

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, September 4, 1969

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on Resolution 98. The motion is that the Minister's salary be reduced from \$15,600 to \$12,500. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GIRARD: I'm sorry. I was standing, I suppose I didn't attract your attention. May I speak on the . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. GIRARD: No, I'm sorry, I'll withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then I'll put the . . .

MR. GIRARD: No, that's fine, I'll withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll put the question again.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the amendment lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've been, as you've noticed, very eager to speak on behalf of my constituents. The reason I was so eager was that at the moment we were discussing the Minister's salary; I thought that we had the Minister very interested and that it was easy to attract his attention. I'm hopeful that I can do this without discussing salary.

I would like to bring about some consideration for a certain piece of road that is very important to the members of the Emerson constituency, to the people of Emerson constituency. It's not news to this House; it's a request that has been made by my predecessor on many occasions, and it's one that has had the focus of the people of Emerson for some time. I'm speaking now with reference to a small stretch of road on the highway 201. The highway 201 is a road east and west that travels along the American border approximately nine miles north. If anyone will study the area, the southeastern portion of Manitoba, you will notice that the school boundary, the electoral boundary, the municipal boundaries are for the most part in an east-west direction, and this particular stretch of road is the only communication, road communication, of note that is available to these people. This area of Manitoba has been settled for some 80 years and they are still travelling on a second-rate kind of road. This road is important for many reasons. As I pointed out, it is a very main artery for the school division which, incidentally, operates some 30 school buses and these school buses, almost every one of them, travels on this piece of road for some mileage every day. Cumulatively, this is a great number of miles, and of course both bus drivers, students, parents and school officials are very interested, for this reason, to see some improvement on that particular piece of road.

I'd like to mention another thing that would justify the improvement of this road and this is the considerable gravel deposits that are located in Tolstoi. We have in Tolstoi large quantities of good quality construction gravel and for the people who own this gravel we have a market, and this market happens to be on the west side of the Red River. This means that a great deal of transportation along the highway 201 occurs in transporting this gravel from Place A to B. This is not only a lot of transportation, a great number of vehicles, it's also transportation of heavy vehicles, heavily laden trucks, and of course this presents added problems. I think that the paving of the Highway 201 is something that we're requesting because of the convenience that it means to the people, but it's something more than that. I think because of the transportation of the heavy vehicles it's necessary because it presents a serious traffic hazard.

I'd like to point out that completion of the paving of Highway 201 between Highways 75 and 59 is almost complete. It would require less than 10 miles of pavement to complete this very important road connection. We are in our constituency, of course, interested in many road developments and road projects, but I want to be specific in this request. I'd like to mention that particular piece of road for the Emerson constituency solely because I think it warrants that kind of interest. I am hopeful that in the estimates the Minister will see fit to provide our constituency with this development. It has been facetiously suggested to me that if I really want this road to be developed that we'd have to somehow move it up north. I, for one, can't believe this, but I'm satisfied that we can wait and see for a few months. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words at this particular time in

(MR. BILTON cont'd.) . . . . regard to these estimates. I've had the privilege of privately complimenting the Minister of Transport on his appointment to the Cabinet, and I too, with others, would wish him well.

I'm not going to cover the northland as much as the Honourable Member for Churchill did. I certainly support what he had to say and will certainly give it my undivided support as the future unfolds. I was however, Mr. Chairman, very interested in what the Minister had to say insofar as the Indians were concerned at Nelson House, where some \$50,000 initially is to be poured into that community, thus providing jobs and taking these people off welfare. I applaud this most sincerely. It seems to me that it's a step in the right direction, and it's going to take care of some 50 people, 50 or 60 people I understand, much unfortunately, as my honourable friend must know, and I do too, that we have some 20-30,000 Indians in that country. Certainly it will not be possible to put them all to work but I hope and pray, as I am sure he does, that the Indians in this particular regard will put their best foot forward and take advantage of at least this effort in their welfare. I noted, too, that this could be a saving of some \$5,000 to \$9,000 in welfare. This too, Sir, is all to the good.

Having heard those remarks from the Minister, my mind of course went to the area from whence I come, and that is Pelican Rapids as one particular area, where we have a similar bill for welfare month by month. These people have a road. It's a road that work and money has been put on, but it needs an awful lot of work to put it into the shape and the safe condition that it ought to be for this 400 or 500 people, Indian and Metis, that live and have lived in that area for many, many years. So I don't feel at all out of place, Mr. Chairman, in prevailing upon the Minister in making this effort in Nelson House to extend the same privilege to the people in Pelican Rapids. There's work there to be done, clearing to be done, to satisfy the situation. Those people, as he possibly knows, have taken their livelihood from fishing, and fishing is not what it was. The men in the wintertime work in the bush, taking out pulpwood and that sort of thing, and that is an economy that is up and down depending on the season. They have a problem but they meet their situation. I notice too, Mr. Chairman, that cottages, small cottages I suppose you could call them - I believe it's a federal and provincial effort - are in Pelican Rapids, and they're meeting an excellent need. Timber in that area is such that can be taken down, worked and turned into timber, and I think I sensed the Minister talking in terms of a small sawmill in the Nelson area. I would ask again for that privilege for the Pelican Rapids area, with the thought, Sir, that the lumber derived therefrom could be put into use by setting up these buildings for people to live in. I'm sure the Minister, as well as myself, deplores some of these TV programs, that when they're showing the villages and communities of our Indian folk it always seems to me that they're slap board buildings or tarpaper buildings and that sort of thing. To me, these people in this country can use the timber or the lumber, and I would suggest to him that possibly a broad axe might be given to the odd family and log cabins built which would be far in excess and much more comfortable than some of these buildings that are thrown together in which women and children are living in disgraceful conditions. -- (Interjection) -- I was just going to mention that. I live in a log cabin; I find it very comfortable; and that cabin, Sir, is some 60-odd years old, and that's first-class, 100 percent. The plumbing can be put in too.

But anyway, I do feel that the Indians themselves in this direction - and I say it most sincerely; I know it doesn't altogether reflect the Minister concerned - but if in some way they could be prevailed upon to put the timber to that kind of use, I think nothing but good would come of it.

I may as well, while I am on my feet too, Mr. Chairman, refer to Duck Bay. That, of course, through redistribution also was brought into my area and in the past, work has been done but I do remind the Minister, and I will be reminding him again no doubt, that there's certain road construction should go on there for the benefit of those people. Roads have been put in and rocks of enormous size have been left in the gutter, and somehow or other I feel that here again local labour could be put to work with the horses that are around there and the sleighs and what have you, and help clean up that community.

I had a note, Mr. Chairman, to speak of the airport, but after what has been said today I guess I'll have to wait until the First Minister takes the floor in Industry and Commerce. I feel I must abide by the rules of the House, and I have a story to tell which I'm sure he will give consideration to at that particular time.

Whilst I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, words have been said about the north and road

(MR. BILTON cont'd.) . . . . building. I think that a lot of the discussion that is developing, it is well worthwhile, and I will be the first to say and possibly the last to say that the north has been ignored too long. Our young people ought to be taught to look north rather than looking south. But it hasn't been too bad a picture on the western side of northern Manitoba. I believe a good job has been done. What we've been talking about the last few days it seems to me is a new area. After all, Thompson wasn't there ten years ago and, as we all know, governments move slowly and certainly dollar bills are the things that count.

Again Mr. Chairman, I would wish the Minister every success, and certainly I will do my utmost to support him when it comes to roads for the north, and anything for the north, for that matter. But I was a little put out the other day and I am taking advantage of the opportunity that I have the floor, and that is of Tuesday of this week I asked a question of the Minister of Transportation and I received anything but an answer. The First Minister suggested I should call for the information by way of Order of Return. This, Mr. Chairman, I agreed to do. That evening, that evening a TV reporter asked the Minister the same question and the Minister answered it, and that answer was of course that the defeated NDP candidate for Swan River was in fact a technical assistant to the Minister. I have no argument; no argument with that whatsoever, nor did I intend any argument, but I would remind the Minister that that weekend I was home and I was asked this question, and it was in the name of the people that I represent that I asked that question, and I didn't take too kindly to his refusal and I took less kindly to him doing it over the air publicly, something that he had refused me in this House. And I would hope that in future when I ask a reasonable and sensible question, I'll get a reasonable and sensible answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Does someone else wish to speak?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the Minister wishes to defer to the Member for St. Vital. Do you intend to speak?

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): If it is the wish of the Minister, Mr. Chairman. I would certainly appreciate any remarks he may have. -- (Interjection) -- Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I believe it was the Member for St. Matthews who indicated in his Throne Speech debate that it was the intent of the government to introduce, or at least their philosophy was such that there was going to be a redistribution of wealth. I, in my thoughts, went back to the opening of this session and, on going out the front door, I noticed a very large tent and I must admit, Mr. Minister, I said to myself, "My God, Joe's made it. His renewed wealth, or his wealth has put him in the position where he has now a larger tent." But unfortunately or fortunately, as the case may be, it was a question of the food concession or the food tent at that time. -- (Interjection) -- I am sure I don't know whether he's running a concession or not. But I must say in all sincerity, Mr. Minister, I congratulate you on your position. I believe that from the comments that have been made here today, and previously, that you realize that you have a very onerous task.

With reference to the comments of the Honourable Member from Churchill, I must admit to you, Sir, that I have a much better appreciation of the north country and I think it's most appropriate that a person such as you represent over half of the area of Manitoba. But I think it was indicated that there are problems in the north country and I'm sure the previous government realized this as we do now, the new members, insofar as the north country is concerned.

Also, as far as the member from Birtle-Russell, I believe he mentioned the fact that the Mauro Commission undertook a transportation study in the area of air transportation. The Honourable Member from Churchill indicated that the aircraft were perhaps antiquated, and may I suggest, Sir, that the Dakota has been the workhorse of many air forces and has pushed back many frontiers. The YS-11 that we had the opportunity of being placed on, I think do well for the north country although I must admit I believe the air fare return to that area is something in the neighbourhood of \$135.00, and I must admit that \$135.00 east or west or south probably brings a bigger return in air miles.

The Member from Churchill also indicated - and I don't mean this facetiously - also indicated that there is a problem insofar as sewage is concerned and the utilities. I would agree that certainly there is a problem, but I must admit that this came from the lips of one of your own constituents, that it's a waste of money. It's a waste of money in view of the fact

(MR. HARDY cont'd.) . . . . that very few, very few people will hook up to the service for the simple reason that, as he suggested, the bulk of the residences - 75 percent of them as a matter of fact were his figures - indicated that they were substandard in nature. Now to me it would seem that before any monies were expended that a much greater outlook, a much greater assessment of the area must be undertaken in order to facilitate the problems that obviously are in existence in that area.

The First Minister indicated in his speech in Churchill that through technological advances that perhaps in the not too distant future the port facilities of Churchill could be increased by 23 percent. I have no quarrel with 23 percent, I think it's a magnificent idea. But may I suggest that in the past three years the exports from the Port of Churchill insofar as grain commodities are concerned averages just slightly over 20 million bushels as compared with the 1965 figure of 25 million. So rather than put the cart before the horse, I would suggest that the people in authority, the people - and I say the Provincial Government - are in a position to do something that has to be done for the western farmer. So I'm suggesting that the markets have to be established before the increase in the port facilities or the extension of the period.

It has been mentioned many many times that the roads in northern Manitoba have to be extended. I don't think really anyone would quarrel with this extension, but here again it's a matter of finances, a matter of economics, and may I suggest to the Minister of Transportation that these same problems exist in the urban area of Winnipeg and in the western part of Manitoba, in the southern part of Manitoba and in the eastern part of Manitoba. The Minister I am sure is aware that transportation study has been undertaken, certain recommendations have been made, and it's obvious from that report that public money in conjunction with private capital is going to be required in order to bring any transportation study to a fruition, their recommendations.

I think they will also agree that urbanization, the high cost of urbanization, is something that has to be, has to be grappled with. I'm sure the Minister is aware that the transit deficit of \$4.1 million is a direct cost or tax to the property owners of the Greater Winnipeg area, and this also applies to the City of Brandon. To my knowledge, I am not aware of any transportation system, any public transportation system that is operating in the black. This 4.1 million, as I mentioned, is a direct tax to the property owner.

Now the announcement was made this afternoon that there would be a decrease in the cost of Medicare. This I welcome. The problem now naturally is the raising of \$28 million. It has been suggested that a portion of this may be attributed or may be tacked on to the provincial gas tax. The provincial gas tax at the present time offers revenue in the neighbourhood of \$36 million. Any additional monies there, some of it should be directed I feel to the Metropolitan Corporation in order to increase the lane mileage of \$1,750 as it exists at the present time. The \$254,000 grant that was made to the Transit System is only a drop in the bucket. I'm sure that the Minister is also aware that certain suburban routes have been deleted from their service which again will recoup about \$200,000.00. Now this is a step in the right direction but it's a far cry from the possible deficit - even with the increase in fare - from the possible deficit which is going to be placed on the property owners in the year 1970. I would suggest that the figure of 3.6, in that neighbourhood is something that is going to have to be contended with as far as the local ratepayers are concerned.

Also, I am sure that the Minister is very much aware that because of the contribution that is made by the Provincial Government to the Metropolitan Corporation in negotiations on river crossings that the Provincial Government should have some say as to the location, and I bring to mind the construction, or the proposed construction of a river crossing between Fort Garry and St. Vital. The figure for the proposed construction I have not available, but it would appear to me that a concrete approach has to be taken in this area in order that the millions of dollars of private capital that will be injected into that section of the city hopefully will come to fruition and the whole area of Metropolitan Winnipeg as a matter of fact will benefit from it.

Now the Minister has said that southern projects give way to the north. I hope sincerely, and I can appreciate the Minister's position, I hope sincerely that he didn't mean this in total, because I believe he also indicated that people getting killed in the north, on the northern highways, is of paramount importance. I couldn't agree with him more, but as I have brought to the attention of the Minister, in the southern section of the perimeter highway 15 deaths have occurred and I still suggest respectfully, and implore him as a matter of fact, that they take

(MR. HARDY cont'd.) . . . . definite action towards alleviating this problem.

I was very pleased to hear that they are employing Indian labour in the clearing of the new highway. I think it was also indicated by the Member from Birtle-Russell that this is not a first, but I'm very pleased to see that this policy is being carried on.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I haven't any quarrel with the Minister's salary. Quite frankly, I haven't any idea of his incompetence or otherwise, and until such a time as that is proven I will support this resolution. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I had not originally intended to take part in this debate; however, certain things that have been said or certain things that have not been said has compelled me to make a few brief remarks at this time.

First of all, the Minister in introducing these estimates made the statement that since they were the estimates that we had introduced earlier in the year and that they had been thoroughly debated at that time, it wasn't necessary to debate them further. I would have been prepared to accept that until I asked him for a breakdown of the road projects that were contemplated for the constituency of Morris earlier this year, and then much to my dismay I discover that every one of them had been scrapped. Now if this is the case in all other parts of the province, then it's quite obvious that the estimates that we are dealing with are not the ones that were debated this spring. The amounts may be the same, but the road program that had been outlined this spring is not the road program that the Minister is embarking on or the program that he is going ahead with at the present time.

Now the Member for St. Boniface when he made his brief contribution - and I suppose most of us were quite happy to note that it was brief - came to the defence of the Minister and the question of his salary. Now there is no question about questioning the Minister's competence, none of us want to do that at this point, but we recall only too well the degrading episode that took place outside this building a few years ago and the loud and vociferous remarks that he made in connection with Minister's salaries at that time, and the intention was just simply to ask him to put his money where his mouth was.

I see that today the situation has reversed itself and the Minister has given us the answer that we want. He now feels that members of the Cabinet earn the salary, and I agree with him. I have never disagreed with the view that Ministers of the Crown who spend long hours at their desks and at their jobs are worthy of the kind of compensation that will enable them to carry on that responsibility, and in the twelve years or so that I have been an elected representative of the area which I come from, I have seen different governments and I have sat in opposition to different governments and I have sat on the side of governments. There never has been in my mind any question of their integrity, and I am not questioning anybody's integrity today, but I remember some of the remarks that were made by that Minister when he was sitting on this side of the House about the integrity of the Cabinet.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre in his contribution just earlier today - and if that's a sample of the kind of contribution he is going to make to this place he had better sit quiet - again made reference to the integrity of the members of the previous government. Now, we may disagree with him, philosophically we may feel, and as I feel, that some members opposite are somewhat misguided; they may make mistakes; they may make errors of judgment; but I hope that we have heard the last from members opposite about lack of integrity or honesty on the part of cabinet ministers. I am sure my honourable friends are not going to hear it from this side of the House.

But I think that the Minister owes this House an explanation, and I think he owes it to the members of this Chamber to table that list of road projects, the complete list that was tabled in this House this spring, which ones have been scrapped, which ones have been proceeded with and which new ones have been added. I don't see him nodding his head in approval, as I anticipated he would, so now my suspicions are beginning to mount and I am beginning to wonder just what kind of a program the Minister is proceeding with. One would almost get the impression - and I certainly don't want to create the impression here that we are opposed to roads in the north because that's just like being opposed to motherhood in this Chamber. I certainly am not, but surely there must be a system of priorities in road construction that enables all communities to benefit from better communications through roads.

There is going to be a very serious question of rail line abandonment to be considered, and with rail abandonment in many areas better roads will be required. We have communities -

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) . . . . and I can think of one in particular and that was dealt with by the Honourable Member for River Heights and I don't want to go into that - but I want to mention just one community just north of Morris, and incidentally there was a fatal accident there just last weekend, the second one within a month, but according to the Minister people who get killed in the south don't count. It is only the . . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the member to withdraw that statement.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, the Minister said that he was concerned about deaths in the north and the implication was that deaths in the south are not of that great importance.

In that community of Rosenort they've received -- they haven't asked for any particular help from government, they happen to be the kind of people who do things for themselves and who build their own communities. One of the things that they have asked for, and had every reason to hope for, was a road connecting them to Highway No. 75. It was on the roads project for this year and has been scrapped by the Minister. This is just one of the many that my honourable friend the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs will be very unhappy to learn, that the project that was scheduled to connect his community with the perimeter road has been scrapped. I don't know of any other, but I do think this House is entitled to have an explanation from the Minister and that he should be asked to table a complete list of the road projects that he is proceeding with and those that have been scrapped and the new projects that have been added. I hope that before this debate ends - I don't ask for it tonight and I don't ask for it when he replies - but I do think the House is entitled to that information at the earliest opportunity that he's able to provide it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Does someone else wish to speak? Mr. Chairman, after listening to all the speeches that were made up to and until we reached the Member for Swan River, I had made up my mind I was going to be real nice. After listening to his speech I made up my mind I was going to be real nasty. But thinking it over, when you consider that they voted for my salary, this is - you know - this is quite a thing, especially the Member for Lakeside, and really I don't have the heart to be nasty. But I would like to answer some of their criticisms. Some of it was justified; some of it wasn't; some of it was silly. The last member that made the speech there I think he just likes imitating Mr. Diefenbaker, and I really think this is the only reason he ever gets up to make a speech because he wants to give the impression he's a second Diefenbaker.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . . a compliment.

MR. ENNS: There's nothing wrong with the first Diefenbaker, I'll tell you that.

MR. BOROWSKI: That's right. I agree, I think he's a great guy. Anyway, I'm glad you didn't economically defrost me tonight, I need the money. But even if you did, I really don't mind. I have a wife that's working 15 hours a day. If you cut my salary to 98 cents, as they attempted to cut yours, I'm sure I'd still be provided because she's running a store and we'd get by somehow. I'm not here for the money, you know. You could cut it down and I'd still work the 15 hours a day, seven days a week. It doesn't bother me. I don't care about the money.

However, I would like to answer some of the questions. The first question was asked by the Member for Portage la Prairie. He talked about some changes made from the last budget. I think this question was asked by several members and I'd just like to indicate that in the projects that were scrapped, to put some of the members at ease, the first one was - and they are not scrapped, this is a rough term, I prefer the term "deferred" - and the first one that was deferred was the road mix on Highway 312. This is a highway by West Hawk Lake, about a five mile stretch. The traffic count is extremely low, the road's used a few months a year, I believe it's just cottages. I checked the road personally and I will be very frank with you, it's a better road than some of the roads we have to drive on in the north where there's three and four hundred vehicles per day.

The second project that was deferred was Manitou West to top of Valley and this is a 50-50 deferment, because according to my engineer it was put on the estimates that were passed through here but they weren't sure whether they were going to go through with it. But we'll assume, we'll give you the benefit of the doubt and say that we deferred these two projects which are worth about \$350,000.

I'll deal with the three items that are mentioned by some of the members as I go down the line. There's a few other questions I'd like to answer as we go down.

Mention was made about the by-pass from Minnedosa and I've checked with my department.

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) The Member for Portage la Prairie indicated that there may have been some funny business going on. I'm not going -- you know, I think that the government of the day has every right to make that by-pass. You and I may not agree, in fact I'm sure we don't agree it should have went there, they had every legal right to propose a by-pass and to spend the money. They spent the money and I'm certainly not going to argue. I think we can start arguing about the money that's spent from here on in, but this was done and it was done legally so I'm not going to get into the area of trying to suggest that there was some wrongdoing by the previous Minister.

MR. ENNS: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, but would the Minister permit a question at this point? I don't wish to interrupt, but is he implying that any of the funds spent by the Highways Department were spent illegally?

MR. BOROWSKI: Oh no. I think it was a question of priorities.

MR. ENNS: . . . . just clarification, but the answer he gave . . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, it was inferred, or I got the impression it was inferred. I'm simply suggesting if that member and I didn't agree with the priorities, he probably felt the money should have been spent in Portage la Prairie; I felt it should have been spent in Thompson; the Member for Minnedosa felt it should have been spent there and he spent it and he had every right to do it. Things have changed now and we'll change the priorities, and now maybe you may not agree with them, but we have that responsibility and we intend to re-establish or change the priorities if necessary, and if we feel the money should be spent elsewhere we'll do it and you'll have the opportunity when we bring our next budget in to stand up in the House here and criticize. You'll have that right and I'm sure we can stand any criticism you can throw our way.

The Member for Churchill asked about TransAir. Now I think since he asked the question, whether it's proper for me to deal with it as the Minister or not is irrelevant. The question was asked; I'd like to answer it. We in Thompson have complained about the service we've received from TransAir for many years. On Friday, as the member mentioned, we went out. I happened to be sitting beside the door and there was an opening between the door and the decks big enough to stick a hand through, and when we got into Thompson - I wasn't sure whether we'd get in there, this was an old aircraft, four engine job, and it was pretty wobbly, like a drunk - and after circling for awhile we finally got in. We were lucky. We're really in a position where we can complain, but somebody can get up and say, well you've never had an accident in 10 years, and surely if these planes were as unsafe as you indicate they are, there would have been an accident. And of course it's a good argument, except must we wait until there is an accident?

I agree with the Member for Churchill that we are not being properly serviced and the government, the Minister who will get up here from River Heights - or the Member for River Heights who got up and complained, I'd like to ask him what he's ever done in all the time he was in office since 1966. I understand it was in his department. The Chamber of Commerce, the church groups, the union groups have complained bitterly for years about the service; the safety of the plane, the cost and the rest of it, and I'm really amazed that the Member for River Heights should get up here and make a big issue out of it when in fact he was the Minister under whose jurisdiction this very thing fell under and he didn't do a thing. You know, you talked the other day about hypocrisy, or something like that, and you know if you want to use - I don't like using that word because I think it's not a proper word - but if I was the type of person who would use such a word I would say that you were a hypocrite because you didn't do anything about it, and I've never heard you complain publicly, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Honourable Minister whether he has on any occasion discussed this matter either with his Deputy Minister, the Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce, or has he looked on the record in the files that are available in connection with TransAir to determine whether the statement that he just made as a Minister is a responsible statement to have been made on this occasion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I don't think it's up to any member to question a Minister on the basis of the information he has given, especially whether or not he has talked to his Deputy Minister or otherwise, and I would think that is not the proper right of any member to question.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy House Leader may want to protect the Honourable Minister, but I suggest that the Honourable Minister has given a judgment,

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . an opinion, and he's giving that judgment and opinion as a Minister, Now either he knows the facts - he's not in opposition now - he either knows the facts, and if he doesn't know the facts let him determine it, and on the basis of his determination then he can make the statement and make the accusation that he has.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It is not for the honourable member to worry about my duty. My duty here today is acting as House Leader and as such it is my duty to protect the rules of the House. If my interpretation is wrong, then, Mr. Chairman, you have the opportunity to review the correct decision and you are fortunate in having an expert sitting beside you whom you could consult. If I'm wrong, then I should be told I'm wrong and we can proceed. But it's not up to the member to impute motives to me either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member for River Heights is requesting information of an inter-departmental nature, and in view of the context of the debate he does not especially have the right to ask this of the Minister and the Minister of course is not obliged to answer in those terms.

MR. ENNS: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, my deskmate has been called a hypocrite. I think that's the question that he's trying to answer and he wants to know on what basis he was being called that. I take pleasure in rising to the defence of my deskmate.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into debate here because I said initially that we want to get out of here as fast as possible. I think the First Minister had indicated when the House opened that we wanted to be out of here in one month. What have we got left? One week? And at the rate the future leader of the party is going, we're going to be here for one year. You know, he's making speeches on everything that comes up and questioning. I was simply answering a question. You don't have to agree with what I'm saying. The Member for Churchill asked a question and I answered it. You ask a question; I'll answer it. You don't have to agree with the question.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to the Minister of Transportation that I have no reason for delaying the session longer than necessary.

MR. BOROWSKI: May I just say another word on TransAir. We are looking into it. We have talked to TransAir management. We have talked to the other management that's taken it over and I'm hoping - I'm not going to promise anything - I'm hoping as a result of the criticism that's come out in this House and the public interest in it, that maybe TransAir will take another look and realize that they do have a responsibility to the people of the north because this is really what their primary function is, to serve the north, and this is why the rates are 24 percent over. And your Mauro Report, that your government commissioned, has some pretty strong recommendations. I really don't know how you could criticize me for saying these things; it's a fact. And we're going to try and do something about it, lowering the rates and getting better service.

And the rail line abandonment. I think we have already discussed this and answered the questions. -- (Interjection) -- I would like to answer another question -- (Interjection) -- Can I proceed, Mr. Chairman?

The Member for Churchill suggested, I think probably in honest ignorance, that had we put the highway some other way that this Rusty Lake property which Sherritt Gordon is developing would have had the highway next door. The fact of the matter is that when the decision was made by the previous administration to flood the lake, they had re-routed the highway and there was nothing I could do to change that. So whether we went straight to Snow Lake or Flin Flon or Ponton or to Thompson, the distance still would have been 16 miles. I've been in consultation with Sherritt-Gordon - as a matter of fact I talked with their manager today - they're asking us to rush a survey crew to blaze a trail through the 16 miles and they want a tote road in by December so they can get their equipment in and get this new mine operating. The cost, as it's presently negotiated between the company and this government, they're paying the entire cost subject to negotiations. Now I understand the previous administration negotiated an agreement to the Fox Lake road where I believe the company paid 65 percent, the government paid the difference, which to me sounds like a heck of a good deal and I think that if we can do this with other companies this would be a satisfactory arrangement. And on this basis we're going to pursue it. I hope that answers the questions for the Member for Churchill.

The Member for Roblin mentioned something about No. 83. I really don't know why he's so concerned about a number. There's nothing magical about it unless he's a crap shooter.

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) I don't know how your roads are going to be improved by re-naming - you know, if it made any difference to the motoring public by changing names. I have no objection saying all the way to Thompson it's 83, and all the way to Churchill eventually or to Lynn Lake. I really don't see the point in it. It's not going to change anything.

The Member for Emerson mentioned that Highway 201 was scrapped. Well I'd like to inform him - I have again this magic document in front of me - it was scrapped but by your Minister, not me.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I'd like to clarify I did not mention that it was scrapped.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, might I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Transportation that he has the power of resurrection.

MR. BOROWSKI: As a Catholic I'm not sure if I should take that as a compliment. That's considered blasphemy in our church. However, he did mention it and I looked it up in this sheet that was left - as a matter of fact I think this was the only thing that was left in my desk is this schedule - and it shows that this was scrapped indefinitely. Maybe they intended it to go next year; I don't know. But this was done by the previous administration.

The same thing happened to the Member for Morris. He's a very clever fellow. He sent me a note this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, asking me about . . .

A MEMBER: A love note?

MR. BOROWSKI: A love note. I thought it was at the time. He was very nice in it. He asked me about these three projects and I looked it up very quickly and within five minutes he had his answer, and I must give him the same answer. The previous Minister scrapped these projects, not me. -- (Interjection) -- Well, he didn't ask me. He wanted to know if it was scrapped and I said yes. So I hope that answers that question. And I'd like to thank him for the nice things he said about me. The Member for Swan River hurt my feelings.

MR. BILTON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. My feelings were not hurt at all. It was the rude reply that I didn't appreciate.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, I'm glad we both have feelings, Mr. Chairman. He asked about the Indians and putting them into work. Well, there's nothing wrong with this except I might, if I wanted to be nasty, say, where the devil were you the last 11 years? The Indians were still there without work. Suddenly he's concerned about them. But I'm glad that he is . . .

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I don't accept that either. If the honourable gentleman wishes to be nasty, I can be nasty too.

MR. BOROWSKI: You're being very successful, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to tell him, any place where it's humanly possible to use local, especially Indian or Metis labour, I can assure him that it will be used by my department and I'm sure that the other ministers will do likewise. This is going to receive top priority I can assure you.

You mentioned Alex Filuk and I think we should deal with it. You brought it up in here. Whether this is a proper question to be brought up in the question period or not I'm not going to debate, but I'd just like to remind you, Sir, that you people have been in office for many years and it's common knowledge that the Ministers have executive assistants and what have you. I don't recollect that anybody on this side thought this was a terrible crime or this was an item you should get up in the House and try to make political hay out of. If you wanted that question answered, all you had to do was ask me.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I did not ask that question to make political hay out of it. I reiterate it tonight, as I did the other day, that I asked it in the name of the people that elected me, and surely, Sir, that is a fair question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . motives on questions if possible. -- (Interjection) --

MR. BOROWSKI: Coming from a farming area you certainly should understand that. However, I just want to say this because I don't really think that we should get up in the House and start talking politics about executive assistants. We have that right to hire anybody we choose and it shouldn't be open to question. Whether the guy's my brother or your brother, what the devil is the difference?

MR. BILTON: I wasn't talking politics.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well I'm talking about it. The Member for St. Vital was talking about - he's worried that we are going to spend all the money in the north and I'm just wondering if he ever read the Jones report when his government was in office, and the Jones report had some suggestions to make and they were ignored, and I think the government came out

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . eventually and said they were not going to spend a cent. Now we are trying to spend some cents in there and we are being criticized. And he's talking about people getting killed down south on Highway 59 and the Perimeter, and of course I know that. I also know that if that government have spent \$27 million, which they have every legal right to do, but they spent \$27 million on that Perimeter of the taxpayers' money, the northern taxpayers as well as the southern taxpayers, they are still not finished - that's right, they are still not finished, and I have checked, I have taken the liberty to check with my department, how many people were killed and it's not fifteen, it's twelve, but it's not important again, the figure. Even if one was killed we should be concerned. These people were killed when that government was in office. There was only one killed since we took office, so how anybody can get up there and . . . .

MR. HARDY: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the Minister? Are we to assume that that one death is a martyr to the NDP?

MR. BOROWSKI: I didn't hear the question. I think I should ignore it anyway. But, look; I didn't bring this matter. I don't think when you are talking about people dying that it should be used as a basis to bring it up and try and embarrass the other side, whether it is us or you fellows. This was brought up by the Member for St. Vital tonight. The question was asked -- you'll get your chance, Walter. Let me have the floor now. The Member for St. Vital brought this up last week when a person was killed. I took the liberty again of checking with the police and they said that the highway in this case had nothing to do with it. Somebody was driving along and he made a U-turn right in front of another car. The intersection had nothing to do with it. If he'd taken the trouble to check he would have found out that that particular intersection didn't have anything to do with it.

The other accidents, most of them - not all of them - most of them were as a direct result because the highway crosses the Perimeter. It is a bad spot, there's no question about it. Anybody that has driven on it knows this, but what bothers me, Mr. Chairman, is that somebody should get up in this House and try to embarrass someone else because of this. This perimeter has been there since it was opened in 1964 and if people have been dying yearly, nobody was concerned about it on that side; suddenly they are trying to say, "Well you guys are terrible. Why don't you do something?" We intend to do something about it. We intend to, but we can't do it in a month and a half or maybe even in a year. It takes a great deal of money and if we must raise this money we'll have a proposition for you come February or January or whenever the House sits again. We will increase taxes in certain areas to raise enough money to build these overpasses, and obviously the only way you are going to prevent these accidents is by building overpasses which, as you all know, costs a great deal of money. But I hope it's not going to be the practice in this House to get up in the question period and make hay, if I can use that term, because somebody gets killed. That's a terrible thing, to use a person's death to come in here and try and embarrass the government. It's a terrible thing. -- (Interjection) -- Well you guys brought it up -- . . . have to answer.

MR. HARDY: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the Minister?

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, you certainly may.

MR. HARDY: I believe, Sir, that it was your comments in connection with the road death on the highway to Thompson that brought to the attention of this House the fact that apparently your road construction program was going to be based on the number of deaths. My point in bringing this to the Minister's attention was the fact that we have had many unfortunate accidents on the Perimeter Highway, and I can recall a correspondence from the Minister indicating that, I must admit, because of a lack of funds they were not in a position to do this, but it was only at the instigation of the Minister that this was brought into this House.

MR. BOROWSKI: That's fine. I accept that. Let's just be consistent in the future and let's have a little more feeling for the people that die on these roads. Let's not use them to further our political ends.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, will the Minister answer a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, certainly.

MR. HENDERSON: I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Transport, he was quoting the highway programs that had been delayed, shall we say. Did you mention from Manitou to La Riviere?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, my note is here, "Manitou west to top of valley," whatever that is.

MR. HENDERSON: We're referring to the same piece of road, so that's all right. This was withdrawn by you, though; it was not withdrawn by the former Conservative Party, is this not right?

MR. BOROWSKI: Pardon?

MR. HENDERSON: This was withdrawn by you, though. It was not withdrawn by the former Conservative Party.

MR. BOROWSKI: As soon as I got up, Sir, I indicated these were the two projects that I had deferred. Yes. I said that....

MR. HENDERSON: You deferred that.

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes.

MR. HENDERSON: Well that's fine, thanks. That's the answer to my question.

..... Continued on next page.

MR. BOROWSKI: There is one last item I'd just like to deal with. It was brought up by the Member from Morris again when he talked about priorities in the north, and again I have to insist to him that when he talks about priorities surely he is not suggesting he is going to come into the House and establish the priorities. He may again not agree, as the Member from Portage la Prairie and I don't agree to where the priorities should have been for the last 11 years, but I suggest to him that his government never consulted with the opposition when they established their priorities and I can assure him we are not going to break tradition.

The last item I would like to quote, and this is in answer to the question from Birtle-Russell, I believe. I would just like to read a couple of lines here from the Mauro Commission on Northern Transportation. He implied, or suggested that I was not following the Mauro Commission's recommendations because he claims that the Mauro Commission said that air transportation was first and highway was secondary. I would just like to read part of the report: "1. The State must provide a minimum standard of transportation, transport by some mode, on an uninterrupted basis with reasonable frequency at reasonable cost. 2. Air links within the north should be extended in stages, and air facilities and services upgraded. Subsequently, surface transportation in the form of highways should be provided, with the first stage emphasizing winter roads capable of use by vehicles, wheeled vehicles. Railways should be constructed when rail transportation offers unique advantages. 3. The Federal Government's regional air policy 1966 should be extended to provide subsidy to . . . . or local air carriers to maintain an adequate level of service. 4. Air transport charges should be no higher per mile in the north than in the south, and operations and functions of the Manitoba Government Air Service should be reviewed." And I think the suggestion there was that if the TransAir or other air carriers -- now this is my understanding of it or interpretation -- that if necessary that government air services should be introduced in areas where the carriers won't go in, but the point I am trying to make in here, that the emphasis is on highway transportation, whether it's through the bush or regular highways. This is the emphasis throughout the report and I would recommend to the member to read the report which, incidentally, I will be tabling tomorrow, or distributing tomorrow. They will be out of the printers ready for distribution and you can read the thing, and I think you will realize that the emphasis throughout is on highway travel.

MR. GRAHAM: Will the Member permit a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, certainly.

MR. GRAHAM: The Minister. Are you reading from the Mauro Report there? That is the Mauro Report that you are reading?

MR. BOROWSKI: This is a distilled version.

MR. SPIVAK: Just on this one point. I have some comments I would like to make afterwards and I'll wait until the Minister is finished, but is he suggesting that tomorrow he is going to be filing in this House a distilled report or he's going to be filing the printed report?

MR. CHERNIACK: The report was filed some time ago -- tabled some time ago.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes that's right, but my understanding was that the Minister indicated that it would be printed shortly and was going to be sent to the federal officials, and I think we on this side assumed that, having been printed and to be sent to the federal authorities, that we would be getting a copy; that is, a complete copy not a distilled copy.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have only just indicated that the printer indicated to me today that copies are ready and they will be distributed. I did table the original uncorrected version, as you recollect. The corrected printed version, the entire report is now ready and it will be distributed to all the members of the House and to any other interested parties tomorrow.

MR. GRAHAM: Would the Minister permit another question? Who corrected the version then, because the report that he was reading there was not what I read out of the Mauro Report.

MR. BOROWSKI: That's probably the reason. It was uncorrected.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, on this one item, I'd just like to clarify it. The Minister of Transport. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not question period and it is at the discretion of the Minister for him to answer.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, that is true, but on the other hand we are dealing with the items on the estimates and if I'm correct there is no limit on the number of. . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: May I point out that the Minister has the floor and he only yields it on request if he wishes so to do. I am not aware that the Member for River Heights asked for

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.).... permission, and I remind him that only this afternoon he refused permission several times when he was asked for that permission.

MR. SPIVAK: There is a distinction between being heckled and asking a question. Now may I ask the Honourable Minister -- is the Minister finished or not? If he is not finished, then I'll.....

MR. CHERNIACK: .... finished, it would appear to me.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, would the Minister permit a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: I never say no to a lady.

MR. TRUEMAN: Well Mr. Chairman, I'm a little concerned with the fact that the Mauro Report has apparently been corrected. It's my understanding that a report cannot be corrected by anyone except the people who produce it, and if it is now a corrected version of it, then is it the Borowski report?

MR. BOROWSKI: I'm not that vain, I assure you. I think what I probably should have said....

MR. CHAIRMAN: .... in the last half hour or so, I have several times heard the first name or the last name of members of this House, and this is not in keeping with the tradition that members are to be referred to only by their constituencies, and I would ask the members not to refer to other members by their first or last name.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm just as guilty as some other people. I think what I should have said -- when I said "uncorrected", I meant not proofread. Now I'm not sure of the procedure that's followed. I understand when any report comes out it goes to the Queen's Printer. They must have people in there that proofread it and this is really all that was the matter with it. It had to be proofread and then they would put it into book form. This is what happened, so there are no changes. I think I had something else to say, Mr. Chairman, but somebody got me all mixed up and I think I'll sit down now.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is finished, a couple of points just bring me to my feet. I hadn't really counted on having anything to say on these estimates but reference was made to the Minnedosa by-pass and I think there's a bit of misunderstanding between what the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party said and the reply that came from the Minister of Transportation. I think my honourable friend the House Leader was referring to the advisability of the location rather than the advisability of spending the money, and there is a strong, well a big difference of opinion, because I don't think there is any doubt in the mind of the Leader of the Liberal Party about the fact that the money should be spent, but I think that he must have, as a result of the comments that he made he must have inherited the files of the former Member for Gladstone. All I can say is that if he got them, I hope he won't use the rest of them or we'll be here all summer. But many of the statistics that he used were not accurate in that case and I think that if he has looked into it any further he'd probably recognize this himself, so that I think that there is a difference of opinion there and I don't think that the answer was really the correct one.

The other thing that brings me to my feet is really that I think that I have a responsibility and I hadn't recognized it until the Minister of Transportation started talking about the Perimeter, and I suddenly recognized that I have a responsibility on behalf of the Minister of Labour. It's true he never mentioned bringing this up when he left but I am sure he didn't recognize that we would reach this point in the estimates of the Department of Transportation. All I have the responsibility of doing is not voting and being paired with him while he is away on government business and outside the province, which I am happy to be able to do so that he can look after the interests of the people of Manitoba, but just out of tradition, for seven years now the Minister of Labour, the present Minister of Labour, has enquired annually about when the construction of the north east section of the perimeter highway will be undertaken, and while I am looking after his interests and making sure that nothing happens to that government on the other side because he is away looking after our interests, might I ask the Minister of Transportation, on his behalf, when he can go back and tell the people from Transcona that construction will be undertaken on the north east section of the perimeter highway?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Like my honourable friend the Leader of the Official Opposition, I had not meant to re-enter this debate. However, when the Minister gave his explanation of the

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.)... present location of the by-pass around Minnedosa, perhaps he inadvertently made a poor choice of words, but I was not inferring funny business or questioning the legality. I was asking whether in his judgment, of the staff, it was in the proper place, but I can understand his feelings in not wanting to embarrass his staff or even embarrass the previous Minister by not answering that question, so I am willing to let that pass, Mr. Chairman, but I was rather disturbed when the choice of words of "funny business" or the "legality" was connected with my comments.

I am rather happy to see that the Minister has, within a short period of time, changed from a hot-eyed revolutionary into a traditionalist, and I compliment him for that but I hope he doesn't become hidebound in his tradition and he keeps an open mind in his department.

But seriously, I would like to ask this question and I mean it in a serious manner. The words have been used tonight with respect to projects which were discussed and passed in the last House but not proclaimed. Perhaps he could differentiate between the wording "scrapped" for certain projects, some of them in the constituency of Morris, and other projects which were "deferred", and if he could explain that to the House and also if he could cover the whole list of highway projects contemplated in Manitoba by the previous administration and, as we have had mentioned to us many, many times by the front bench on that side of the House, that really this House, the main purpose is only to okay what has transpired in the spring session and not to bring in too much new business. I think at this point in time it's very important that the Minister would go through the whole list of projects which were passed by this House last session by the last Legislature, and explain in detail the changes that have been made, whether by his decision and his administration or by the previous Minister and the previous administration. I believe the people of Manitoba are entitled to know this.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to answer that question to the best of my ability, but first of all I'd like to apologize if I've got the wires crossed. It was not my intention to infer there was anything wrong because I'm sure they had every right to do what they did and it was done quite properly. As I say, we may disagree that it should have been done but they had the legal right to do it and I'm sorry if I misunderstood you.

The other question, you say you want to know, or the public have the right to know, and I'll be very frank with you. Now, these are not my estimates. If I want to know something I have to go to my Deputy and I say, well, what's the score down there or some other place, and he'll tell me and I'll make a notation on this sheet that you received, as every other member received in the House, and the ones that were scrapped -- and I don't know what the reason is. Again the word "scrapped" -- maybe they were deferring them. It doesn't say. They just put a big circle in front of the ones that they are not going ahead with this year. In some instances it could be the weather. We've had a bad year this year and last year, so I'm sure some of these projects were nobody's fault. They were what you call acts of God, and if it's wet you can't work. Some of them may have been deferred for some other reason. I really can't say and I don't really feel that I can get up here and answer these questions. If you or anyone else has specific questions they can come to the office and I'll consult with my staff and give you the answer. I think this is the fairest way to do it. If I use the other approach I'll probably end up making it look like the government had introduced estimates for \$25 million when in fact they had plans of spending only fifteen. I don't want to do this because, you know, I don't have the information.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that anyone here would expect that the Minister's going to be able to stand up tonight and give us a complete breakdown of those projects that have been scrapped, deferred or whatever he wants to call them, but I think the House would appreciate very much if he could give us, at some later date, if he'd give us the undertaking that he would do this at some time during the course of this session; if he would give us the undertaking that he would provide us with the list of those projects that have been deferred and the reasons. And I quite agree with him; I know that in certain parts of the province weather conditions were such that no roads could be proceeded with, and after today there'll probably be a few more that won't be proceeded with, but if he would undertake to give us this assurance that he will provide us with this list, we'll be very happy.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'd be very happy to comply with the wishes of the Member for Morris and I think he's asking for trouble because it's going to reflect -- if it's bad, you know, it could reflect on his own government, but I'll be very happy to do it. As a matter of fact, I'll do it within a week but I think the proper way, not to break the rules of the House, he should

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.)... put in an Order for Return and I'd be very happy to give you that. No, that's fine. It doesn't matter. I can give the information. I have no hesitation in digging up that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. HARDY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I ask this question, not facetiously, because I do feel that it represents 500,000 people in the Province of Manitoba and I also realize that the Minister is under no obligation at this time to make any comment, but is the Minister in a position to make any comments with respect to the Transit deficit?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm not in that position and again, I don't want to be facetious, but I would suggest to the member that just spoke that he is not representing half a million people. There are other members there that are representing some of those people.

MR. HARDY: Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the Minister. I individually do not represent 500,000 people, but I think, as a spokesman for the urban area of Greater Winnipeg, in that context 500,000 people are involved as is the 4.1 million deficit of the Transit Corporation.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Minister, and this is in the uncorrected version of the Mauro Report, may I read to him the summary of the report, and I'll quote: "We envision the extension in stages of air links within the north and an upgrading of air facilities and services. Subsequently, surface transportation in the form of highways will be provided again in stages, with the first stage emphasizing winter roads capable of use by wheeled vehicles. Railways will only be constructed when rail transportation offers unique modal advantages.?"

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 98. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Honourable Minister is intending to answer this or not. I'm afraid - and I think he's presented his estimates so far very well - but I am afraid that his language may have been incorrect when he... because of his own experience, when he used the word "distilled" with reference to the actual report that will be tabled tomorrow. I wonder whether really the report that is going to be tabled tomorrow is the complete report? Well, I think this is important because the statement has already been made and there will not be an occasion if the estimates are passed for this to be debated again, and the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell has made his point and the Honourable Minister of Transportation has answered. Now he's answered from a report which obviously does not contain the same wording.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, the reason I used the word "distilled" is because I come from home-brew country and it's a term that everybody uses. I suppose there's another word for it - extracts or main points or summary - but these points come out of that main report. That report that comes out tomorrow will have everything that's in here plus the report - well, everything that's in here.

MR. SPIVAK: But again, plus the full report. Everything that's in the full report that was tabled. All right, fine. Well, I'd like to, if I may then, ask the Minister another question. This comes really as a result of his remarks on TransAir. I wonder if he could indicate to this House whether he in his capacity as Minister of Transportation has complained to TransAir about the safety of their equipment. Has he made an official complaint on behalf of the people of Manitoba?

Well, Mr. Chairman, it would appear the Minister of Transport is not going to answer. He just made a statement earlier that he in fact had taken up this matter. Now had he taken up this matter as the representative from Thompson, as an individual? Did he take up this matter after he had been appointed to the Ministry, and if he did, then I think he owes an explanation to this House because he has in fact made a charge which, or at least insinuated in his remarks a charge against a company that is a regional carrier, that's pretty serious.

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member for River Heights was informed earlier today that matters relating to air policy, air safety and allied matters would be dealt with by the Department of Industry and Commerce, estimates of that department. The honourable member, I know, is a bouncy drummer boy type of fellow, but he'll have his chance.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the First Minister was out of the House when the Minister of Transportation said that although this matter was in fact within the purview of the Department of Industry and Commerce, he nevertheless was going to answer it and he was going to talk about it and he did. I'm sorry he missed the conversation and I'm sorry that he missed the actual presentation, but in the remarks that were made in this

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)... House, the Minister of Transportation made, or referred to the safety of the planes that were being operated by the regional carrier, and I now have to ask him whether in his capacity as Minister of Transportation - because he obviously had had a discussion, he indicated he had a discussion - he has indicated that there is a feeling that the planes being operated do not comply, or there are some planes that do not comply with the safety regulations of the National Transportation Commission.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, the honourable member knows that the Minister of Transport is well aware of conditions and transport requirements for the north. He will be, as all cabinet colleagues do, be working together with the Minister responsible for this matter of air policy and air safety, and the honourable member can ask all the questions he likes at the appropriate time.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I expect this is the appropriate time because either he made that representation or, if he did not, I would like him at least to make an apology in this House to TransAir, because he owes it to them, about the complaint that he's made of the condition of the planes that he's flown on. Now I think this is fairly serious. I think that he has a responsibility and, as I indicated before, he's not in opposition now; he's the government and he's a Minister, and he's handled himself well, but in this connection I think he's forgotten his place and I think either he has or has not made a representation. If he hasn't, fine; if he has, then I'd be interested in knowing whether that was made in an official capacity.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I don't mind him asking questions but I wish he wouldn't make it a leadership campaign every time he gets up. I answered the question, as you ruddy well know, because I was asked a question. I wasn't reporting on my department. I was asked a question. Whether it's a good question or a bad one, I answered. If you don't like what I said, you don't have to like it. I answered a question. This is something what I had said, that the Chamber of Commerce and the church groups and the unions have been complaining about this for years. If you want to challenge that or if you don't like that, that's your business, but I said this and I stand by it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's not very often I support the Honourable Member for River Heights but I feel that some very derogatory statements have been made about a regional airline that's centred in this province, and we all know that they meet the licensing requirements by the Department of Transport, and for a Minister of the Crown to stand up and, with the press taking notes, to make a derogatory statement about an airline that has pioneered in northern Manitoba and has had to try and work within the capital enterprise framework within private enterprise, to try and make a profit, improve and buy their equipment, I feel he has a valid point, and I don't think the Minister should make irrational statements about a company that are operating within the laws of the country, operating under the Department of Transport. I think that this is something that we shouldn't hear too much of in this House.

MR. BOROWSKI: I would just remind the member that TransAir did not ask him to come in here and defend TransAir. If they disagree with what I say I'm sure we'll all hear from them, and I don't really think it's your job to get up here and defend somebody. Maybe there's something to it. You don't know.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'm not a spokesman for any company in this province but when I hear a statement made by a Minister which I consider to be irresponsible, I consider it a duty of mine to get up and reject that statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me just add one thing. If the Minister feels the way he expressed himself in the House, if this is what his feeling is, and he may very well feel this way, he has an obligation, as the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party indicated, to report this to the federal officials. Certainly I may say to him that during the period of time of the previous administration, at least the time that I was there, if representations had been made to our department and had indicated that in fact there was some danger, we would have felt it incumbent upon ourselves to have in fact made a representation to the proper federal authorities for them to take whatever action they deemed necessary. I may say -- (Interjection) -- yes, good for me. Well, the point is we did not act irresponsibly and make statements inside the House and outside the House about a regional carrier because this is what he believes it to be. Now one of the problems that concerns me about the Honourable Minister of Transportation - and I say that I think he's handled himself very well - but he still has a little bit of opposition

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . . psychology. He still begins to feel that the things that he thought were so are really so. He made certain representations about me when I handled the department. He doesn't even know, he hasn't checked with anybody, but he still believes it to be so, and he's not the only one. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture said the same thing the other night when we talked about the capital estimates, because he still was thinking in opposition of what the Department of Industry and Commerce may have been done to the Department of Agriculture.

Now I suggest the time has come for a certain degree of maturity in this House on the part of the people who are put in the responsibility of acting as Ministers. -- (Interjection) -- No, no. The responsibility is on the part . . .

MR. USKIW: On a point of privilege. Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I want to point out to the honourable member that my statement was very general and that I made reference to the fact that the Department of Industry and Commerce was overbearing insofar as its relations with the other departments were concerned. That was the emphasis of my point and I can substantiate it if my honourable friend wants me to table something on that particular comment.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I hope eventually to get an apology from the Honourable Minister of Agriculture because his statement was not exactly as he represented. But if I may, may I simply suggest to the Honourable Minister of Transportation that with respect to TransAir who is a regional carrier, and whose success a number of people in the north and a number of people in the south are going to be dependent on, whose success as a carrier, they must be encouraged to do all the things that are necessary. A dialogue has to in fact be maintained with them, and certainly suggestions have to be made and given to them, and certainly they should be encouraged - and I say encouraged - to expand their operations so that they can get other viable line routing which will give them the opportunity to be able to finance properly the equipment that's necessary to meet the needs and to be able to satisfy some of the requirements in the Mauro Report, and this will not come about by what the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party referred to as irrational statements which we've had exhibited today. Now I'm sorry this may appear as a reprimand but I think it's very important. I'm sorry about that but it's very important in recognition that there has to be some degree of maturity and responsibility in this area.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should have risen earlier again. I hesitate to do so, but if the honourable member persists in carrying on this way I think it will be necessary to ask you for a ruling whether it is really in order for the honourable member to persist in discussing matters that come under the Department of Industry and Commerce when in fact the estimates of the Department of Transport are before us. I'm quite prepared to make some statements about TransAir myself at the appropriate time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just might say in passing that I feel that the debate that has gone on was of a fairly wide latitude, and since it has been allowed up to now I don't feel that there's any useful purpose at the moment to attempt to roll it back.

I might also point out to members that we have a rule, No. 37, which talks about persistence and repetition, and there has been a great deal of repetition just recently on a particular point and I would ask members to attempt to move on and continue the debate.

The Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, going back to the perimeter highway again without repeating, I think that a great deal has been done over the years, not just in 1964 but since. But the point that I think comes out of it is that the problem persists, and what we want to ensure is that there are continued sums of money put into it to add the protective devices that will help cut down on the problem on the perimeter highway. I'm not even sure that the perimeter is the worst stretch of road in the Greater Winnipeg area. It's certainly very bad and I would certainly hope that the Minister will give this his particular attention because I think he'll find out if he enquires from the Highways Department that when they compare it with the Metro statistics that this stretch is probably the worst that there is in the general area. It's not a case of nothing being done. They do keep changing it and trying to get around the problem, the costly problem of divided intersections which will add millions, and if in the interim period there are devices that can be used, better lights and so on, it would certainly be a help.

The other point I wanted to make is that one of the major problems in the Metro area

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . is river and rail crossings that the Minister will have to become involved in because the province does pay for 50 percent of these and the recommendations will undoubtedly come to him from the Metropolitan Corporation with their priorities. There are considerations though that the province does have to take into account, and I think particularly in respect of hospitals which come under the jurisdiction of a provincial agency, and I think that these should be taken into account when the Minister or the government is setting its priorities in conjunction with their discussions with Metro. I think you may find that if the crossing of the C.P.R. tracks is embarked upon, which is a very major expenditure, at some future time, that the General Hospital will in fact become much more accessible to the northern reaches of Greater Winnipeg and this may in fact help serve some of the demand that has mounted in northern Winnipeg for a hospital facility, but with the General Hospital being by far our largest and most capable hospital unit, and with the economies in hospitals indicating to the direction of very large units, that it may in fact be a joint decision between the Transportation and Health in this regard, and I think this is one of the advantages in the provincial government actually having some involvement in the road program in the Metro area.

Now at the same time I have to support the plea of the Member for St. Vital with regard to the bridge between St. Vital and Fort Garry. As you know, we have a new hospital going up in Fort Garry, the Victoria Hospital on Pembina Highway, which would be accessible to St. Vital if a bridge were in fact put across between St. Vital and Fort Garry. It would also service the university, which must now use the access via the perimeter highway which is several miles south of the university. But thinking particularly in respect of health facilities, the bridge in south St. Vital is a must as this city grows, and particularly for that reason, and it is one of the considerations that the city government, the Metropolitan government is not likely to be completely aware of because of their non-involvement in this sort of demand.

So I would ask the Minister to give this his very strong consideration. The former government was in favour in fact and indicated to the Metropolitan government that they felt that the south St. Vital bridge between St. Vital and Fort Garry was a priority. I think again the priority probably was moved back by the Metropolitan council when they found that they had to go ahead in all practical terms with the bridges they were in trouble with, the Maryland Bridge and the interchange on Pembina Highway, but in terms of priorities which the Provincial Government has to think about, in terms of hospitals and some long-term planning at the university, I think that there was no question that the bridge between St. Vital and Fort Garry has to take a top priority and I would recommend that to him for his future consideration.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification I would like to say that I think we have a rather unique situation here tonight in that we have the estimates of the Department of Transport to present to this House for the first time in my knowledge without an accompanying road building program. The Honourable the Minister has indicated tonight that some of the roads that are being deferred or emasculated, or what is the word that has been bandied around here - castrated? - I would like to know if there are other areas in the program that are being eliminated from the road building program this year. The Honourable the Member from Morris has indicated that we could possibly wait for a few days for this program, but we are now discussing the estimates, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister of Transport and I think that in all fairness that we should have a road program, a road building program before us so that we know what is happening in our respective constituencies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just a few brief comments that I would like to make at this time. On previous occasions I have asked the government in connection with traffic counts and the Honourable Minister stated that these would be disclosed and I thanked him for it too, because I think in the past this was something that we as members of the opposition always asked for and were turned down. This is in my opinion a good indicator as to where the roads should be built. If you have a heavy traffic count, I think that is where you should have good roads and good highways, so that if these traffic counts are available I certainly would appreciate getting them from the department. If it is necessary for us to make an Order for Return we can do that, although if the Minister would volunteer the information I think it would be appreciated by members on this side of the House.

Perhaps some members might argue that this would not always hold true, that where you have good roads that that's where the highways should be built, and sometimes if you do not have a road at all, how are you going to get a traffic count? How are you going to establish the need in that particular area? So there might be a question in this respect. But we were

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . . told earlier that the perimeter highway had cost something like 27 or 28 million dollars, and sometimes I question stretches of that perimeter road. The stretch between Highway No. 75 and No. 1 Highway, I think if a traffic count has been held, I don't think there is too much traffic on that stretch and I think some monies of that type could have been spent to much better advantage in other places, in other areas of this province. Therefore, I would certainly appreciate getting information along this line as to traffic counts, and if this information can be made available to us without having to file an Order for Return, I certainly would appreciate it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, let me just indicate to the member who spoke that traffic counts are available. All you have to do is to phone our Portage Avenue office and if you want a traffic count, as an MLA or as a Mayor or a Councillor, they are available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just two specific questions of the Minister. I have the feeling that we will be passing through the specific portions of the estimates after we get off this, so I may be out of order in asking for them at this time. But I note that the estimates for highway buildings and storage yards and acquisition and re-construction stand as they stood under our administration, namely a pretty hefty rise from some \$266,000 to some \$535,000, which I understood, at least it was our intention to make major improvements to maintenance facilities in Dauphin, Brandon and in the Winnipeg area. Could the Minister indicate which areas are under construction or which are his priorities. They of course may not be the same as the previous administration, but I note the amount is still standing so I assume that this capital construction, this improvement to the physical plan of the Highways Department will still continue.

Then one other item, to get off the air business and down to a more physical means of transport, namely the ferry service. We do have ferries in the Province of Manitoba and I note that the cost of the ferry service in Manitoba is going down, and if nothing else that's one thing that should be appreciated, that there is something that goes down in this day and age from some \$60,000 to \$50,000. I suspect that that is the discontinuance of the ferry service that operated on the Lake Winnipeg Narrows. Could the Minister indicate to us - I am trying to go by memory - is it the one sole ferry that we have operating to Hecla Island that accounts for the remainder of the \$50,000, and if we can take heart with what the Minister of Tourism and Recreation indicated the other day that development plans are proceeding at Hecla Island, then this ferry too will be redundant. Can he give us any time scheduling on that?

The two questions: the highway buildings, the maintenance yard facilities which are in progress, and the question of the ferry service.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, the member is breaking his word again. He promised not to question me, knowing that it was the old estimates, and really I am not in a position to answer your question. All I can say to you on garage building, any funds that are allocated, to my knowledge they are going ahead. That's all I can tell you, and I think if you have any specific questions you could ask me and I'll ask my staff and I can get you an answer. You know, we have a \$50 million budget and we could stand here for six months answering questions which I simply have to go and get some place else. I just can't give them to you, but as I have indicated, to my knowledge these things are going ahead unless they were scrapped, as I say, or deferred by the previous minister, which I don't know.

On the ferry, I think the ferry was taken out that you mentioned on the Narrows and there is a new bridge there now. As a matter of fact, on touring the highways last weekend I drove through and it's a lovely bridge. They have done a very nice job on it. The ferry was taken out and we are using it, I believe the same ferry, on the Churchill River to build the Lynn Lake-Thompson Highway. All the equipment and food and men are coming through Churchill River to build that highway from Lynn Lake to Thompson. I think there are three ferries, with that one there are three ferries operating in Manitoba.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I accept the Minister's statement, although I suggest that he does or must realize then that if we are not to get the information, relatively simple information on specific questions to which I would hope that he would avail himself from his departmental sources, that this has to then by fact prolong the daily question period or other things for these kinds of information. Now at the same time we would like to abide by the rules of asking questions of more urgent matters during that period, but if we cannot get specific questions answered during the estimates then of course that is what we have to

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . avail ourselves of. I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that I am sure that the members of his staff would be more than happy to brief him on the estimates, even though they are our estimates, so that he is in a position in fact to answer these questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to ask the Honourable Minister - not in the form of a question - I asked him about the Metro Transit report earlier in the session and I am sure he has had the opportunity to study it by now. The problem, one of the major problems in the Winnipeg area that I am sure that he will be having to look at very soon, as far as the Greater Winnipeg area is concerned, as you know Portage Avenue is the only major artery from downtown Winnipeg into the western part of the city. Ellice Avenue stops at the airport; Sargent Avenue stops at the airport; all of the roads north of there have to get to the airport. I know that in the Metro Transit report they have an east-west highway planned which will service from downtown Winnipeg right through to the western part of the city, and there has been talk in this House in the past while about Boeing, and most of you know that they are considering the western part of our city, and I am sure that this has been one of the considerations that has been discussed, which is transportation into this area.

I have referred to the Metro beltway in my first speech and I assure the Minister there is one part of that beltway you can build anywhere else but through that park, I will absolutely agree with you, but I would say that the east-west transportation system in the Greater Winnipeg area which runs through the whole area is in real need, and when he is discussing this with Metro I hope he puts it into one of the first considerations.

MR. BOROWSKI: I would indicate to the last speaker that I have got about two dozen reports which I should read and I will read as soon as we get out of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolutions 98 and 99 were passed.) Resolution 100. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Perhaps the Minister could tell us if his Party, or he himself, is contemplating the changing of the method of constructing highways and other works in our province. What I am thinking about now, is he thinking of going into provincial road crews to build highways and roads and bridges or is he going to go with what has been the custom and the practice in the past, to contract work out to private enterprise people?

MR. BOROWSKI: It's a matter of policy as I am sure the honourable member knows. If we decide at some future time to change it, it will be announced in the House or out of the House.

MR. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Then the House can take it that there is no change contemplated at the present time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 100 -- passed; 101 -- The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): When I first spoke on the Minister's salary I perhaps - I can't recall now whether I did mention the use of the breathalyzer - is there any plans to put this into force in the near future? I directed a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs - no, the Attorney-General, pardon me. So it is in force now I know, but is it being spread all across the province, the use of it, or is it confined to the Winnipeg area? I understand that it hasn't been proclaimed at the federal level. Is the province ready to proceed? Does it have the equipment? Are they training people in the various . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: If your question is are we for the breathalyzer and whether -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: This comes properly under the Attorney-General's estimates and I hope he has the answers when you ask him.

MR. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Well, I accept that and will wait for that department to come up. But will this be operated under the Motor Vehicle Branch or will it be operated under the Attorney-General's department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolutions 101 and 102 were passed.) That completes the Department of Transportation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the next item is that of Tourism and Recreation and the Minister who will be rising to his feet for the first time on this matter has a brief statement and he'd like to make it tonight before we adjourn - I mean an introduction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Tourism and Recreation, Page 25 of the estimates.

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.) . . . . Resolution 92 1 (a). The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, I'm indeed honoured to have the position as Minister of the Department of Tourism and Recreation. I consider this department one of the most interesting of all the departments of government and it will be a great challenge to meet the demands that must be made in formulating and implementing different departmental programs in tourism, in parks and also in community recreation.

The challenge to be met is especially great, because each of these fields is one that has experienced, and is still experiencing, tremendous increases in public demands for the services provided. Not only does this department provide for the recreational well-being of the citizens of this province, but within the programs of the Tourist Branch is the responsibility for the development of an industry that is already significantly important to the economy of Manitoba and is growing substantially yearly.

I should like to acknowledge the excellent co-operation and assistance that has been given to me since taking office by the Deputy Minister of the department, Mr. Guy Moore, and all of the other departmental personnel.

This year we have had what I might call an old-fashioned summer, at least since the early summer rains declined, and this has meant that our provincial park system has had unprecedented use, both by tourists and Manitobans alike. There is no question, Mr. Chairman, that we require new parks and extended park facilities to meet the increasing demands on park use. Unfortunately, good parks cannot be developed and operated without considerable costs and therefore we are forced to pace our developments. However, as I announced recently to the House, one new additional provincial park has been established at Hecla Island and Manitoba's centennial year, which is 1970, will see the official opening of two other provincial parks, namely the Spruce Woods Provincial Park and the Asessippi Provincial Park. Naturally, none of these three parks will be fully completed in all respects for some years to come, but limited use of initial facilities will be possible.

This good summer weather has brought also a new record total of tourist visitors to this province and I'm pleased to report that DBS figures for the month of July show Manitoba is up 22 percent on long-term traffic over last year. Now this figure does not include Canadian traffic. These tourists bring with them important dollars into the economy of the Province of Manitoba. We intend to put forth every effort to see that during Manitoba's centennial year that tourist business will again take a significant jump because of the added attraction of centennial celebrations and special events, and I would like to call upon all the citizens of this province to band together to encourage and welcome tourists from all over the world to help us celebrate our 100th anniversary.

The Community Recreation Branch of this department has been deeply involved in the organization and development of summer games as it has been in fostering other fitness and sports activities, and indeed many other forms of recreation at the community level. With the general increase in leisure time, the provision of adequate recreational pastime activities is becoming more important yearly and it is my department's intention to assist communities in gearing up to meet the added needs of community recreation.

As the estimates presented now, Mr. Chairman, for this department are identical to those presented during the last session of the House, I do not propose to go into them in further detail at this time.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I will make every effort to give the department the kind of leadership and direction that will result in the operation of successful programs in all of the department areas in which this department has responsibility.

MR. CHERNIACK: Committee rise and report, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the committee has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

MR. DOERN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that the Report of the committee be received.

September 4, 1969

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 10:00 o'clock Friday morning.