous and costly waste of time in this probe that they have been making the last few weeks, and their attitude, and their attitude, and their attitude

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order -- (interjection) -- on a point of order, if the Honourable Minister's going to insist on discussing everything under the sun under these estimates, we can expect the same treatment, and if you let this get out of hand, Mr. Chairman, we'll be here until the 12th of July.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would say we should establish a point of order. There's been a lot of latitude in the general discussion here, and I can't see anything out of order in what the Minister, the was saying just now.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, let's make this clear. It is in order to discuss the probe of the Grand Rapids contract here. --(Interjection)-- If it is, that's fine, Mr. Chairman, I'm quite prepared to discuss it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it isn't that's not talking about commissions generally, but

MR. MOLGAT: No, no, but this is what he's talking about, and I'm quite prepared to discuss it. I have no objections to that at all, just so long as both parties have the same right. Now, this is all I want established.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm glad -- just a moment, please. That's absolutely right, that there must be nothing which is a direct suggestion to a commission which is sitting at the present time, but the question, I suppose, of commission coming into it was when the suggestion was made that we have a commission -- (interjection) -- but not to deal with to make any suggestion that something may be wrong in the carrying out of a commission's work, and so forth, when we have at the present time a commission sitting on the question.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege as a member of this committee and not as the leader of my group, may I respectfully suggest to all concerned that we get back to the question dealing with the estimates of the Department of Public Works. Now, I would say on this point of privilege that I think as a member of this committee, my time is valuable; I am trying to consider the estimates of the Honourable Minister of Public Works; I would say both the Minister of Agriculture has gone astray from the consideration of the department as has other members on this side of the House; and I respectfully ask you, Mr. Chairman, and members of this House to get back to the job that I think we should be doing in the interests of the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba, namely, considering the estimates of the Government of Manitoba in respect of road building and other allied factors.

MR. CHAIRMAN: we've had a very wide discussion, and sometimes it has seemed as though it hasn't been directly on certain items, but we are dealing with, not with any subdivision here, but highways generally, and I was willing to let that go, and the member for St. Boniface talked about perhaps we should have a commission. I couldn't see anything wrong with that. But I do think that we must -- we've spent altogether too much time on the estimates. We've been, I think all sides will agree, that we've been generous and perhaps too generous in allowing discussion and argument. We're getting pretty well now into 90 hours, and we've got a long way to travel and I will take the stand that we should now, this having coming to a

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd) head just now -- let us all realize that we will keep close to it and try to conserve everybody's time, because everybody's time is valuable.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to prolong this debate, but the statement has been made that if you set up a commission, you're going to take this matter of the location and so forth of the priority of roads out of the field of politics, and I don't think that there's a smitch of evidence, Mr. Chairman, that will be brought to bear to prove this point. On the contrary, I think that a pretty good case could be documented to prove that this is no safeguard at all.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if the Honourable Minister of Public Works is also of the same opinion. This is all we can ask. We brought in what we feel is constructive suggestions, very sincerely -- the Minister of Agriculture doesn't believe in that -- that's his privilege. But I ask that question from the Minister of Public Works if the -- maybe we should explain here, that once a commission is named, it doesn't mean that the people elected in this House are absolved of any more responsibility. That's not true. The people in opposition are in there to see that everything is done right, and if they think that something is wrong it's up to them to bring it up the way this was done, the way it should be done in any commission. Considering all that, we might say in reply, or I might say in reply to what has been said by the last speaker, that definitely, even if there's a commission named that doesn't mean we will just wash our hands and never worry and never try and see what is done by this commission. That's not true. The commission will come under a certain department -- this department -- things will be discussed, but I don't have to elaborate on this, I think that it is a known fact that if you have a commission, you'll have way less danger of playing politics with this. Mind you it's always possible by one party or the other -- they accuse somebody of doing that -- in the Wheat Board in the Federal Government -- but we're not supposed to talk about this today. I just wanted to give you an idea there is a possibility of bringing politics into this, that's true.

And as long as I'm on my feet, the last speaker also said that we're second best. That gives me the idea -- well this is not what I had said, I said second best as far as number, and I didn't think we were less valuable or we have less right of being here, because we were here to keep the government straight. This is the system of democracy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Get right down to the estimates

MR. DESJARDINS: Well the estimate is -- we've been --(Interjection) -- All right we'll get back, that's fine, we'll get back to the estimates, but I still would like to have a reply from the Minister first of all, the other speakers are welcome, they can say what they want, but I'm interested in finding out what the policy of the government is on that. If he believes in this suggestion that we had given, which we feel is a good one, and we certainly think that it definitely would take some politics away from this. I think it's important enough and I think that -- we think it's important enough on this side of the House -- I would like the Minister, and I think I'm entitled to this, to know what he thinks about this. Either he's against it, he's for it, or he'll think it over. I want to know why and I think the people of Manitoba are entitled to know this. We still have a few of us if we're not the first choice.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct the Honourable Minister of Education and I'm going to be very brief. He stated that insofar as the member for Ethelbert Plains is concerned he has been well treated because there are quite a number of roads in the Duck Mountains. For his information, may I point out to him and the other members of this committee, that the Duck Mountains are not in my constituency, that the Duck Mountains are surrounded by three constituencies, the Ethelbert Plains constituency, the Roblin constituency, and the Swan River constituency and the roads that are built in that mountain are not built for the use of the residents in the Mountain, because there are none. They are built for the use of the people of the Province of Manitoba and they're making excellent use of them, and if that is all that the Honourable Minister of Education can say about the Ethelbert Plains constituency obtaining it's share of the roads, then I say that isn't much.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I think a backbencher needs to be reminded that he is a backbencher and I've been reminded for the last ten or fifteen minutes that I am. I feel like a jack-in-the-box, but I don't intend to talk about that, I want to talk about the plans that the department has for building roads in those places where they are most needed, and the thought that a commission might settle the problem. Mr. Chairman, I don't conceive that a commission

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd) which would be appointed by a government -- and I don't care which government it is -- would be anything but a commission appointed of politicians representatives, and I can't conceive but that the same problems would be discussed whether it were a commission or otherwise. The responsibility of the people who are elected to this House is to carry out the work to be done in this province, and if it is not a public utility which involves income, which involves rating, then I believe it belongs in this House and should remain in the hands of the government. Of course I'm not sure that we approach this the same way and having listened to the two parties for some period of time accusing each other and levelling various charges I wonder if it's unparliamentary for me to say a plague on both your parties -- because if it is I won't say it, of course.

I do feel though Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable the Minister of Education who for a moment I thought was like Pontius Pilate who wouldn't wait for that answer, and I'm glad he did come back so that he could hear my answer to his approach to the way I look at my responsibilities. I'm pleased at the fact that he knew that I had made an address to the Speech from the Throne, wherein I referred to my constituency -- and I must tell the Honourable the Minister of Education that one of my regrets in life was that I never did become a teacher because I thought that was an avocation I would have enjoyed, that I realize now that I don't have the ability to get across what I want to say as well as a teacher might, and possibly under the existing Minister of Education my progress would not be too good in his field. I would like to remind the Honourable Minister that when I spoke of the responsibilities that I felt to my constituency I did that in describing my constituency just as other members have done, and in doing so I pointed out certain things that are common not to my constituency alone but rather to many areas in this city and in this province, and I think I dealt specifically with slums. I don't think that I did then, or did at any subsequent, I hope I never will, ask for something for my constituency which would be preferential in any way to that of any other constituency. When I pointed out to the Honourable Minister that the method used by this province in financing education was wrong and needed a change, and that my constituents needed tax relief as compared to that of any others. I'm sorry he didn't understand me that way, and I'm sorry that he jumped to the conclusion that I was appealing for special relief for my constituents in tax relief. I'm sure I didn't say anything like that, but apparently he understood me to speak in that respect.

I feel, and I say it again, that the job that we are given, entrusted, by our constituents is to try to bring good government to this province, and I cannot conceive of any member of this House who knows so much about the road construction problem in the province as to be able to assess the needs of road construction in his constituency as against the needs elsewhere, and I would point out to the Honourable the Minister of Education and any other member who feels strongly on this point, that I feel that it is wrong for a constituent to get up -- for a public representative, a member of this Legislature, to get up and say, I need a road in my constituency because it's bogged down or it has potholes or anything like that. I feel that the proper way to approach this problem is not through a commission, but rather through the municipal representatives who I believe have a ready access to this government and to whom the door has never been closed. I feel it is those people who can properly present their claims because they're right on the spot and they have their advisors and they have their engineers and they are the ones who can assess the costs and the ability to pay within their municipality. Along with that I hear the pride expressed in the members of the department, in the staff of the Department of Highways, of Public Works, as to their ability to judge, and I for one hope that I will never set myself as expert over them in deciding which roads need proper maintenance. I don't think it is something that the government has to take particular pride in to point at a map and say, look we've covered the entire area. I think we have to be shown that the work is being done where it is needed, and that is why I asked the Honourable Minister of Public Works, for some statistics on origin and destination studies, some statistics on traffic counts in the north perimeter intersection that I was speaking of, west of the river, and that's why I heard other members ask for traffic counts. I think those are the kind of things we have to be shown, and I think that is the kind of justification we should hear and not satisfaction by any one member as to the work that was done or attacks on any one member because more work was done on his constituency than that of another. I hope that I can still

(Mr. Cherniack cont'd)..... measure up to being a teacher in my late age and that I will be able to get across my ideas better to the Minister of Education than I have done in the past.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to appear to be lecturing the committee in any way about the way it's carrying on its business -- and I'm not attempting to apportion any responsibility in respect of the matter that concerns me -- but I do express the opinion that right from the first day or two that the committee sat, we have really been violating what is a rather important rule of the Committee of Supply, which I now read 62(2): "Speeches in Committee of the Whole House," and this refers to Committees of Supply as well, "must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration." Now I know that in discussing an item or clause under consideration that we do allow reasonable latitude to bring in matters which members think important and relevant to the item, but it has been apparent, to me at least, for the last week or so, that we are abusing that rule, and you Mr. Chairman, have been rather lenient, I think, in allowing us to do so. I'm conscious too, that what is really required is not a ruling from the chair, but a reasonable degree of self restraint and caution on the part of all members. Now I make the plea that in considering the rest of our business in the Committee of Supply that we do our best to stick to the rule of relevancy to the item under discussion. Let's forget about all the little arguments we've been having in the past that's got several of us a little excited about our comments in here, and let us try to stick to the principle of relevancy on the items under consideration.

I have heard this particular request made before by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and he was perhaps a little more persuasive than I have been often on this particular point, but I would suggest to the members that it just makes sense to cut out the cackle; it makes sense to stick to the point. We've all had a chance to spread our wings a little on various points that have concerned us, but let's stick to the point and get on with the business of the House. We have passed the 65 hour point quite some time ago -- 90 hours now, I hear. I myself don't care to sit after 11; it's a thing that I regret even suggesting to the committee and all that I think we should ask for is reasonable adherence to the rule of relevancy so that we can get our business done within a reasonable time. Now I don't know whether this little remark of mine will provoke a flood of counter-suggestions by other members of the House. I hope it will not. I hope that we'll simply agree to agree on this occasion and stick to the point under discussion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I agree with the statements made by the First Minister. I think that the discussion this afternoon has certainly been very interesting but we didn't make possibly too much progress in discussing the items under the estimates. I agree with the suggestion; I think that possibly during the supper hour there will be time for the ruffled feelings that were developed during the course of the afternoon to cool off and this evening we can get to the work at hand.

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