

*The Budget—Mr. Deachman*

area, has been hampered by struggles between competing railways, competing industries and competing governments. In a submission to the province of British Columbia and local governments and railways, the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board recently protested such struggles in these words:

• (5:20 p.m.)

If the operating railways are not willing or are not able to co-operate to bring about this integrated rail service network on a joint basis, then immediate government action at all levels should be undertaken to institute a terminal rail system in the lower mainland.

The government of British Columbia and the government of Canada each operates a harbours board of its own that fights for possession and jurisdiction of the new superport at Roberts Bank. The C.P.R. and the C.N.R. have carved the inner harbour of Vancouver into two unco-ordinated and competing jurisdictions. The port of Vancouver development committee, which was established to give some guidance to harbour development, often finds itself on the outside looking at major transportation changes of which it had no knowledge, such as the Second Narrows railway bridge now nearing completion.

The National Harbours Board is too far removed from the scene to give strong direction and administration to the port of Vancouver and the other transportation facilities of the lower mainland. A complete overhaul of the National Harbours Board is long overdue. In the minds of many who are concerned about this problem such an overhaul should include the establishment of a crown corporation to run Canadian harbours with an autonomous western region capable of giving regional and local planning and administration.

I do not want to dwell at length on the transportation problem today. Let me say, however, that we need federal answers to a number of problems. What is to be the ultimate fate of the inner harbour of Vancouver? Is it to be a container port or will the great container cranes go to Roberts Bank? What is to be done to give the port more grain storage to take some of the stress off the rail system? What is the future of New Westminster harbour, caught between the conflicting ambitions of the inner port and Roberts Bank? What will be done to rationalize the conflicting federal and provincial jurisdictions and

[Mr. Deachman.]

the conflicting ambitions of the five railway companies that serve the lower mainland and the ports?

Still on the subject of transportation, let me mention a subject that greatly interests Albertans and British Columbians. On June 5 the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) told the house that a subcommittee of the United States House of Representatives will be in Calgary on June 19 to discuss with businessmen and local officials the paving of the Alaska highway. This highway comes under the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing). Formerly it was under the armed forces. It is not a provincial highway. For years westerners have urged the federal government to undertake an annual paving and improvement program for this highway. To head off local pressure, the government had two surveys undertaken, one by the Stanford Research Institute which indicated the route would not be very economical and another by the Department of Public Works which showed that the engineering would be costly and difficult.

If Sir John A. Macdonald had bought a couple of surveys like that he could have proved beyond doubt that the C.P.R. should never have been built. I ask hon. members, whether or not they are familiar with this problem, how can we possibly lose by building, maintaining and improving a highway which connects two provinces with the territories and Alaska, which connects Canada with the United States and in addition opens up a vast new area that constantly turns up new mineral resources? So I ask the government in its consideration of objectives to look toward the idea of a paving program for the Alaska highway in order that we may accomplish this task rather than beg the United States to do something for us which, if we do it ourselves, can only benefit us greatly.

When we bargain with the United States authorities on matters concerning Alaska and transportation between Washington and Alaska we should always bear in mind that area of Alaska, the Panhandle, which denies access to the sea to Canadian developers in northern British Columbia and the Yukon Territory. Any development which would benefit Alaska and Washington should have connected with it from the Canadian side negotiations for access to the sea through the Alaskan Panhandle.

In closing I should like to leave a thought with the minister concerning the mining