

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock Monday, April 13, 1970.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We are now dealing with a brand new department, the Department of Transportation. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a most memorable night, not because I am going to bring in my estimates, which are important, but because a certain nice fellow got what he deserved to-night. I know this is improper, but I am very happy to announce that the latest results show that Doug. Rowland for the NDP is going to be the winner in the by-election -- (Interjection) -- Well, it looks like four deposits are going to be lost and the figures will come in in a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was sitting around for the last three or four days on pins and needles thinking I'd never get down to my estimates, and this is you know -- I still consider myself, although I said this the last time, a rookie minister. The fact is this is my first budget, genuine home-made budget of our own. The last time we had something that was left over to us, so I'm kind of proud of it for several reasons, and one of them is that I think I can say fairly and honestly that most of the items in the program which will be distributed in a few minutes are items that I've checked out myself, the roads and the bridges, overpasses, and other such items. If we can get the Page Boy to come down here we'll distribute the programs, and I hope everybody is as happy and cheerful after they've read their program as they are at the moment.

Well you can make a lot of speeches, and I searched Hansard over the last three years to see what the previous ministers say when they bring in their estimates, and last year when Mr. McLean brought it in, it really didn't give me much to go on so I went all the way back to one of the best ministers that the previous government ever had, which was Mr. Weir, the present Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BILTON: That's the kindest thing you've ever said about him.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well it's true, I like to give credit where credit is due.

--(Interjection)-- Well I don't blame him, I'd probably get drunk if my candidate lost that badly.

A MEMBER: How about the Member for Rhineland?

MR. BOROWSKI: Rhineland? Well I think we'll give him a couple of truckloads of gravel for sure. But I checked back into the speech that was made by the now Leader of the Opposition that he made in '67 bringing his estimates in, and I was kind of disappointed in what he had to say. It seems that when a Minister introduces his estimates he doesn't reveal too much, although later on as the debate progresses we find that's when the real meat of the estimates comes out, and I felt that -- I just have the latest figures for the elections. It's 11, 110 for NDP; 4, 550 for -- the Republicans? -- Liberals, I'm sorry, I didn't know they had Republicans in Manitoba; and Conservatives 3, 457.

When the Minister of Health introduced his estimates, Mr. Chairman, he was bragging I think that they had the best department and the largest department. Of course I'm not going to brag about the size, we're like Avis, we're not the biggest but we do try harder, and if you look at the green sheet that was distributed I think you'll agree that we probably do have the best department although it may not be the largest in size -- (Interjection) -- Yes, we've looked after your folks down there. Like the rest of the north they have been neglected for many years and I'm hoping to kind of balance the thing out this year. One of my main objectives is to take the last ten year average and kind of bring up the constituencies that have been badly neglected. I can understand the Member for Swan River, being a Speaker, nobody really paid much attention to him except when he brought down a ruling.

MR. BILTON. Enough of that now, enough of that.

MR. BOROWSKI: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, it's traditional for a Minister to say something about his staff when he introduces his estimates. Last year I made certain statements which were quite proper, and of course this year I've had an opportunity to assess the functioning of the department. We have taken on some new staff and a few people have left. I would like to say at this time that I would like to pay tribute and express my heartfelt appreciation to the key personnel, particularly those who helped me in the preparation of the budget, express my appreciation to them, and particularly to my technical assistant.

(MR. BOROWSKI Cont'd) . . . Mr. Filuk, who I think has saved the government and the taxpayers of Manitoba tens of thousands of dollars because, as you know, I know beans about building roads. He had been a contractor for 15 years and his experience has been very valuable to myself and to the department. And I'd also like to take the opportunity to thank my two sweet little gals out in the front office who have worked many hours overtime and on occasion have come in on Saturday at no cost to the government, and I think they deserve a vote of thanks from all of us.

I'd like to talk about one of the more important programs that we brought in since the last session that we're pretty proud of, and that has to do with the hiring of Indian and Metis people for road clearing jobs. I recall when I introduced the initial road contract there was some skepticism on the other side. I don't blame them for being skeptical; let's face it, the image of the Indian and Metis was that they are a bunch of useless, lazy, no-good drunks, and there may have been some reason for it since they were never given the opportunity to show what they can do. I think in the short period that they've been on the job that we can honestly say that they have shown clearly that they don't like to be on welfare, they're not lazy, they're not drunks and they do want to work. I'm happy to say that since last September we've expended about \$600,000 on road clearing jobs for the Indian and Metis, and although \$600,000 may not seem like a lot of money, the fact is that we have taken about 400 people off welfare, voluntarily off welfare and put them to work.

There's another way, I suppose if I wanted to brag, I could say it didn't cost us a penny, because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that these jobs would have been done by contractors. In other words, the money would have been spent in any event and it's possible under the tendering system that we could have paid a lot more. I've checked the record over the past three years of what the previous administration has paid for an acre of road clearing or Hydro right-of-way clearing and I think it's safe to say that the prices we have paid are slightly less, are slightly less than what has been paid in the past. So one might say we have taken 400 people off welfare and it didn't cost the taxpayers of Manitoba one penny.

We have had our problems, there's no question. Our policy and philosophy has been, and is, that we believe in treating the Indian and Metis as equals, and by saying this we thought we'd put it into practice and we gave them the contract and told them: You run your job; you hire and you fire and run the job as you please as long as it's done according to our standards, that is cutting, height of stumps, burning, etc. And there was problems, there's no question about it. The first few months we had difficulties because of rain, because of inexperience, because of a slowness in pay cheques coming, and because also the Indian and Metis who have lived on reserves for I suppose over a hundred years has never developed the work habits that we in our society have developed, and that is if the fishing season is on he'll work 15 hours a day, when the trapping season is on he may work for two months straight. --(Interjection--) Like farming, that's right, except that the farming has more money and more subsidies. I can safely say that because the Minister of Agriculture has finished his estimates so nobody can get up and make a speech --(Interjection)--Well he's a nice fellow I'm sure he's not going to do this.

But the problem has been to develop work habits. Now I've felt as a northerner that if you're going to take an Indian off the reserve and say you've got to punch the clock at eight o'clock and work and then take an hour off for lunch and then punch the clock at five it's just not going to work. I recall quite well when I left the farm at the age of fourteen and went to work in the industrial world, I had great difficulty getting up in the morning and punching a clock and being regimented, being given hell by the shift boss or foreman and told what to do, when to do it and how to do it. I found it very difficult and I am sure that anybody who was born and raised on a farm where there wasn't the regimentation that you have in our industrial society found it difficult to adapt.

So we adopted the position that we'll pay you so much an acre, now you run the job and you work whenever you want to work. The result was that the son of a gun worked longer hours and started earlier than I had expected, and as it ended up the first project was completed about a month ahead of time, a month ahead of our engineer's schedule, which made me very happy, and as a result of which we have given about six or seven further projects, I'm happy to say to this date we have about 200 men at the moment on the job working away ten, twelve and more hours a day, and some of them will even go on Sunday. I've tried to discourage Sunday work, but at the same time we've taken the position you run the job yourselves

(MR. BOROWSKI Cont'd) . . . and if they want to work Sunday that's fine.

So we're kind of proud of the fact that the Indians and Metis are proving for the first time that they don't want welfare, they want jobs, and I think if we can encourage this across the board -- at CFI for example, it is our hope that when they finish these projects we can pull them off there and take them over to CFI and put them on contract cutting, so much per cord, because right now CFI as you know is bringing in the majority of their workers from outside the province and I think it's a shame. We put in all that money into a project and the jobs are being created not for Manitobans but for people from Ontario, Quebec, and in fact some people from outside of Canada. Hopefully, when the dust settles we will have possibly half of the workers in the bush at any rate of Indian and Metis extraction.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, we have instituted a program where we have taken men off the reserve and are training them as surveyors. We have eight lads out of Nelson House which we have had working on survey crews during the winter, and we had given them the proposition at that time that after six months is over, if you work out we will put you on permanent staff, and I think in another two months time from now these boys will be going on permanent staff.

I think I should say a few things about what we're doing elsewhere in Manitoba. I hate to keep talking about the north, but --(Interjection)--Well, you know in our party we're always saying we'd rather do things than talk about them, and if I keep talking too much I may get some people turned off, they'll figure that, you know, I'm the Minister of the north. The fact is I'm concerned about the south; I'm concerned about Winnipeg, the Perimeter, the over-pass, the completion of the Perimeter . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: How about St. John's?

MR. BOROWSKI: St. John's? I never heard of the place. In the south here in Winnipeg, we're going to complete the Perimeter. This year we're giving the last contract out to pave the Perimeter with the exception of Perimeter 59 to Perimeter No. 1. There's a section that will probably cost \$15 million, and in view of the fact we already have No. 20 completed, we think it would be a waste of taxpayers' money. But outside of that northeast section, the Perimeter will be complete this year.

If you look at your chart, way down at the bottom, you'll find that we're going to start on some over-passes. I think I don't have to remind you that last summer we had some pretty heated debates and discussions here about the slaughter on the Perimeter and some suggestions from the Opposition how we could overcome this by . . . quite clearly at that time and we are now carrying out a program at the two worst intersections where according to our statistics the largest number of people were killed.

The Trans-Canada program ends this year. I think those of you who have been in the House previously know that the Federal Government put in about \$22 million into Manitoba to be spent on the up-grading of the Trans-Canada Highway. This is the last year; the end of October it expires, and if we don't use the money we forfeit it back to Ottawa. Because we felt we wanted to take advantage of every Federal dollar we can lay our hands on, we have given out three contracts, the last one of which I believe was just announced today, the last contract which will take up every dollar that has been allocated by the Federal Government on the Trans-Canada program.

We are proceeding at an increased pace in the building of the Thompson-Lynn Lake Highway - I'm back to the north again - and I think I should say a few words about it because it's a highway that's going to cost \$12 million, which is our money, and I think everybody is concerned about whether the money is spent wisely or not. One of the reasons that we are escalating the pace is because Sherritt-Gordon found a large ore body in the Ruttan Lake which is very close to the Churchill River, South Indian Lake, which at one time we feared may be flooded. It's my hope that it won't be, in view of the recent recommendations by Underwood-Mac. But we have pushed the road as rapidly as possible because the company does need a road and they are at this moment hauling out about five truckloads of high-grade into Lynn Lake to test it, to find out what metallurgical process they can use for the separation of ore from rock. We are escalating the program of building the bridge across the Churchill River which is going to be the most expensive bridge, probably the most expensive bridge in Manitoba, and the longest single span. When it's completed, just about that time it is our hope that Sherritt-Gordon will be ready to proceed with the development, and it is my hope, of a new townsite right at Ruttan Lake, or possibly at the Churchill River and

April 13, 1970.

(MR. BOROWSKI Cont'd) . . . Leaf Rapid Junction. At the risk of sounding like we're bragging, I should mention here that for the first time in the history of Manitoba that I'm aware of, we convinced Sherritt-Gordon Company to pay 100 percent for the 14-mile road which leads into the property. We have felt for many years, as northerners, that a lot of this expenditure that's going on is really for the benefit of the company and we felt that the company should have some moral obligation, if not legal, to pay for part of these roads, and after having discussions with the Sherritt-Gordon Company between the Premier and some of the Ministers, they have agreed to pay 100 percent for the building of this road. Additionally, we are discussing, and I'm hopeful that something will come of this, that they will pay part of the cost of upgrading the entire Ruttan Lake to Lynn Lake Highway, and I don't have to tell you how much money it costs to build roads in that area.

We've also cut down the completion date between Grand Rapids and Ponton. I think the old schedule was for two years. We have cut it down by working all winter and by having Dave Courchene and the Indians and the Metis people cut out the bush this winter, and we think that we will have the highway opened in about 12 months from now. Now to those living in Winnipeg or elsewhere this may not seem very significant, but it's probably the only highway in Canada, if not in North America, where by building 100 miles of road you can cut off the distance by about 35 percent, which will mean first of all a saving of one tank of gas for people travelling from Winnipeg to visit their friends or relatives in Thompson, and the Thompsonites travelling to Winnipeg, or east, it will mean a saving of one tank of gas plus maybe four hours of travelling time, not to mention the wear and tear on the car.

In addition, the bus companies with whom I have been in close contact with have agreed that when the highway is opened they will cut the bus fare by the same amount; in other words by 30 or 35 percent, whatever the mileage is. The truck companies, there's two companies that haul freight up there, it'll cut freight costs to all businessmen and thereby to all residents, and also for gas companies and oil companies that haul bunker oil for furnaces, it'll cut the cost by that same amount. So I would say if anything in this budget, if I had nothing in the budget, this one item is going to mean a tremendous saving for the people in the north and for the shippers and manufacturers in the south, and I would say it probably would affect even the companies that are shipping out nickel and whatever other products they may have.

One other item that we're giving top priority to - and this is something that was instituted by the previous administration. They hired a consultant from Toronto to study the whole apparatus of the Transportation Department with the hope of saving five or ten percent in operation. My first inclination was when I looked at it that it's just probably one of those pay-offs to some political hacks down east and I was going to scrap it. After examining it closer, it looked like it had great potential so reluctantly I went along with the program, and we now have reached the stage, as of April 1st, where we're going to implement the first phase of it, and this program I am told by our key people will save us five to seven percent per year.

The other part that I like about it, it's going to take certain decisions out of my hands and out of the hands of the district engineers. We have heard complaints from the Member for Rhineland where his roads aren't graded often enough, and I think maybe it's a valid argument. It's very easy for a district engineer, for the Minister to say: look, there's a new Democrat MLA in that constituency, or Social Credit, cut the grading in half and let's save some money. By implementing this program we have designated five classes of highways and each class is going to have a different amount of drags or grades per year. No. 1 Highway, they will have probably 40 gradings a year; but if it's a No. 5 Highway, they'll have 15 draggings a year.

This is a program that has been distributed during this winter and each district engineer, superintendent or foreman will have it in front of him and it won't be left to his discretion, it certainly won't be left to my discretion, which I think is a good thing. He knows that every week on Tuesday he has to go out there and grade the road. Although this program is an excellent program, there will be some people that'll squawk, and I think the Member for Rhineland has already mentioned that he feels his constituency is not getting the service it used to. The fact is . . .

MR. MACKLING: He hasn't got enough drag.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, you know, he's not even recognized in the House and it's nobody's

(MR. BOROWSKI Cont'd) . . . fault. I think today's election results indicate that the people simply don't recognize the funny money party. However, that's not his fault. By doing this--well, you know I looked at the record, and as a reader of Hansard - I've read Hansard since '64, '65 and I've heard the Member for Rhineland say on many occasions, "nothing for Rhineland". But you know, and I hate to give credit to the previous administration, but when Walty Weir was Minister of Highways I think that he was pretty fair, and the Member for Rhineland, I would say, has got as good roads in his constituency as anywhere in Manitoba - outside of Minnedosa.

MR. USKIW: I didn't get the last remark.

MR. BOROWSKI: There's many other things in this Management Maintenance Program which are going to be I think well received by the people. For example, in the old system they used to put chemicals and dust suppressants. They would put it in one place and skip some other place. The system we have worked out now, it's worked out in advance, and it's not left to the discretion of the district engineer. Each town, say one mile on each side, will be chemically treated; all roads leading inside will be chemically treated so there'll be no dust. People located alongside the highway, wherever they may be, will have 500 feet of chemical treatment on each side of their house. Now this is something that's been talked about according to the people in my department for many years, but in actual fact it's a very difficult thing to do, because by doing this it meant you had to cut the service some place else. And there will be cuts in service --(Interjection)--

MR. USKIW: On a point of privilege, I would want to inform my honourable friend that during the last week of the last election I noticed quite a few highways were treated in such a way.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, if our friend from Selkirk, or is it Lac du Bonnet, says so, I'll take his word for it. I think I've made similar statements. As a matter of fact, we even had stakes put up on the Thompson Highway - and this has been done for several elections - and after the election the stakes are pulled out and put into the warehouse and left there till the next election. I can assure you this is not going to happen this time. One of the policy statements I've made to the staff is that we want everybody treated fairly. Now it's very difficult for me and for our Party, who have been in a political wilderness for more years than Moses, to come out once they come into office and say let's treat the other guys fairly when we know damn well they haven't treated us or the Liberals fairly, but we're going to do that. And we're going to get a lot of squawk. --(Interjection)-- Carrying out the tests - we've carried out tests, actual on-the-spot tests on the grading for example, and this is one of the values of having an occasional study.

You know, I've generally looked at studies and commissions and the like as a waste of money and an indication that the politicians didn't have the guts to do what they believed they should do, so they sloughed it off by hiring some consultants. But in this case I think it was a worthwhile exercise. They've graded a road, they've checked it daily, and a week later they've come back and checked it again and they found that grading it a second time didn't do it any good. After carrying out these tests for several months, we're convinced, at least the engineers in my department have convinced me of the value of this study and of this Management Maintenance Program, and as far as I'm concerned, I'm sold on it. We've implemented it as of April 1st, and from April 1st onward I will not be making decisions where graders go or where certain work is done. We have the study, the same charts in every district office, and every district engineer knows what he has to do. He doesn't have to ask me, he doesn't have to ask the Deputy or anyone else; he'll simply go ahead on the basis of that and if it goes as it's recommended, if we carry this program out as it's recommended, I think you will find something that has not been done in Canada before, and that is that we will give equal treatment and equal maintenance to all roads across Canada. They have all been classified - and that includes Lakeside.

One other innovation we're going to try and bring in, and I think we will probably get support - and I hope the Member for Lakeside doesn't run off because this affects him. Two weeks ago he asked if I would table the Road Program so the contractors could decide what they're going to do for the next year. At that time I said I can't do it because traditionally and historically we do not give out the program to anyone until it's tabled in the House, and I think it costs us money. My recommendation, and perhaps my plea to the opposition is that they allow, or they would recommend or agree with us that we can tender half of our

April 13, 1970.

(MR. BOROWSKI Cont'd) . . . program this fall and the other half next spring.

In other words, we would not have to wait until I get up in the Legislature here and bring down the program before we can start tendering. We found the value last fall. We tendered three contracts - four contracts last fall, and we did this because we had money in Capital Supply, raised authorized capital on which we drew, so we could do it without coming to the Legislature for approval for the expenditures and we found that there was a saving of about 15 to 20 percent.

Now this may seem hard to believe, that intelligent contractors - and we have some pretty big contractors with sharp pencils in Manitoba - would cut their prices by 15 percent. I've met with them and they say, well it's true, if you give us the contract in fall, if we know we've got the tender we could retain our key men; we can tell them that you're with us and we'll hire you on a certain date, or they could retain them for the winter. They can repair their equipment, they can purchase new equipment; in other words they can prepare for spring and when spring comes along they can go right in and start working. Now they say to us that's worth 10 or 15 percent, and I hope that when my estimates are over that the Opposition will agree that in order to save \$2 1/2 million - and this is our department estimates - we could save \$2 1/2 million a year by tendering half of the road work this fall for next year and the other half next spring. In view of the statements made by the Member for Lakeside, I get the feeling that the Opposition would look kindly to such a proposition, and I hope they do because it's going to mean a tremendous saving for us.

One of the other new policies we've implemented is to hire ladies for certain jobs. Now we're going to hire four ladies this week to man weigh scales. We're going to hire 20 girls for destination and origin studies which were started by the previous administration last year I believe for the first time, and they're very valuable for the Tourist Branch and very valuable to us and possibly even Industry and Commerce may find some value in it. The women have for many years agitated for equality - and I've said it before and I'll say it again - I don't believe they want equality, at least not the type of equality I have in mind.

However, if they want equality, we'll give them equality. We'll hire them on the same basis, treat them the same way, pay them the same rate, and if the program works out, it's our hope that in the various jobs that we have - I think we have as much as 2,300 employees in the department at the peak season during the summer - we will be able to have quite a few women employees on certain jobs like weigh scales for example and the studies I've mentioned, and possibly some other ones. Now that's going to be up to them. I think we'll simply open it up and if they want to apply for it we're not going to discriminate against them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there's a lot of things I'd like to say here but I'm told that it's not good to give everything, that it's best to give your program on an installment basis so the Opposition can't gather all their ammunition and blast you at once. So if it's all right with you, I'll leave it at this and give the Opposition a chance to digest what I've said. Thank you.

continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, may I be the first one to - although this is perhaps not strictly in order - to offer my congratulations to Doug Rowland for his victory today. I'm sure that Mr. Rowland will be a credit to the constituency of Selkirk and represent it in a way that will be a credit to those people who elected him.

I'm somewhat taken back by the mild manner of the Minister who normally storms into the House all wind and fury, and this very soft sell approach that he took here this evening I'm sure is a surprise to all of us. I was quite intrigued by his initial statement, that in presentation of his estimates he had to look back over previous Hansards to find out what previous ministers were saying. I found this rather interesting in the light of the item in the Speech from the Throne, that they were going to throw out all these old dogmas and traditions and ideas and come up with a new approach, and I find it rather amusing to see that the Minister has to look back over past years to get the words of wisdom from previous ministers in order to make his presentation.

However, although he said that, he didn't follow it. He didn't follow it at all. He spent a great deal of time talking about roads in the north, which is to be expected I presume from a Minister from that area. He took a great deal of credit on to himself for the hiring of Indians in road clearing projects, and I want to say that we give him credit for the continuation of that program which was originated and started by the previous administration, particularly in the forebay area of the Grand Rapids project. But I want to say quite sincerely that we commend him for his efforts on behalf of the native people of the northern part of the province in using them and utilizing their abilities on these particular projects.

I note from the estimates that there is a very modest increase in the departmental spending on transportation. One I think could have logically expected that in a department as important as transportation and the role that it plays in economic development, that there would have been a considerably greater increase in the estimates. I note also that about half that increase comes in administration rather than actual spending projects, so there are some severe limitations in the amount of money that is going to be spent in actual road projects.

Now in spite of the fact that the Department of Transportation is not the largest one in terms of the amount of money that is spent, I'm sure that most of us will agree that it is very important in terms of its economic impact on this province. I doubt very much if there's a subject in this province and indeed in Canada that has been subject to more inquiries, studies, briefs, complaints and Royal Commissions than the matter of transportation, and more particularly here in the Province of Manitoba, where it assumes not only important but critical proportions. The two latest of such reports on transportation were dealt with in the TED Commission Report and I know that the Minister, if he's read the chapter on transportation in the TED Commission Report he probably did it under a pillow so nobody could see him doing it because I know that his pathological hatred of anything that was done by the previous administration would prevent him from reading it in public, but I'm sure that he has read the Mauro Commission Report because it deals with an area of the province that he is vitally concerned with, and there are some interesting observations and some very critical observations contained in that report on matters relating to transportation.

MR. SCHREYER: It's a good report.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well the First Minister says it's a good report and surely he didn't expect that I was going to disagree with that observation. I haven't read it all, I must confess, but I have read a major part of it and the information contained therein and some of the recommendations contained therein are those that could well be observed by this government.

Now, Sir, because of the historical importance of transportation facilities, services and rates to the Manitoba economy, and because of the growing integration of all modes of transport, the Department of Transportation was established by a merger of the former Department of Highways and Department of Public Utilities. The philosophy underlying the formation of the department was the need for one central agency that would co-ordinate the provincial interest in transportation by all modes - rail, highway, air, water, and pipeline. The new department was going to undertake the necessary research and planning in the transport field and discharge the regulatory functions over the motor carrier industry and provide an agency for liaison with similar bodies at the federal level and in the other provinces and in the United States. This approach to co-ordination by one government department recognized the changes that were taking place in the various sectors of the transportation industry and was in accord

April 13, 1970.

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.) with the practice carried on in Ontario and by the Federal Government. Ontario had established a Department of Transportation and the Federal Parliament had established the Canadian Transport Commission, a central co-ordinating agency that replaced the separate agency of the Board of Transport Commissioners, the Air Transport Board and the Maritime Transport Commission. The National Transportation Act recognized the changing environment of transportation and defined national transportation policy as follows: "It is hereby declared that an economic, efficient and adequate transportation system, making the best use of all available modes of transportation at the lowest total cost, is essential to protect the interests of the users of transportation and to maintain the economic well-being of the growth of Canada." The Canadian Transport Commission was given broad powers to co-ordinate and harmonize all forms of transport. The Act provides as follows: "It is the duty of the Commission to perform the functions vested in the Commission by this Act, The Railway Act, The Aeronautics Act and The Transport Act, with the object of co-ordinating and harmonizing the operations of all carriers engaged in transport by railway, water, aircraft, extra provincial motor vehicle transport and commodity pipelines."

In piloting the legislation through the House of Commons, the Minister of Transport at that time, Mr. Pickersgill, who by virtue of his piloting that legislation through the House of Commons, inherited a very lucrative position, emphasized that "efficiency and economy will best be attained by establishing a single over-all regulatory agency which can consider the whole transportation system as a unit. Such an agency can ensure co-ordination and would be better able to combat unremunerative and undersirable services which constitute a burden to the Treasury."

Now the new Manitoba Department of Transportation was welcomed by the transportation industry. The report of the Mauro Royal Commission into Northern Transportation states at Page 48 and 49: "We emphasize the need for co-ordinating transport policies within the province. The recent establishment of the provincial Department of Transportation reflects the acceptance of the need for considering the over-all requirements, rather than a single model approach. Co-ordination of policies relative to rail, road, air and water are of particular importance in the north where capital costs are high and the fiscal penalty resulting from duplication correspondingly high."

However, the Department of Transportation in this province was to be stillborn. Shortly after the present government assumed power last July, the Premier in a series of interviews with the press and on the By-line program on radio, reduced the Department of Transportation into the old Department of Highways and attached the Highway Transport and the Motor Carrier Board to it. Air transport and the Port of Churchill were made the responsibility of the Minister of Industry and Commerce - which was the First Minister himself at that time, until December 18th last - and subsequently the responsibility for railways, including the abandonment of passenger service and railway branch lines was transferred to the Minister of Labour who was appointed a Railway Commissioner.

Now this appears to be the present situation. Instead of one co-ordinating department in effect, responsibility for transportation is divided amongst three Ministers and three departments. The Department of Transportation is responsible for highways and the motor carrier industry, and more recently he has been attached the responsibility for skidoos. The Department of Industry and Commerce is responsible for air transport and the Port of Churchill, and the Railway Commissioner is responsible for rail transport. Water transport and pipelines appear to be nobody's responsibility.

Now in introducing his Cabinet, during I believe it was the month of July last, the First Minister indicated that his real problem in selecting Cabinet was the plethora of talent that he had amongst his members. One would have thought that in view of the importance of the co-ordination of transport facilities in this province, that a continuation of the effort that had been initiated by the previous administration in co-ordinating all transport facilities into one department would have been continued. Now, I don't know the reason for this duplication or for this spreading around of the Transport Department. Now either the First Minister recognized that he didn't have quite all the talent that he thought he had or that, because of their philosophical approach to these matters -- and one would have thought that the reverse would have been true, that they would have undertaken to combine all transport facilities under one department. However, that is not to be the case, and we find now that because of the splitting of the responsibilities for transport amongst three separate Ministers and perhaps others,

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) there is not to be that necessary co-ordination of effort that is required if transport and transportation is to assume its rightful role in the development of the economic life of this province. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I've just pointed out -- the First Minister apparently wasn't listening -- that the Department of Transportation had been formed with the intention of bringing together all of these various functions. I didn't say that the process had been completed and . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my honourable . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, I wonder, you know . . .

MR. PAULLEY: O.K. All right. You just go ahead. I was going to ask you . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: We've had an awful time getting the floor on this side of the House and once I get it I hate like Sam Hill to relinquish it because . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, come on now. I wasn't bargaining. I was going to make a request.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . because of the difficulty of getting the floor back again. This is not a second reading debate; this is a debate that enables members from both sides of the House to participate and I'm sure that the Minister will have ample opportunity to make a statement if he chooses.

MR. PAULLEY: Okay. I just want to put you straight, that's all.

MR. JORGENSEN: I would like to be able to complete my remarks and I was saying, before I was diverted, that the importance of bringing all modes of transport under one department cannot be under-estimated. It's one of the recommendations of the early COMEF Report; it's a recommendation of the TED Commission Report, and implied in the Mauro Commission Report as well. Both the Mauro Commission Report and the Northern Task Force reinforced the views of those of us who have lived in the areas suffering from lack of adequate transportation facilities as to the need for adequate transportation to assist in the development of the economic life of particularly the rural parts of this province.

I find it rather strange to hear certain members of the opposition keep talking about the need for bringing in and developing more Crown corporations as a means of assisting in economic development. Well, Sir, if the CNR in Northern Manitoba is an example of how Crown corporations are assisting in the economic development of any part of this country, then we can do well without them. I can cite other examples of Crown corporations and their inability to deal with the problems that are being faced by people in certain parts of this country.

I would think, Sir, that the government could more effectively help the rural parts of this province, and the north, in industrial development by using government agencies such as the Department of Transportation in its entirety to promote the kind of growth that we would like to see. Rural transportation in particular has been the one reason why industrial and economic development in the rural parts of this province have lagged behind - because of the inadequate system of roads and transportation; and it wasn't until about 10 years ago that we began to have a system of roads to meet the needs of the sixties. I suggest to you now, Sir, that the needs of the seventies must be met and some of the suggestions contained in the TED Report -- and I would suggest perhaps the Minister of Transportation, since he hasn't read them, might be interested in one particular portion of that report contained on Page 375 and it deals with rural transportation. It says: "There is reason to believe that the present transportation services in rural Manitoba are unsatisfactory in terms of variety, equality and cost. To support long-term regional development strategy in the province, rural transportation presents more problems of co-ordination and development than any other element of the whole Manitoba economy. The importance of developing an efficient transportation system can hardly be overrated in a province like Manitoba, and certainly the targets for rural development set forth in this report cannot be attained unless ways and means can be devised of improving efficiency of transportation to those areas. Any improvement in the efficiency of transportation in rural Manitoba will of course promote the growth of the economy as a whole. The following specific problems need to be recognized and attempts made to resolve them if transportation is to be used in a creative and positive manner as a development tool." And those points that they mention are cost distribution and development implications.

I suggest, Sir, that the government are not following a policy that will ensure and encourage the proper growth of the economic life of the rural parts of this province by splitting up the Department of Transportation in the manner that they have done. I suggest further, Sir, that perhaps - though I offer no particular criticism of the functions of the Highway Traffic

April 13, 1970.

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) and the Motor Transport Board - I suggest, Sir, that perhaps now is a good time that these functions of the department could well be examined, and I hesitate to suggest that another committee be set up to do so, but since transportation plays such an important part in the economic development of this province, I would suggest perhaps this particular aspect of our government could be subjected to some examination by the Economic Development Committee, if that committee ever gets off the ground. It seems to me, Sir, that if we are to consider economic development in its proper perspective, then transportation most certainly plays a vital role in contributing to that economic development. Therefore, I would suggest the examination of the functions of the Department of Transportation as they presently exist, and I'm paying particular reference to the Highway Traffic and the Motor Transport Board and how they function, how they grant licences, and are their functions and are their services sufficient to meet the needs of the seventies. I think that an examination by a committee of this House would not only enlighten many members of the House as to the functions of the Transportation Department, but also perhaps could bring before the committee a number of people who are vitally concerned with the transportation industry. I think that the government could well follow the recommendations contained in the TED Report so far as the bringing together of all the functions of transportation within this province, and I would hope that the Minister would give some consideration and I hope that the First Minister would give some consideration, to bringing together instead of attempting to split the various functions of transportation into different fields. I think that one cannot consider transportation in its entirety and properly in its proper perspective unless air transport and railway transport and highway transport are all brought together and used in their proper way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend now would permit me to make an observation and to bring him up-to-date as to the *modus operandi* in the past in respect of the conduct of the previous administration in matters relating to the over-all picture in transportation. I attempted to draw this to the attention of my honourable friend but it seemed that he felt that I might be impinging on his right as a member of this House, which I had no intention of doing so but merely to draw to my honourable friend's attention matters of fact so that he didn't pursue erroneous statements as to the past conduct of the operation so far as the over-all picture of transportation which was followed by the previous administration in Manitoba, and I'd suggest that my honourable friend may just pay attention for a moment or two because under the direction of a former Premier of Manitoba, the Honourable Dufferin Roblin, he was responsible, notwithstanding a Department of Transportation or Highways or whatever you want to call it, he was responsible and designated as the Railway Commissioner for the Province of Manitoba. And when matters pertaining to railroads arose in the House, it was that honourable gentleman who undertook whatever was required by way of action in the sphere of rail transportation. I want to say, too, to my honourable friend the Member for Morris that in matters of air transportation with the previous administration it was a former Minister of Industry and Commerce, one Gurney Evans, who looked after matters pertaining to air transport. It was the present member for River Heights, Mr. Sidney Spivak, that in the immediate past government spearheaded the delegations going to Ottawa in respect of air transportation, and I went along with him as I did Mr. Evans when he was Minister of Industry and Commerce on a number of occasions, pertaining to the retention of Air Canada particularly here in Winnipeg and also insofar as the retention of the air training base at Rivers.

MR. SCHREYER: I think the member for Morris does need some historical facts . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Oh surely, my friend from Morris does need a little education as to what has gone on in the past, and while I'm prepared, as a member of the administration, to listen to the admonitions of my honourable friend, I do suggest that there are times when he would be well advised to sit down and just listen for a moment or two to factual historical background insofar as transportation is concerned, and I don't know - I don't want to put my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose on the spot, but I think that he would agree with me, particularly in respect of going down to Ottawa to try and get the minds of the government there changed insofar as Air Canada is concerned, the delegations were spearheaded not by the Minister of Transportation but by the Ministers of Industry and Commerce. So I want to say to my honourable friend, while he may admonish the present government because we haven't got all aspects of transportation under a unified, or one minister at the present time, there are reasons for this. Of course there are reasons for this. And it's not anything different than it was before.

MR. MCKENZIE: Oh, come on.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend for Roblin says, "Oh come on." We are coming on. We're going ahead. We're progressing, despite my honourable friends on the other side of the House, and may I interject my remarks just now, Mr. Chairman, by saying we're advancing so rapidly that the latest in full count in the by-election at Selkirk indicates that the New Democratic candidate has 16,245 votes, the Liberal has 6,839 and the Conservative candidate has 4,831 which indicates . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, where is the Fish Plant going to go, Selkirk or Transcona? -- (Interjection) --

MR. PAULLEY: Or maybe to Pilot Mound, I don't know. That hasn't been decided and it won't be decided by this government; it will be decided by the Fish Marketing Board. And incidently, Mr. Chairman, I think the vote is indicative that there was no interference at all with the decision that will be made by the Fish Marketing Board - but it does indicate that we're going ahead.

MR. MCKENZIE: . . . that the fish plant will go now to Transcona.

MR. JORGENSON: It won't go to Grand View.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I doubt if it'll go to Transcona but if it does, as a result of the decision of the Fish Marketing Board, we'll abide by that decision.

A MEMBER: You mean "we in Transcona."

MR. PAULLEY: We in Manitoba will abide by the decision of the Fish Marketing Board and that is only proper.

MR. MCKENZIE: Would the Member for Selkirk like to voice an opinion on that subject as well?

MR. JORGENSON: We might get back to the Department of Transportation.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, and one of the considerations I understand, Mr. Chairman, insofar as the Fish Marketing Board has to deal with transportation but in a different context than the Estimates of the Minister of Transportation.

But I do want to implore my honourable friend from Morris: Do a little homework. Do a little research. I recall my honourable friend there on the Rules Committee agreed with a suggestion that research personnel should be given to members opposite, and I can now understand the necessity, the real necessity for giving research personnel to my honourable friend the Member for Morris, because he stands up in this House, looks up at the gallery and all and sundry, and comes out with such statements that he's come through in respect to transportation, of which he has no knowledge, which is very very evident, about the topic that he was talking about. So I suggest, I suggest to my honourable friend that while he is talking, if the Minister of Labour just happens to say to my honourable friend, "Will you permit an interjection or an observation," that rather than taking the attitude that he did, he sits down and says, "I'd appreciate my honourable friend putting me straight once again." And that is my suggestion to my honourable friend. And may I again say that a previous premier of this province, the Honourable Duffering Roblin, was the spokesman, the Railway Commissioner for Manitoba, when we still had others dealing with the matter of transportation, that two previous Ministers of Industry and Commerce, namely Mr. Gurney Evans and the Honourable Member for River Heights, acted on behalf of the government of Manitoba insofar as air transport is concerned. I do not fault them for the job that they did, I do not fault my honourable friend and colleague the Minister of Transport, but I do say to my honourable friend the Member for Morris, will you please . . . look into the records a little bit of history so that you know what you're talking about.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I just don't understand the jumble or the jargo that's coming across from the other side of the House tonight about rail abandonment, but is this Minister trying to stand up and tell this House that they're not going to abandon the railway system?

MR. PAULLEY: I can understand from my honourable friend's final sentence why he is in such a jungle because he had no comprehension of what I was talking about.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, if there ever was an indication that members in this House do not have to know what they're talking about to get up and speak, my honourable friend is a classic example of it. And I want to say that he completely took out of context the remarks I made. I think the First Minister understood what I said because he nodded his head in agreement when I stated that I know that the process had not been completed. I knew

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) who was in charge of air transport and I knew who was in charge of rail transport under the previous administration. It's a funny thing, Sir, that every time we get up to criticize this government, the Minister of Labour takes refuge. In going back to what the previous administration did is his safeguard. If we did it it was fine. And he always continues to take refuge in what we did and how we did things.

MR. PAULLEY: Again I say to my honourable friend the Member for Morris, he's an able debater who loves to debate without any factual history behind him or the facts of what has transpired before, now, or is likely to transpire in the future.

MR. JORGENSEN: Since when was that a criteria for debate, knowing what you're talking about? You're a classic example of that.

. continued on next page

April 13, 1970.

877

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I wouldn't like to interfere in this intellectual debate, Mr. Chairman. If they're completed that's fine; if not, I'm glad to wait.

I can't help but pass along my congratulations to the Minister of Transportation because, in the quick perusal of his format for this year, I think it is a fair one and I don't particularly have to say that because it's Northern Manitoba I come from, but it looks as if Manitoba is going to get its share as a whole, and this will be the first time that that has happened. And I would hope that this carries on because I think that the North has changed. I think that we have to make it an accessible North if we're going to develop the North. But in saying that, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Labour, who was out when the Minister spoke, but he said his girls were working overtime; they were working Saturday; they weren't getting paid for it; and I think that he should look into it very carefully, because there was no remuneration for all this overtime, and I think this is very serious.

I was getting quite interested when the Minister said that now when they completed the Nelson House road they would go on, and I was sure he was going to say they were going to go on to Churchill, but then he went on and said they were going on to Churchill Forest Products - which is going east; they're going west instead of east - and this was very difficult for me to have to sit and listen to that, because I think the Indian people have a lot to do towards developing further North also.

I thought that it was a very good map he had this year, and as I mentioned before, unfortunately he cut off Churchill just the same as he cut off the road to Churchill, and I wasn't really disappointed. I think that it made a little room for Government Services propaganda on the back. Unfortunately, I don't believe that this is what the map should be. I'm a strong believer in the map itself because I think it does and can do a great deal of service for the tourists that come through the country. It certainly does a lot for Manitobans themselves, to make them aware of what Manitoba is like, and I would hope that in the future that, as we get off with the Centennial Year, that we will stop slapping ourselves on the back and make it something that is worthwhile, not only for the motorists but I say for the people who are going further north particularly, on air transportation and in the small planes. I think it is very important because they have to find and know where they're going to have emergency landing fields, where the areas are going to be that they can gas up etc., and this is becoming more and more of a way of movement throughout the whole of Northern Manitoba and it is certainly just as important as someone travelling along the hard surface highways in 20 percent of the province of 15 percent of the province, and I think that if we're going to make this map do one over-all job, it certainly should be one in which the tourist can move about as a motorist, to find docking areas to know where he can fish; for air traffic to know where the small planes can land and where they can't land; where they can gas up; where they can get the information; and particularly help them in their charting, because certainly this should be an information map for all types of travel and I think the days are past when you're going to call it a Highway Map. I think it's got to become more of that particularly in Manitoba where central and northern Manitoba have to be included as a transportation area.

And Mr. Chairman, I think that I would like to see some indication from the Minister that he would have monies set aside to allow him to use areas adjacent and part of northern roads for emergency landing fields so that planes, when they're travelling, can have additional areas to land. Perhaps it can become part of a tourist area at a later date, but these clearances wouldn't cost that much more, I suppose, during the building of the road in the first place, and certainly it would help in many cases, because when small planes are going, they use roads quite often for navigation bases and if they could land on spots along these new roads that we're building in the north, it would assist them because quite often they're travelling by wheel now instead of pontoons.

The Minister, in stating that the Ponton road to Winnipeg would be completed within one year, is a very welcome statement, not only to the people of Thompson but I'm sure to people in Southern Manitoba, and I'm sure that it will be to many many people throughout the North, because if we can anticipate that we will have a road through the central part of Manitoba up as far as Thompson within a year, it will be something that we did not dream of who live in the North, and it will certainly assist tourists, fishing and many many other things that will follow roads, because certainly any road that is built today in the North produces. It produces mines or it produces additional tourists and transportation and it produces dollars for the Treasury

April 13, 1970.

(MR. BEARD cont'd) of the Province of Manitoba. If the Minister is correct in respect to the 35 percent reduction in passenger and freight rates to Thompson through the production of this road itself, will repay all the moneys that have been introduced into this road system in a very short time, because I can assure you that the growth of Thompson will be just that much faster and certainly the consumption of goods will be that much greater.

I would hope that there can be some assurance that both air and rail transportation centres in Thompson will pass along this 35 percent reduction to other areas of Northern Manitoba, because as both of us know, this is often absorbed by either Crown corporations or businesses, etc., and it is not passed along, and I hope that if this is the case that we can record rates now and see to it that as these rates are reduced that they are passed along to areas further north. It certainly has not been the case in the past. I think that this was one of the basic things that the Northern Task Force heard more and more, and it was particularly discouraging for somebody to say that at Norway House that the rates could not be lowered even though they've had a larger airfield placed in that community, but I would hope that that would change.

Of course transportation can not be talked about unless we bring in the old Roads to Resources programming that has disappeared. I believe the Minister indicated some time ago that possibly they would have a complementary program to replace this shortly. I would point out to him that the Crown corporation, the Northern Transportation Company Limited, which is a federal socialistic program that has been one of the greatest programs to speed up the development of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon - and they boast about it being unmatched, experienced in every phase of northern freighting - and anybody on the Northern Task Force will know that this was certainly one of the things that was talked about in most cases in most communities that we met in, so I think that we've got to have some grasp of what the costs are going to be in respect to transportation within the north.

While I personally have no quarrel with the government splitting the transportation services amongst other Ministers, I would hope that the Minister of Highways would make sure that programs were carried out that were complementary both with the railroad and with the plane service, because going back to his transportation, as far as roads go, they have northern resource roads programmed for the Northwest Territories. It's complementary in respect to sawmills, tourist lodges, canneries or industry which will add to the growth and development of the Territories, may be eligible for federal road building assistance, and this is the Government of Canada assisting the Northwest Territories government and there is a difference. There is just the same difference in respect to this as there is to the Province of Manitoba or Saskatchewan or whatever it may be and the Federal Government.

So there is a program available for the government of the Northwest Territories that is not being made available for the other provinces of Canada, and I believe that there must be something done about this. I think we should make a protest in respect of this because they're offering up to 50 percent cost of the construction on the development of these types of roads. The amount of the federal assistance will not exceed 50 percent of actual road costs. It's allowed to either share it with the company or with the province, and I think this is important particularly in respect to his statement a while ago when he said that Sherritt-Gordon were accepting 100 percent of the cost of developing their road, then why can't they get a 50 percent assistance from the Federal Government. I believe this would be only fair. They say that the maximum yearly contribution is limited to \$100,000 if the project is exploratory in nature and \$500,000 a year if the project is primarily development, and we are developing roads in Northern Manitoba. I think in looking through this program, and the Federal Government make no secret in respect to their cost-sharing information, I think that we should as government certainly see to it that something is done to get the Federal Government to help because they certainly share in the results of road building in Northern Manitoba.

Now we come I suppose to one of the more controversial things, and I disagreed with the last government and I certainly disagree with this government in respect to the Lynn Lake road. The Member for Swan River tried to say this afternoon that he wanted to keep something non-political. I don't believe you can, but in respect to the Lynn Lake road there has been representation made all along by the people of Lynn Lake that they wanted the road to go to Snow Lake. Snow Lake people said they wanted the road to go that way. We know the road is going to cost more to go that way and they realized this, but I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that what is the use of building a road unless it's a road in which people want to travel, because

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) we have found now that sometimes political roads do not prove to be successful and you have to go back and do it properly after the whole thing is completed, and I would say that in many respects the Thompson Road to The Pas was not properly thought out in the first place. We knew, or the government knew when they were starting that road, that certainly the obvious place in which Thompson was going to draw its material would be from Winnipeg, but in diverting it 750 miles it was bound to cost more and now we are in a position where we have to spend some millions of dollars developing a road where it should have been in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, we're living with it again in respect to the people's feelings as far as having to travel to Thompson and then go back down through to Ponton. And it is a long road. It will be a long, dusty road for many years to come before it can be paved. We've got to accept that and it will not be used as much as it would be if people knew that they could get down through to the area in which they are socially oriented, because the Lynn Lake people are more in the area, come more in the area of Swan River and Saskatchewan, etc., and Flin Flon too, and that is the way that they are going when they want to go somewhere.

I realize that the road to Thompson will be using funds, I presume - rather I should say from Hydro, that it will cost the government of this province less to build it that way, but when Hydro is finished with that road then its job is finished and it is no longer interested in the road to any great extent. I would say, let Hydro go ahead with that road. You can't stop it now, but I think there should be some indication from this government and from the Minister to the people of Snow Lake and Lynn Lake that they will consider a road that will be direct to Snow Lake, because this is what the people have asked and this is what they'll continually ask and it will start to come up as a political platform as the elections come. -- (Interjection) -- I think so. It would just be natural for people to support a road that would serve the area best.

There's no indication that the people are going to change their minds; they are going to ask it. I suppose we could prophesy that in so many years it will happen anyway, just the same as the Ponton road has happened. But I would say that if the Ponton road had happened a few years ago, then certainly today there would have been changes in Thompson. I think the rates in every respect in living, the higher cost of living would have been lower, and if the Minister can point out tonight that the freight rates themselves should come down as far as 35 percent, then if we went back and said surely over the over-all program, that if they'd built the road in the right place in the first place the over-all cost of developing Thompson as far as freight was concerned would be down almost 25 percent. This is an amazing figure and it was an obvious road. As far as I understand, it was on the map and it was taken off. It was on the drawing board but it was withdrawn, and if the Lynn Lake road is not used as much as people would hope it would be used, it will be because the people feel that again they are travelling many many more miles than they would have had to if it had been built in the proper place in the first place.

So we can't stop what has already been started. We can't say we've got to start all over again tomorrow, but I would hope the Minister can go back over his development program and say to himself that I think that this has to be looked at again. I don't want him to stand up and say, Well, do you want the road from Lynn Lake to Snow Lake or do you want the road from Churchill, because I will have to hide behind the fact that I am a backbencher and a member of the opposition, but the fact is that there is a need for many roads.

I will wind up by saying that rather than repeating what I intend to talk about in respect to Northern Task Force, that all people are looking for roads, and if we are going to build them I would hope that we can build them in the proper place in the first place and save as much as possible and bring about a production which will show the rest of the people in Manitoba that building roads in Northern Manitoba pays, not in the future but now. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few points in connection with transportation and how it will affect the Greater Winnipeg area. I believe it was on March 19th that you, Mr. Chairman, made a speech to the members of the Assembly here dealing mostly with transportation in Metropolitan Winnipeg, and at that time it was mentioned or suggested that the former government was defeated because they had not shown any interest in urban problems of Greater Winnipeg. Perhaps we can carry this on a little further at this time and maybe draw it to its logical conclusion, that perhaps maybe this is in sight for the present government too, because I have seen nothing up to the present time that this government is prepared

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) to deal with these problems, with urban problems in Greater Winnipeg and with transportation problems, and if I'm not mistaken, I think you made references to those points as well.

Now I said that the government has said nothing up to the present time, or I've heard nothing which holds any promise of what it intends to do in respect to long-range transportation problems in this city. I know that on June 25th the Premier himself, in the issue of June 25th, 1969, Free Press, blamed the Weir administration for the tragic situation which saw Metro Winnipeg not functioning properly and not realizing its full potential as the major urban centre in Manitoba and the fourth ranking centre in the whole of Canada.

At that time he blamed the government for not doing as much as it should have been doing, or completely ignoring the urban problems and the transportation problems. I know that the Premier at that time had some planks in his platform, such as regional urban development and there were others endorsing the principle of the balanced transportation system contained in the Winnipeg transportation study, and he said he would immediately initiate discussions and means that would implement the principle. I would like to ask the question at the present time, has this been done, or has he started or even said anything about it? I don't think he has. At the present time nothing has been done to this point.

I know that the long-range transportation are quite necessary and the longer we wait the greater the expense is going to be for the needs of Winnipeg. Roads and public transportation constitute one of the most essential elements of public services and I think that this government, if anything else, has ignored this problem. The Greater Winnipeg Transportation Study which was I believe done quite well - it took some six years to prepare the document - it said we cannot afford to wait until '71 to start; we have to start immediately on some plans and to go ahead with some of the streets and roads because I think it was developed on a four stage development. Certain streets had to be completed; the next stage, bridges and overpasses; and the whole construction timetable would cover the period in four stages.

Now I think we are late, even if we started to do something this session, and I feel that the government did have a year to plan, to initiate a program, or at least tell us what it intends to do. Does it accept the transportation study, does it endorse the transportation study that was done by the Metropolitan Corporation? The transportation study states that the network of freeways, major thoroughfares and transit lines should provide a good level of mobility to the centre core of Greater Winnipeg. And I think that's necessary, because we have to, if we're concerned about redeveloping our downtown core, this is what we'll have to do. The study also recommends that we must have periodical reviews as to construction priorities so that adjustments could be made to account for actual patterns of growth in the Greater Winnipeg area, and I'm not so certain that any review has even been started in this respect, Mr. Chairman. I'm quite concerned. I understand the Minister has not made any mention of Inner-Perimeter Beltway. Has it been shelved completely? Is it still going? Is it going in the same . . .

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): . . . submit to a question?

MR. PATRICK: Yes I will.

MR. PAWLEY: Do you support the Inner-Perimeter Beltway?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Minister would tell us what Inner-Perimeter Beltway is and what way it is proposed, how much the expenditures are, I could answer you quite quickly. I'm not so certain, and I would not agree to where it's going to cross Portage Avenue and the Woodhaven Creek or the Sturgeon Creek and Assiniboine River; I'm not in favour of that. But is that what's stopping the whole implementing of the Greater Winnipeg transportation study, is that one small section of the Inner-Perimeter Beltway?

MR. PAWLEY: No.

MR. PATRICK: I'm posing that as a question to the government - is that what's stopping the whole implementation of the study and progress, or any progress in the Winnipeg . . . ?

MR. PAWLEY: No, that's not the problem.

MR. PATRICK: It isn't. I don't know if I answered the Minister or not, but I'm saying I'm not against the Inner-Perimeter Beltway but I am against where it is going to destroy a 40-acre park in Woodhaven and going next to the hospital. When the hospital went to get its permit, they were told to stay off Portage Avenue because it was too noisy and now you're putting a super highway right beside it with big tractors, a 50 - 60 mile speedway, or speed zones which will cause noise and I'm not so sure that that's the right location, but certainly

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) I don't think it has to be there. There must be some alternate location for the Inner-Perimeter Beltway.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . the St. Charles Country Club alternative? Moray Street?

MR. PATRICK: Sure, I think it's a good one. There's nothing wrong . . .

MR. PAWLEY: . . . with the residences that are involved.

MR. PATRICK: It seems that the Honourable Minister must have the alternate proposals so I wish that he would give them to the House, to all the members, so that we could study them.

MR. BOROWSKI: If you're asking for half a pregnancy, it's impossible.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the answer is not to stall and do nothing, and this is where we are at the present time. I would like to ask the government again, do they recognize the need for a balanced transportation system as recommended in the report, or do they not? This is one of the promises that the Premier made during the election, with many others which concerns the I think the Department of Municipal Affairs which I will be able to discuss at that time, but I think in transportation matters that we must have some direction from this government which way they propose to go in respect to the transportation problems in Greater Winnipeg, and up to the present time we have not heard anything, so I would like to hear from the Minister in that respect. Does he endorse the transportation study from the Metropolitan Government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe I should start off in the usual way or in the way the former Member for Rhineland put it - "Not a nickel for Rhineland." I think this is what the late Mr. Miller said. It's not quite that bad but it is really bad; I can tell him that. In my opinion we are spending too much in the North. Everything for the North and nothing for the South. That is the truth, and I'm just wondering what is happening here. The Honourable Member for Swan River mentioned that it was quite satisfactory to him. Well, I'm just wondering whether the government is not catering to those particular constituencies closer to the north which they hope to win in the next election.

A MEMBER: We're looking at Rhineland, Jake.

MR. FROESE: . . . not mention that.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, we're interested in Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I think we need a second Highways Minister for the South. The trouble is they have no members in the South so there's no one there to take up the ministership. The Minister of Labour would do no good for southern Manitoba. We know . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I . . . up too many high wages . . .

MR. FROESE: You can't be a candidate for that one.

MR. PAULLEY: Especially around Altona.

MR. CHERNIACK: They don't mind the minimum wage there.

MR. FROESE: We need more hard surface roads too and we need them very badly, I can tell the Minister, because southern Manitoba has area that is producing special crops. They have canneries, industries of that type. They need roads where you don't whip up the dust and just cloud these products with dust before they reach the cannery or the industry where they're supposed to be processed, and I've mentioned this on previous occasions but it seems to me it's falling on deaf ears and I hope that the Minister is listening tonight and will do something about it. Maybe he can reconsider his estimates; I'm sure with the \$50 million that he has at his disposal that he can cut a million here and probably another one there and put it into Rhineland. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the estimates are for better than \$50 million so I'm sure that he can cut corners somewhere.

When we go across the line to North Dakota, Minnesota, you will find that most of the highways out there are hard-surfaced, and they are cross checked; every so often you have a hard-surfaced road - many more than what we have. All we have that I can see is two roads leading to the States which are hard surfaced. And then the quality of these roads is not one that you can brag about because we have an industry in Altona which is facing a bad experience every Spring. Road restrictions went on today and this always hits that community. The roads in the States are much better, or at least the restrictions are not as severe, and the same holds true for Highway 75 and the concrete road as far as Rosenfeld. But when it comes that they shall deliver these beans to Altona, you have a stretch from Gretna to Altona coming in from the south as you come in from the east you have a stretch from Rosenfeld to Altona

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) the same way, and you're hit by these severe restrictions and this is causing a lot of trouble for the industry. I've in past years brought this to the attention of the Minister and sometimes they would relinquish it somewhat. But that's not the answer to it. We need a better road, and what amazes me is that Highway No. 30 has been on the list for development for the last two years and now it's dropped. Why?

It amazes me that when a road is scheduled to be programmed or it's supposed to be undertaken and was on the list for two years -- mind you, that, I think, was a bad record for the previous government to have that many roads on the road program and never do anything about them except survey them. So I'd hoped that this year we would see some development, and lo and behold, we see it's dropped. I'm just wondering -- the previous government would not give us the highway traffic counts. This government changed that policy. We now are able to get the traffic counts of the various highways where these counts are being made, but what use or what value are they if you have these roads that needed upgrading, that needed hard surfacing, and then not to go accordingly, and I would certainly like to hear from the Minister as far as the traffic count is concerned on those roads; if not, then I'll have to put in an Order for Return to find out just what is happening. Many surveys too. What's happened to the surveys? Why were the surveys conducted? Surveys have been held repeatedly and yet we now find that nothing is happening, so surely there must have been some reason for conducting the surveys on these highways.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that when we're spending this amount of money and spending it mostly in the north, and the south has to pay for it, that this is certainly not the right thing because the economy in rural Manitoba, if it keeps on going the way it is, then some of our farmers won't have money to go out fishing and they won't even be able to see what is being done up north; won't even be able to ride on your highways up north. So this means that we're just putting up new highways for the tourists, and I'm not sure whether this is a sound idea at all. I feel that we should first put in the better roads where we have development, where they can be put to use, and where the money is coming from to pay for them.

The matter of maintenance: I've raised that on previous occasions and asked the Minister to give us an explanation on the directives that apparently went out, and we now hear from the Minister that the district managers are to be in charge and that servicing will be done in this way and that directives will be going out from there. I would like to get a copy of the program as far as the maintenance is concerned on these various provincial roads, so that we would have some idea here as members as to what is happening, because he mentioned certain roads would be maintained more often than others. I think we should have an indication -- at least I would like it for my area -- as to what roads will be maintained more often than others, because we have, really, heavy traffic on quite a number of these provincial roads and they get to be very very rough and also dusty at different periods during the summer months.

Another matter that I think we should discuss briefly has to do with the abandonment of rail lines. I think the Member for Morris already mentioned this. We know that a little while ago we had hearings in my area in connection with eliminating the railway stations in 78 points and also doing away with the people that were in charge of operating these stations. The trend is evidently set, and with the elimination of stations and also rail line abandonment, this means that elevators will have to be moved and some will have to be discarded. I feel that this in itself means that we have to have a better road program, that we have to have a road program that will be able to bear the traffic that the rail lines are presently carrying, and that we cannot just go ahead and abandon rail lines and not look after the roads so that we'll have something to replace those lines with and properly serve the various communities. I'm sure that in many instances the matter of rail line abandonment will also mean the liquidation of certain smaller centres in Manitoba.

Another thing -- what about the access road program? We used to have that program in effect at some time, and I think it proved very beneficial for the centres that were probably half a mile away from a highway and that these centres could in this way be served with proper roads. I feel that this should be brought into being again if it has been discontinued, and that some of our communities could take advantage of it again. Perhaps we need a Task Force for the South such as we've had for the North. I think it would only be proper. If this is what is helping to pinpoint the needs, surely we should have one for the south that we could bring home to the government the needs that we have in the south. We have needs of better roads but there are other needs as well, and I would recommend that the government appoint a Task Force

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) similar to the one they had last year for the north so that we could bring home to the government the needs of the south as well. I'm all for improving the lot of the Indians. Surely there's a lot that can be done but I don't think it should be done completely at the expense of the people in the south.

MR. BEARD: You've been stealing from us for a hundred years, Jake.

MR. FROESE: I don't believe that. We have worked, and we've worked hard in the south for every road and every dollar that has been coming out of there. -- (Interjection) -- I'm not asking necessarily for more roads, I'm asking for improved roads. Sure, we need better roads. Too many of our roads are narrow; they haven't got the proper base; there should be wider shoulders on them and then resurfacing so that they were of a better standard, and I claim that the present program as outlined leaves much to be desired for southern Manitoba. If it came to vote, that the people should vote on his salary, I don't think he'd get it, not on the basis of the report that he just submitted, so I think he can be happy that it's not the people of the south that will be voting on his salary but that the members of this House are going to vote. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I think you've gone overboard the other way. Probably at one time it was that we were getting more attention but I think the pendulum has swung over completely the other way and now the emphasis is completely on the north and the south is being forgotten. We are not getting the proper attention in southern Manitoba.

The Minister mentioned that certain contracts had been let last fall. Could he inform us as to what contracts have been let so that we'd have some idea, and what the amounts were in these cases?

There's another matter. I already discussed this actually with members of his department but I don't think it would hurt to mention it in Committee here tonight. This has to do with the jobs that private operators are seeking, especially during the late fall months or winter months. Apparently certain jobs, smaller jobs, will be open and the municipalities move in and do the job, and the smaller contracts, the contractors, the individual operators are left out, and I've had complaints in my riding about this. They feel that this is very unfair because they have to pay the taxes, they have to pay all the taxes and certain ones which the municipalities are exempt from, and they feel that they should have a prior right to these jobs if they are open and of such a nature that they can do. I don't want to pinpoint exactly any specific jobs at this time but I know of certain cases where this did happen and they feel very bad about this.

Now I know what the Minister will probably come back with; he'll say that in certain instances the proper equipment was there and they moved in and they could get it done faster and so on, but I think at the same time we should be mindful of this and that when we have people in our province, smaller operators that can be put to use, I think we should do so. I think we should support our smaller contractors as well and give them a chance. In this way they can make a living and they can also improve their machinery and at some future date be successful so that they can do better and bigger jobs.

A final matter that I thought I should mention is the matter of air strips. I'm not sure whether it falls within his department. Some of the municipalities, or people in municipalities have asked me and through me whether the government would give assistance to build air strips in the smaller centres of this province -- when I'm talking of smaller centres, I'm not necessarily speaking of very small centres but centres like we have at Morden, Winkler and the like, because we feel that this is the coming thing, that certainly the Air Industry Conference that we had here last fall in the City of Winnipeg certainly gave every direction that we will see more transporting done by air and in much larger volume and much faster too, so that certainly I feel that we cannot just stop at Winnipeg as such; that we need other locals where transportation can be directed to, probably and most likely in smaller planes, but certainly it's time I think that we take a good look at this and that we provide for airstrips to these smaller centres so that we can start and build an industry of this type that can serve the people of Manitoba.

Just what does the government have in mind? Do they have a program? I know the federal people were in attendance at the conference last fall. Just how does the federal program tie in with the province and what can we expect in the way of development as far as air strips and as far as the air transport industry in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, it's almost 10:00 o'clock. I will probably have some more things to say tomorrow when we continue with the estimates of the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee Rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, your committee has instructed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 10:00 o'clock and the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon (Tuesday).