

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, July 8, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Morris.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have addressed a question to the Minister of Agriculture, I notice he's not in the House; I wonder if I may direct it to the First Minister. That is, the Minister of Agriculture indicated to the House yesterday that he would be attending a meeting in Montreal next week some time. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate the date of that meeting and who will be represented. I'm particularly interested in knowing if there will be a representative of the Marketing trade, or the processing trade, along with the Minister on that meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding, that the Producing and Marketing groups involved will be represented. I can't give the honourable member the exact date - 12th of July? 12th of July, I am told. I can check further and confirm that with my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if I may ask, will the Minister be in the House this evening so I can question him further on this. I think it's a very critical situation that has developed and I wonder if the Minister could make himself available tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, either that or as I say, I can make very specific enquiries and try to answer my honourable friend's question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address my question to the First Minister also and ask him has he received any requests for assistance from the Municipalities of Rosedale or Westbourne or Lansdowne; has he or The Minister of Agriculture, I'll state it this way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, approximately two weeks ago I did receive verbal reports of very rough estimates of anticipated damages to municipal structures, municipal public works, and at the time it was intended that this would be followed up with a more specific list of estimates in the various municipalities affected by the flood, by the excessive rainfall, and I really couldn't say at this time whether or not the Department of Municipal Affairs or Mines and Resources has received any such formal submission yet. But the Ministers will check on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): I'm assuming we are on the Oral Question period?

MR. SPEAKER: We are.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Finance can indicate the date on which the instructions were given to the Provincial Auditors to commence special audit of the Manitoba Development Corporation with respect to The Pas project.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I will take that as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to Municipal Affairs, maybe I'll transfer it to the Honourable First Minister.

I'm wondering, are the automobiles that are insured if they are in collision with a uninsured vehicle covered by the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund for the period between now and the first of November.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's expected that a legal opinion be given and that really is tantamount to asking for a legal opinion. But may I say in layman's terms that it is my understanding that the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund continues in force at least until the coming into force of the Insurance Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I see the Honourable Member for Rhineland here. I wonder if you can call Bill 89.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Bill which? -- 89. 89 is at the top of Page 4. Proposed motion of the honourable member. Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, last night we advanced this bill twice and I adjourned it so that I could peruse its contents. I noted that the bill provides, I imagine, to keep the books open till the 20th day of April 1972. I imagine this is customary so that all accounts can be transferred that need to be transferred. I find, too, in looking at the bills there are certain transfers that will and can be made from certain accounts so that they need not lapse even after March 31st of next year. This certainly applies to the matter of the provincial garage and the highway program, certain aspects of it, \$22 million, and a portion of the provincial trunk highways coming under the FRED program. This means that these moneys, these allocations will not lapse. However, in other cases they do lapse after the year end and if moneys are not expended this is naturally a surplus then and will be reported as such.

However, we never receive, actually, an accounting of just what accounts were under-expended at the year end. I think we would like to have a sheet showing us the various items that were under-expended. We do pass supplementary estimates or supplementary allocations in case they were insufficient. These come to our attention. Then I take it under a certain section of the bill it also says that those items that lapse shall be written off. I imagine this applies to all of the moneys where lapse has occurred.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, it contains the various items that we passed in estimates and on the final page of the bill there is an amount of \$9,842,000 under General Statutory Appropriations. I take it these are from Hydro and Telephone, credits from, maybe the Minister could explain this particular item when he closes debate.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing else to comment - letting the bill proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'll be closing debate, Mr. Speaker. Generally speaking, the Member for Rhineland made the kind of speech that I would have made had I been asked to explain the bill. He shows a knowledge of the contents of the bill and that's part of his experience. He asked one specific question on the general statutory appropriations. These are the ones which are in the Estimates but on which no vote is required because they're statutory which is payment of debt and the legislative portion, the indemnities, wherever it is indicated as statutory in the Estimates; but in the main I think it is the debt payments under Finance Page -? -- it'll be the debt payments in Finance on Page 25 of the Estimates and it'll probably be the indemnities under the Legislative Assembly Act and although I haven't added it up I would guess that I'd come awfully close to that as being the total. As to any other items, we can deal with them as we move into committee, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, as soon as you call the vote I will be moving that we go into committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Youth and Education, by leave, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bill No. 89, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the Province, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 89 - Sections 1 to 4(3) were read section by section and passed.) The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Just one correction here. In this particular section it reads "that the current expenditure appropriation account for purposes similar to those described in appropriation mentioned Subsection 1. When we talk about similar, this applies to the particular department or is it just on the particular vote?"

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Refers to the vote, I believe, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill 89 was read section by section and passed.) Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS - Cont'd.

BILL NO. 89 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Could you call Bill 51, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Brandon West had been speaking on this early this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, just before the break at noon I had dealt with the point which I felt was a rather important one in this bill and that was that the Board had been relieved of a necessity of providing a written judgment in all cases except those on which appeals were to be filed and I think it should be a matter of serious consideration that the written should be the basis and the important document upon which decisions would be by applicants on whether or not they would appeal the decision made by the Board. So I feel this is perhaps a serious shortcoming of the amendment to the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act as it is now presented to us.

The other point which concerns me and is one on which I am given to understand there is some need for serious thought is that this bill and its intent is leading away from rather than toward uniformity with other provinces in respect to Criminal Injuries' compensation. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that we all agree there's no particular merit in conformity just for the sake of sameness, but in the matter of law there undoubtedly is some merit in having our legislation fairly close to the legislation of other provinces. We have adopted this principle and we have discussed it as an important principle in respect to the amendments to the Securities Act which are being made this session. So I think this needs to be considered and while I admittedly have no specifics in this matter, I am given to understand that there is tendency, if this bill is passed in its present form, to move away from rather than towards the bills and the legislation of other provinces. In this respect there has also been some indication by the Federal Government that there were possibly some grants to be made to the provinces by the Federal Government which would be dependent upon Criminal Injuries' compensation legislation in the provinces, and I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if there isn't some danger that these grants might be affected by changes which would take our legislation farther away from rather than toward the legislation passed and now in effect in other provinces of Canada. I think this is a matter which the Attorney-General should consider and make sure that if grants are likely to be provided that nothing in the proposed amendments will weaken rather than support our case for consideration.

So, in summary, Mr. Speaker, it's commendable that the Attorney-General is attempting to save the setting up of another board and thus to save the taxpayers of Manitoba some additional expense by combining the administration of this Act with that of the Workmen's Compensation Board. I think we support this; but in doing this he may have introduced some possible weaknesses here that may in a sense counterbalance the effectiveness of his proposals; and if my interpretation is correct and he is reducing the umbrella of financial protection that was

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) contemplated by the original act rather than increasing it, then I think we're going in a direction which would not be as generally supported as in the previous instance.

These are the points, Mr. Speaker, that I see as worthy of additional explanation, and I'm sure the Attorney-General in his summation will deal with them.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Call Bill 36, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Morris, The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Member for River Heights, the Leader of our Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the motion for a six months' hoist as an opportunity for the second occasion to debate this matter. My remarks to a large extent are addressed to the First Minister; I'm sorry that he's absent, because it becomes relevant to relate his explanation and his support for the bill. Mr. Speaker, we waited for approximately ten days for the First Minister to stand up in the House and to make his contribution. I had hoped that the 35 questions that have been posed by myself to the government would have been answered by him. He saw fit not to answer it but to deal in a general way with the principles of the bill and I would like to, if I may, deal with his remarks.

The Premier's speech represents a continuation of a great NDP tradition, and that tradition is the habitual rationalization of decrees that have been previously made. The reason decrees have to be rationalized is because they lack original validity and it is very obvious from the Premier's remarks that we now have government by good intention. The Premier's speech does not answer questions that were raised on June 22nd, and at that time I raised 35 questions of both detail and of principle, and I laid particular emphasis on the matters of the detail and the 35 questions were posed because the government's evasiveness and inconsistency in this House and in the hearings or meetings that were held prior to the calling of this session dealing with the matter of details, revealed what I suggest is both the weakness and the confusion of its principles.

The government's principles require exploration because essentially the NDP, as in Autopac, have bought a bill of goods which it hardly understands and is perfectly willing to sell it to the people of Manitoba at an exorbitant cost. In that sense, Mr. Speaker, the government is a wholesaler of empty reforms. In fact, its policy is political usury, because it lends false hope or a heavy price in taxes. Mr. Speaker, the Premier in many respects is a Pled Piper who is leading us down to a road to oblivion. Now I had hoped -- I didn't expect, but I'd hoped that there would be some satisfactory answers to the questions that were posed; the Premier has indicated that there may in fact be some information furnished, but I'm going to try and confine my initial remarks to the matter of principle.

First, I want to refute the Premier's allegations and representation that our Party ignored the fundamental questions of principles in regard to Bill 36. In terms of principle the fundamental question which must be answered is what are the very basic, human, economic and social problems which the present structure of municipal government is not solving, and by which an improved form of government could solve; and only when this question is answered can we really establish or appreciate an approach to reform. I attempted in my presentation the other day to indicate that I recognize that there were real areas in which there was concern, in which it was necessary to examine the objectives, because we knew that it is only in land use control and the confusion that exists in planning, in the basic whole impossibility of getting things done in the Greater Winnipeg area, in the reality of equitable taxation, in the problems of our core area, that there were problems, and that they were not necessarily being solved under the present manner in which the structure was operating. But the question that has to be posed, Mr. Speaker, is whether in fact what the government is proposing is in fact the best solution. Is it the most direct solution; is it the least costly solution; and was it possible through the two-tier system of government, which the First Minister seems to reject, is it possible that through the two-tier system of government a solution could be found?

Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has rejected the principle of reform on the basis

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) of an amendment to the present structure that now exists in Greater Winnipeg, and I'd like to take a few minutes to explore the principles which he advocated when he spoke in this House. From his remarks I think we can establish three principles of which his program of reform has come about. First, Mr. Speaker, Bill 36 represents a scientific advance of such incredible value that we as dutiful Manitobans are morally obliged to accept it unconditionally. Secondly, as a result of the Premier's remarks, we can determine that we are now at a unique point in time where Bill 36 is absolutely necessary and essential. And thirdly, for anyone to call Bill 36 amalgamation on the basis of what the Premier has suggested is preposterous and even sinful.

Now let's examine the first principle. I believe that the Premier, a few days ago, suggested that a certain dispute has been carried on since mankind first squabbled on earth. He said that this dispute was between the urban centralizers and the urban decentralizers, and he suggests that this dispute has been settled by the perfect synthesis of Bill 36. He implied that the novelty and uniqueness to be found in Bill 36 represented indisputable proof of the ingenuity of mankind. Now, Swift presented many remarkable examples of human ingenuity in Gulliver's Travels, but none of them surpassed Bill 36 in wit or in voluminous distinction. The Premier wasn't satisfied with saying that Bill 36 was a scientific accomplishment of unprecedented importance. He also revealed it, at least to him, was a morally uplifting document of immense spiritual value. Bill 36 has certainly renewed the Premier's faith in human nature, and we find an example of this renaissance in his speech the other night. You know, the Premier told us that our municipal politicians acting within the framework of Bill 36 would make Greater Winnipeg a Utopia. He suggested that their prudent surveillance would smooth the transition process; that their wisdom would resolve in an ideal system of service distribution and that their conscientious scrutiny would keep taxes down. On the other hand, he also said it need not necessarily add to the cost because the decision will be made in the wisdom by the people who will determine whether they're going to enrich the services or not. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the same bad boys, because they're going to be the same bad boys who have been acting in the past, and they are going to be making that decision. -- (Interjection) -- No, after. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, the municipal politicians whom he is prepared to allow to handle the immense responsibility and who will create this Utopia are the same very people who are the vested interests and who have refused to listen in the drafting of the bill; and when we get into the Law Amendments, these are the same municipal politicians who are going to be objecting to many of these particular aspects of the bill, and particularly to the staging of it; and running office because this is the only political structure that they're going to be able to do it. And they're no different, by the way, they're no different at all to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources . . . in that sense. Now, I attribute the Premier's sudden change of attitude, that is his change of attitude with respect to our municipal politicians, his sudden generosity really to the spiritual powers of Bill 36. I'm not so cynical as to suggest that the Premier already has doubts about what I have referred to as the Pentagon system that they are establishing for Greater Winnipeg and is already trying to pin the blame for possible failure on the municipal politicians themselves.

Now the second principle which the Premier seems to rely on and which was expressed in his remarks the other night, was the urgency of urban reform, and he advanced this problem in a very different way. Unlike other members of his party who are accustomed to cry gloom and doom about the future of our city, our Premier adopted the scientific approach. He said that it had been ten years since changes had occurred in Greater Winnipeg governmental structure. In fact, he told us they were now in the 11th year without change. What's more, he said, carrying his logic to its irresistible conclusion, "if we wait much longer we will soon be in our 12th year." This is a very persuasive and rational argument. I even think that I can trace the intricate mental process by which this argument was advanced and developed. The Premier probably said to himself, I and only I am the Premier, but if I wish to remain the Premier I shall have to prove that I am at least as well educated and intelligent as the Member from Inkster. I will therefore devise a formula which proves that Metropolitan Winnipeg needs Bill 36. So we have before us this precise mathematical formula, and it works; for as sure as 11 follows 10 and 12 follows 11, we need Bill 36, each and every clause of Bill 36, and no one but the Premier could have proved it to us so cleverly.

Now I come to the Premier's third principle of urban reform, the question of labels. After a little thought, I've come to the conclusion that it is the Premier's prerogative to deny

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) that the NDP urban policy represents total amalgamation. After all he said the other night, he admitted that he had made no effort to gain knowledge by examining conditions elsewhere. It was then that he dismissed possible investigation by saying, "we did not care nor to my knowledge did we enquire." So it really doesn't matter what the Premier calls his urban plan, since everything he said indicated he knows little and cares less. But perhaps I was not being altogether just when I accused the Premier of being unaware of the probable implications of the NDP urban policy, because I'm sure he knows all he has to know, and he can sum up all his knowledge in one phrase - Bill 36.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the 35 questions that have been addressed to the members opposite are questions that the government should answer. There is absolutely no justification or reason why the people of Manitoba and the people of Greater Winnipeg should buy this proposition without having relevant information furnished to them, and relevant information with respect to costs. To suggest that the government is not capable of putting together forecasts of what costs will occur, if in fact there is equalization of services, there is equalization of taxation in the years to come, is incorrect. That information could be furnished and would be a basis on which judgment could be given, because it's not the question of reform for reform sake; what we are talking about is a change which will be a change that will be undertaken at a minimum cost to make our situation work better. I have suggested, and members on the opposite side have suggested that had the government considered the possibility of changing our present two-tier system that it was capable of working.

The Premier has suggested that our position in Greater Winnipeg is untenable, and really, Mr. Speaker, this is an exaggeration of the first order; to suggest that our present situation is untenable is ridiculous; to suggest that we need reform is not. We are in a period of time of fast change and there is no doubt of the requirement and the necessity for government leadership to be given. The planning procedures under which Metro and the municipalities and cities work was wrong; it has held up the development of the Greater Winnipeg area, there's no question; but there was capability of being able to devise a system which could have worked, a system which could in fact allow both land use and development to occur without having to go through the maze. It was possible to have reformed the present system, I suggest, in a way which would have been less costly; and, Mr. Speaker, there was an obligation on the part of the government to furnish this information, to in fact present it to the Legislature so that we could at least make some determination and not have to be in a position of guessing as to what's going to happen.

The Premier suggests that there's nothing impossible about the timing of the legislation, and he suggests that in fact we basically can hold still. Mr. Speaker, my recommendation and suggestion that the opportunity be given, and we are going to give that opportunity, for those people who have been involved in the administrative end of it, of the various cities and in turn the municipal politicians who have been involved in it, to come forward at the committee to present their point of view, and we will wait to hear their opinion as to whether the staging can be completed in the time that is being proposed. There seems to be an unnecessary rush because it's based on the proposition that the situation today is untenable. And if in fact this proposal is going to work; and if in fact, as I've indicated in the House, there are some 250 amendments that have been suggested to the government already that should be brought before the committee for its consideration, then we require, Mr. Speaker, the kind of serious examination that must be given to ensure that the proposal will in fact work and will not be just a matter of introducing something that will cause great confusion. Because, Mr. Speaker, the bad boys of the past are still going to be in control; and, Mr. Speaker, the basic fault of the proposal is that the power has been given to the bureaucratic machine in such a wide manner that depending on their skill, depending on their insight and capability, so will the proposal either fall or carry on and be better than what we have today.

So, Mr. Speaker, we reject the government's proposition on the basis that it has been proposed without any information as to cost, that it was not necessary as a reform measure to bring this kind of dramatic experiment to Manitoba and to Greater Winnipeg; that in turn its proposal is attempting to accomplish in a short period of time something that requires intense study and we will await, because we recognize the government's majority will carry this through, we will await the opportunity for the government to first answer the 35 questions that have been posed to them; and secondly, to hear the representations at Law Amendments and then to deal with the sections clause by clause. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the government

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) is not prepared to answer the 35 questions, is not prepared to give us the information, they cannot expect the Opposition to in fact pass this bill, nor can they logically expect the people of Greater Winnipeg to buy something without knowing the cost. They attempted that in Auto Insurance and in spite of what the Minister of Municipal Affairs has said the other day, they have proposed something which will cost the vast majority of people in Greater Winnipeg more than it was costing them previously. And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest as well that they are proposing the same thing in this particular piece of legislation and they cannot expect the members on this side or the people to buy it on that basis.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I thought the Honourable Minister of Labour was going to ask a question but if he wishes to speak I'd like to ask a few questions, if I may. At the early part of the speech of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition he purported to be quoting the Premier and I'm wondering if he actually will vouch for those quotations as being quotations of the Premier's speech; I mean the beginning portion, of the flight of fantasy, that's one question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I interpreted much of what the Premier said, I think I quoted him specifically, I've taken it from the notes that I've had. I believe that the information I have furnished in this House is correct; and in the event that I have quoted him particularly incorrect, I will be prepared to in fact make that correction when the Hansard comes forward. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that most of what I've indicated has been my interpretation of what I believe the Premier stated.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's an acceptable explanation. Next question, Mr. Speaker, is whether the honourable member has indicated that he is prepared to vote in favour of the bill going to committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to vote in favour of the bill going to committee. I indicated that I recognize the government has a majority and we're going to go to committee because the government obviously is going to propose it. But, Mr. Speaker, at the present time the questions that have been posed by the members opposite have not been answered, there realistically has been a reluctance on the part of the government to discuss details, the manner in which principle has been discussed I suggest is a frivolous way in which the Premier has tried to support his position, and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, for that reason, there is no justification on our part to be able to support or be asked to support something which has not been properly presented and supported by the opposite members on either principle . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe the Honourable Leader of the Opposition did answer the question; he was starting to debate the question as well. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: The third, and I believe my final question, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member indicated at the very first community meeting that was held back in January of this year in River Heights, indicated I think to the meeting and to me, that the Conservative Party had a plan to propose in connection with the reform necessary, and I'm wondering whether he has actually proposed such a plan in any way that I could have been made aware of it?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy that the Honourable Minister of Finance has recalled that particular incident and recalled the question that was asked of me by him. At the time, I asked him for particulars of information which were not given then and have not been given since. He indicated to me "what was your answer?" "What would you have?" If I can recall, my words were a quotation of what he had said to the group earlier and I simply quoted his words.

Mr. Speaker, it was my belief that the government would live up to its legal obligation and hold hearings on the Local Government Boundaries District report. After all, Mr. Speaker, they are supposed to uphold the law, and the truth of the matter is that the section in the Act which indicates that there should be hearings has not in fact been carried out and they have flouted the law and continue to flout it and have not in any way introduced an amendment or a bill that would in fact revoke their obligation for that hearing. -- (Interjection) -- I am answering the question. I also on other occasions, Mr. Speaker, have indicated that it was my opinion that the proposal of the Local Government Boundaries district plus the proposal of the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) government, and the proposal of the municipal people should be brought forward for an opportunity for a public review, at which time a basic bank of information would be furnished in which the cost implications of every proposal would in fact be determined. And I suggested, Mr. Speaker, that if that occurred a judgment then could be arrived at which would in fact allow a competent decision to be made based on fact and not just wishful thinking. And, Mr. Speaker, the whole object of that was to listen to the people for that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is again debating the question. Order, please. I should like to indicate to all honourable members, including the ones who are questioning, that questions should relate to what was in the contents of the debate. I was remiss in allowing the question and in allowing the answer and it's just an indication of what does occur if honourable members do not follow the rules. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I feel that it's incumbent on me as a member of this Assembly, and also a member of the Assembly that has had considerable experience in both the legislative field here and also in the administration of a municipality. I might say too that I regret very much that the Honourable Member for River Heights did not answer the question posed by my colleague the Minister of Finance, and instead in his usual, normal, typical manner went off on another tangent into orbit. It could well be, Mr. Speaker, that due to his attendance at Peter Pan last night, that Pete the Piper of River Heights is trying to duplicate the fine theatrical performance that was given at the stadium . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm certain the Honourable Minister of Labour would not want to cast reflection upon any honourable member in this Chamber by describing anything to him. I'm certain he'll choose his words with care as he usually can and does. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I assure you, other than cast any reflections on my honourable friend I was complimenting him, and if I'm out of context in doing that, then will you please forgive me. — (Interjection) — What did my mumbling friend say? — (Interjection) — Yes, I know, but some of us get in order at least occasionally and I doubt whether I can say that of my honourable friend the Member for River Heights. My honourable friend — and that is stretching it — has raised the question of a matter of 35 questions posed by him. Others have posed questions in this Assembly and outside of it in the past but don't think that they got divine right because they pose them they must of necessity be answered. And, of course, it is typical of my honourable friend that because he asked questions that by right, divine or otherwise, they should be answered.

Now the question before us, Mr. Speaker, and the resolution before us at the present time deals with the whole attitude of the Official Opposition to this bill. They request by their amendment that the bill be not now read but read six months hence, which of course means the effective killing of the bill, and that is the attitude of my honourable friends opposite. They will use any gimmick within their capability to kill this bill and have amply demonstrated it. Reference is made from time to time by members opposite because the recommendations of the commission, Boundaries Commission, have not been adhered to.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I happen to have been a member of this Assembly in 1960 when we dealt with the matter of the establishment of Metropolitan Government for the Greater Winnipeg area, and at that time the Conservative Party in Manitoba had one whom I consider is a very capable leader. I'll make no comparison or give you an expression of my opinion as to the situation prevailing today insofar as leadership is concerned. But Mr. Roblin when he was introducing the bill in 1960 dealing with the Metropolitan Corporation had this to say: First of all that we should develop a central planning authority for this metropolitan area that would be charged with the responsibility of providing a unified development plan for this large urban area. And that is the purport of the bill that we're discussing today, a unified development in the Greater Winnipeg area. And then Mr. Roblin went on to considerable detail, and in respect of recommendations of Commissions he had this to say: "Now I am free to admit that the exact details of the solution which has been adopted in the present bill differ in some particular from the recommendations of the Commission and differ in some important particulars. The views were expressed as far as those who thought that there should be a minimum of reorganization, perhaps placing a few powers in commission would be the solution; those people on the other side ranging all the way over on the other to those who believe that nothing less than

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) full scale 100 percent amalgamation of this Metropolitan area was the thing to do." This was the approach of the then capable leader of the Conservative Party. Mr. Roblin went further on to say that on all sides there were arguments that had to be respected, and I suggest that this should be the proper approach of the Opposition, as indeed that was the approach of the Opposition of the day in 1960. Mr. Roblin then went on to say that "We trust, Sir, that there will be an orderly development, an orderly development to those services that will proceed as a Metropolitan Council feels it is able so to do." This, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is a very important feature of the bill that is before you; that as the unified or unitary council decides what it shall do within the Metropolitan area, then it shall be done. Not imposed under Bill 36 but permissive legislation to bring about orderly unified extensions insofar as Greater Winnipeg or whatever name the Corporation is going to be called.

Then Mr. Roblin said further, "In other words, we acknowledge that this is experimental; we acknowledge that when this particular plan is put into operation we are going to find things out that no one things about at this moment." And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, there was provision in 1960 for a review after five years and further review after that again. And the result of those reviews, we have the proposition before us that we have at the present time.

The then leader of the Conservative Party in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, had a reasonable approach to the problems with which we are going to be confronted. No -- (Interjection) -- that's right. At that time I will admit to my honourable friend, at that time the Conservative Party had a knowledgeable leader, and I can't say the same today. I can't say the same today.

Now much ado, Mr. Speaker, has been made by members opposite of the relationships between urban and rural Manitoba in respect to the development of the Greater Winnipeg area. And I would like to quote in order that the record is straight, some of the remarks of the then leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. D.L. Campbell, -- (Interjection) -- Who is he? He was Leader of the Official Opposition in 1960, a former Premier, that friends opposite like on occasion to suit them to quote Ryan and . . . And while I frankly admit that in every instance I did not agree with Mr. Campbell, I did agree with his approach then, Mr. Speaker, regarding the relationship of the urban area of Greater Winnipeg and rural Manitoba, and I would like particularly the rural members of the Conservative Party who have time after time stood up and criticized the present plan because of the relationship between urban and rural Manitoba and the cost factor.

I would like to read to them the remarks of the former Liberal Premier of Manitoba and the then Leader of the Official Opposition. He first of all described the bill for Metropolitan Winnipeg, "a very important measure." He said: "Well I think, Mr. Speaker, that it will be, probably by the time that this bill is being finally dealt with, that statement will be considered as the understatement of the session, because I think we will not only potentially, but actually that this is one of the most important bills to come before this House in its whole history. And because of its importance, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is entitled - as the Honourable the First Minister, a Conservative Premier, suggests - to our very best consideration, to be considered in a non-partisan and non-sectional way and to have our very best careful consideration so that whatever the final disposition is that we get, all of us will benefit of our advice on this extremely important Act. It is important, Mr. Speaker," said Mr. Campbell, "not only to one-half of the population of the Province of Manitoba which it affects direct, but it is important to the whole province because I, as a rural member and one who has always been so considered, am happy with another opportunity to pay tribute to the fact that Manitoba is one province where the rural part of this province prospers or meets with adversity in direct relationship to the situation in Greater Winnipeg."

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Campbell was perfectly correct at that time, and I heartily endorse what he said and recommend it for the consideration of the rural members of the Conservative Party who are doing their utmost in all of their pronouncements made so far in this House to bring about a divided Manitoba rather than a unified Manitoba, and this has been the tenor and direction of the honourable members opposite.

Then Mr. Campbell went on to say - and I heartily recommend this too, particularly to the Member for Roblin - "We are interdependent on one another, and I think that anyone who has the interests of the Province of Manitoba at heart, whether he be rural or urban representative, must recognize the fact that anything that's of great importance to the other of those important areas is also of importance to the other as well." And the whole approach, the whole attitude on Bill 36 has been rejection, rejection, rejection, because of divisiveness

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) between urban and rural Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we did have a responsible Leader of Opposition in 1960 and this was the approach that he made at that particular time. And I recommend, particularly to the Honourable the Member for Lakeside who came so close to being the Leader of the Official Opposition, that he talk it over with the man who so narrowly defeated him. He might have made it if this session had been held prior to the leadership convention of the Conservative Party. As a matter of fact, I'm not a betting man but I would have bet that the Honourable the Member for Lakeside would have come through with flying colours as the Leader of the Conservative Party. -- (Interjection) -- No politics, of course not.

And that's what I'm asking my honourable friend from Swan River, to forget about his politics and work in the interests of Manitoba, and as Mr. Campbell said in 1960, from the quotes that I've just made from Hansard, that one is reliant on the other and unless one goes along with the other Manitoba will be divided. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it could well be that Swan River is the best constituency, and I ask my honourable friend the Member for Swan River if he would make it an even better one by recognizing the problems that we have in the Greater Winnipeg area and give us credit for an endeavour to solve those differences. -- (Interjection) -- Sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Would the Minister be willing to give the same weight to the judgment of Mr. Campbell on the Hydro controversy as he does on other matters?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do not see that the question is relevant to the debate we're having. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think possibly you are right but I anticipated the question of my honourable friend, and if he will recall my remarks at the offset, I said that at times I did disagree and still do disagree with the former Premier, then Honourable D. L. Campbell, but in this he was so right that I felt that it was worthwhile for me to give the benefit of his wisdom in 1960 to my friends, even the present representative for Portage la Prairie, and I enjoin my honourable friend to take the advice of that great Liberal and work for the unification of Manitoba and support the efforts of this government in Bill 36. Maybe some day, too, some other member in this Assembly will quote him and what he said on behalf of all of Manitoba from the Hansard of today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what brought about Metro? Metro was brought about because the municipal men, myself included at that particular time, had found over the years that there was need for unified approaches in the field of municipal government and that only through some system of a metropolitan type of government would this be possible. I recall sitting on the Board of the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District - there were only about four or five municipalities of the then 18 or 19 municipalities that controlled the Sanitary District of Greater Winnipeg. At that particular time in the Greater Winnipeg Water District there was only a very few as well. Everyone was going their own way and having to beg the then corporation, the Water District, and the Water District almost had to get down on their knees to allow extensions within their respective municipalities to provide services. And we recognized that. The same dealt with the matters of planning, of zoning, and as a result of experience the Metropolitan Corporation evolved and became a fact.

But in becoming a fact, Mr. Speaker, it was recognized in 1960, very very much so, that it was necessary to review from time to time the direction of Metro. And it is true that there was a commission, another commission - I believe about the sixth since I became a member of this House - to investigate and look into the problems of Metropolitan Winnipeg. And they did make their recommendations, but just as Mr. Roblin said in 1960, we did not adhere to those recommendations but deviated from them. And so is this bill a deviation from most of the recommendations of the Smellie Commission.

We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, some quarters, and some municipal men are concerned with the loss of identity. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the concern is only because of the loss of a name, it's fallacious and it's not founded on fact. I recall when Ellen Fairclough, the Postmaster General of Canada, brought in zoning regulations, or established zones throughout the Greater Winnipeg area and in other areas. As then the representative of the City of Transcona, we appealed to her to allow an option between Zone 25 Winnipeg and Zone 25 Transcona in order that the identity should continue. It was granted, and under this, just as it was

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) granted then, is the option. No one will ever lose identity of the City of Transcona or of Brooklands or of Assiniboia or of Fort Garry. These are inherent to people. Surely there will be divisions and boundary changes for representation on a larger council. No one will ever forget St. Boniface. Its history will be continued in the new area.

I can imagine, and I do not charge all municipal men at the present time with this, Mr. Speaker, I can imagine many municipal men would not want to lose their positions in their communities. This, too, is historic. I recall at the time we went into the unitary school divisions and we abolished by legislation in this House many of the school boards and school districts. There was a hue and cry at that particular time but we don't hear it today because it's become a fact of life.

My honourable friend the Member for Souris-Killarney the other day, with almost tears in his eyes, pleaded with me as the sponsor of a bill to establish the City of Transcona to reject the contention under this bill of the possible loss of identity of Transcona. Well I welcome this bill as a long-time resident of Transcona, a former mayor of the City of Transcona, a former school trustee of the City of Transcona and representative in this House for that area since 1953. No one will ever be able to sweep Transcona or the name of Transcona under the rug in any legislation. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Just a generation or two?

Mr. Speaker, I've had the opportunity since coming into this House of being a co-partner in establishing of four cities as the result of my representation in the area - the City of St. Vital, the City of East Kildonan, the City of West Kildonan and the City of Transcona. They are all alive and they will remain alive while anyone is alive in the Province of Manitoba, and I suggest that it's absolute poppycock to try and place obstacles before the further development of this area into a proper unitary system of government by raising red herrings - and this is what my honourable friends opposite are doing.

The outstanding spokesman, the outstanding advocate in opposition to this bill has neither had experience on school boards, on municipal councils, and he's still wet behind the ears insofar as the conduct of business in this House is concerned. His main objective in every utterance that he makes is contrary to the principles that were laid down by the former Premier, Conservative Premier and Leader of the Party, that we should approach this on a non-partisan and not a political basis. Mr. Speaker, I hope the day will come - my days may be getting numbered, but I hope the day does come when the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition realizes that there's more to be accomplished in this Assembly by a non-political and a reasonable approach, and I enjoin him to join in this forward step for the Greater Winnipeg area in the interests of Manitoba than being politically parochial as he has been ever since the bill was introduced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Well, Mr. Speaker, we've just witnessed a remarkable conversion. We've just witnessed a conversion that in the words of better debaters and parliamentary statesmen than I would be described as running a very close second, if not superseding the change that came over Paul on the road to Damascus. The Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, has the unmitigated gall, and that's all it can be called, to try to pull the wool over the eyes of many of us who were not in this Chamber a few years ago when he was here on the other side of the question on which he stands today, and also on the other side of the House unfortunately, but on the other side of the question on which he stands today, regardless of how he voted.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour obviously has a great penchant for history, or at least he displays a great penchant for history this afternoon. He's dipping into the past pulling out quotable plums, quotable quotes from certain speeches made by certain distinguished Manitobans, among them one in particular, Mr. D.L. Campbell, towards whom he seems to take a somewhat ambivalent attitude when it comes to respect for that individual's views. It all depends on the question of course and it all depends on whose northern lake or playground area is being gored and being pillaged.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has spent some time rambling through the records of speeches made on this question, particularly by Mr. Campbell, and obliquely referring at least to comments made by some of his colleagues, erstwhile members of the Liberal Party now sitting on the government benches, in particular the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. He also quoted at length Mr. Duff Roblin and offered some substantial praise of Mr. Roblin's

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) qualifications as a leader and as a commentator on this particular question, Metropolitan government amalgamation, amalgamation as opposed to different individual municipal entities working within a kind of Metro umbrella that we've had these past few years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is what the Honourable Minister of Labour had to say on or about the same time as Mr. Campbell said the things to which the Minister has referred and on or about the same time as Mr. Roblin made the statements to which the Minister of Labour referred. Mr. Speaker, in a newspaper excerpt that I have here in front of me, the Minister of Labour in the present government, who at that time was House Leader of the old CCF Party, backed the principle of Metro according to this particular newspaper report but he was undecided about amalgamation. And the story says this, "that CCF House Leader Russ Paulley, while backing a principle of Metro, was undecided about amalgamation. His main criticism of the plan was that the government will retain too much power."

He goes on - or this particular story, Mr. Speaker, goes on to say that "Larry Desjardins, Liberal, St. Boniface," -- (interjection) -- way back when, "also saw the bill as opening the door to amalgamation and he compared it to 'an anaesthetic before an operation'. He saw good points in Metro for some municipalities, but he said St. Boniface should not be forced into the new level of government. Mr. Desjardins added his support to a request made Wednesday by Liberal Leader, D.L. Campbell, that Winnipeg voters should be allowed to vote on Metro." -- (Interjection) -- He said that.

Mr. Speaker, these excursions into history are intriguing to say the least. The vote on Metro government when it finally came to Greater Winnipeg was 47 to 6, Mr. Speaker; the margin was 47 to 6 in favour of Metropolitan government, and newspaper accounts of that day and that date have this to say: "Opposition Leader Douglas Campbell kicks off debate on the bill's third reading by once again stating that he would be for Metro government if it first was approved by a public vote. It was a drastic move, he said, and not many people realize this super level of government will be able to bring in huge expenditures without approval of the electors." He asked the government to stand the bill over and consider sending it to the people.

"Mr. Desjardins, the only non-rural member to vote against Metro, renewed his attack that the average citizen didn't know what was at stake and that it would be bad for St. Boniface." Quoting Mr. Desjardins: "I oppose it now more than ever because I consider an attempt has been made to politically bribe the citizens of St. Boniface." Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there was an ominous forecast contained in that statement, one of which the Member for St. Boniface probably had no idea at the time, but it turned out that perhaps it was an especially prescient remark; perhaps it was an especially revealing glimpse into the future.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to what the Minister of Labour had to say a few moments ago about where Mr. Campbell and others in the Legislature at that time stood on the vote and on the issue of metropolitan government, it might be worth pointing out also, since we're dealing in history, that of the six votes against Metro at that time, the line-up included Mr. Campbell, Mr. Desjardins, and three members of the day who are not members of this present Legislature, and Mr. Froese, Social Credit, Rhineland. The other three were Edmond Prefontaine, Liberal, Carillon; John Tanchak, Liberal, Emerson; and Ed Dow, Liberal, Turtle Mountain. So the six included Mr. Desjardins and Mr. Campbell. So much, Mr. Speaker, for what the Minister of Labour had to say about where Mr. Campbell stood on this question of metropolitan government and amalgamation.

The Minister of Labour said also that the Conservative Leader of the day, Mr. Roblin, had a reasonable approach to this question. And this really, Mr. Speaker, is all we're asking from this government, from the leaders of the province of this day, a reasonable approach to a reasonable question about a reasonable estimate of what this is going to cost citizens of this area. All we're trying to get from them, Mr. Speaker, is a reasonable costing estimate so that the people of this area know what they're confronted with in terms of taxation. If that's an unreasonable request and an unparliamentary request, then we all have strange ideas indeed, Mr. Speaker, about what Legislatures and Parliaments are supposed to do. We're supposed to be here to determine the raising and the spending of the public purse. That's what we're here for, to inspect the government's plan for raising revenues for that person, for the dispensing, the expenditure of those revenues.

The basic fundamental commitment and responsibility that we face as members is the one that's implicit and incorporated in our question about cost. All we're doing is asking our

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) basic question as legislators; all we're doing is asking for the fundamental information that we were sent here to obtain; what is it going to cost the people of this area, of this province, urban and rural. It's hardly unreasonable or unparliamentary to pursue that professional parliamentary approach, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, and all the protestations and all the excursions into history by the Minister of Labour and others cannot distort or cloud or hide that fact, that our arguments, our case on this question is simple, basic, fundamental parliamentary politics: What is it going to cost? What is it going to cost?

-- (Interjection) -- Yes, I'll permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): You say that Mr. Roblin had a reasonable approach. When he brought in Metro, did he tell the people of Manitoba or the members of this House who were sent here to find out just that, how much Metro would cost?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it was the Minister of Labour. Although I subscribe to it, it was the Minister of Labour who said that Mr. Roblin had a reasonable approach and it was the Minister of Labour I was quoting, but I subscribe to the Minister of Labour's statement and his assessment. The fact is however that my understanding of the situation is that at no time was Mr. Roblin or were his colleagues of the day asked to estimate or predict or project the cost of Metro, but we have asked from the outset what the costs of this plan are going to be. We've made it perfectly clear . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate our Rule 40 says: "When a member is speaking, no member shall interrupt him except to raise a point of order or of privilege." It hasn't altered. I should also like to suggest that the honourable member addressing himself to the Assembly should address his remarks to the Chair and probably that'll cause a lot less heat. The Honourable Member from Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While we're on the subject of history and just before getting away from it, I would like to make reference to one other aspect of these reports during the time of the Metro debates, Mr. Speaker. This has to do with the fear expressed by the Minister of Labour, then Leader of the CCF Party, that taxes would rise drastically and very unfavourably if a Metro or amalgamation plan were introduced. And this particular newspaper report from which I quoted earlier has this to say in describing the events in the Legislature in the debate of that day, and it's referring to the position taken by the Minister of Labour, by the now Minister of Labour. "In his riding of Transcona, about one-half the assessment is exempt now. If his assumption was correct, taxes would be doubled under Metro. Lawyers have told him this interpretation could be made." Well, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and he voted for it. He voted for it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it may be possible for the Minister of Labour to regard in a light vein such a drastic increase in taxation, in local, individual taxation at a doubling, as a 100 percent increase; we on our side for our part don't consider that the kind of increase in taxation burden for homeowners and property owners that can be regarded lightly and dismissed lightly, and this is all we've asked from the beginning of this debate. From the first excursions into the urban and suburban hinterlands by the Minister of Finance and others who have spent the winter trying to sell this plan to the people of this area, this is all we've asked, what is it going to cost - at least a reasonable projection.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Finance on a point of order?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that it is proper for the honourable member to refer to his own constituency as the hinterlands, and I object on that basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Did the Speaker make a ruling as to whether or not that constituted a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't rule because I didn't see any point. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was a ridiculous interjection, beneath the usual parliamentary suavity of the Finance Minister.

Mr. Speaker, this government in addition to studiously avoiding and evading any estimate at cost or any attempt to answer the public's concern about cost is being intellectually dishonest, Sir, when it tries to saddle us with the nine-city plan. This is not intellectual

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) honesty. We have never said at any time that we endorsed and embraced the nine-city plan proposed under the different alternatives offered by the Local Government Boundaries Commission. All we have said is that we believe that the statute which set up the Local Government Boundaries Commission and gave it its terms of reference for operation should be observed in the full, and that includes the holding of public hearings into the recommendations of that commission. There may be some in our caucus who favour three cities; there may be some who favour five or six or seven; there may be some who favour nine, but we have never said that we proposed and intend to adhere to the nine-city proposition, which is the kind of position that the government has attempted from the outset to tag us with, is the kind of position from the outset that they've attempted to label the Conservative Party with, and, Sir, it is not accurate, fair or honest. All we've asked for is adherence to the statutes and a hearing, or a series of hearings into the recommendations of that commission and its work.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I can't avoid reference to the speech of the First Minister on Tuesday night on Bill 36. It was a speech that disappointed me enormously. I normally find that the First Minister has significant things to say and reasonably interesting ways in which to say them, and I rather had looked forward to what he was going to say on this particular legislation, but it was obvious from the outset, Mr. Speaker, that it was a speech that he didn't write, that it was a speech that he didn't like, and that it was a speech that he delivered without conviction.

There has been some sniping at my leader during this session over a purported practice of relying too much on his speech writers. From time to time one or two members on the opposite side of the House have suggested to him that he was being misled by his speech writers, that he was better on his own rather than relying on them. Well let me say, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of the speech that the First Minister gave on Tuesday night on Bill 36, he should fire his speech writer and plead his own case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. There is to be no inference that speeches are being written for any member of this House. As members well know, one of the rules is that members are not to read speeches except to follow their notes closely, and on that basis I would suggest the Honourable Member for Fort Garry withdraw the inference that he is suggesting. I ruled on that yesterday. Possibly he didn't hear me then. I'm certain he's listening to me now. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I respect your admonition. I must say though that I was terribly disappointed in the presentations made on that occasion, because it didn't seem to me really that the First Minister brought any more than a kind of an academic conviction to the side of the argument that is being presented by his colleagues. It hasn't struck me that he has brought any deep feeling sense of conviction or ambition about the kinds of values that this legislation can have for the people of this area or indeed the people of the province; and it was that aspect of it that struck me.

Mr. Speaker, the main thing about this legislation really is that most of the people in the planning division of Metro with whom one has opportunity to come into contact and with whom one has opportunity to discuss this proposed legislation, are against it; privately they are against it. They may not be prepared to stand up and say publicly that they are against this kind of plan, but those in the engineering areas and the engineering phase and divisions, engineering divisional end of the Metropolitan Corporation are, in my opinion, privately opposed to this legislation. They believe it will lead to nothing but chaos, they are not, for many reasons, most of which are known best only to themselves, either in a position to or prepared to make public statements against it.

Now the Minister laughs, the Minister of Finance laughs because he's in a position where he never hears the true expression of the true feelings of many people who are going to be affected by this legislation - and he can't expect to hear it, he can't expect to hear it. He is in a position where he constitutes something of a Czar, something of a superauthority on this legislation, and he'll have a great deal to say about its implementation and about those who work in different areas of the superadministration; he'll have a great deal to say about it. He is a powerful man because of his position as the Minister responsible for piloting this legislation through, and it's only normal and natural, I suggest, that many people whose jobs are threatened are somewhat unwilling to take their cases to him on an eyeball to eyeball basis. But they take their cases to many of us who do not sit in that seat of the mighty occupied by the Minister of Finance; and I can tell him, laugh as he will - and it's very similar to a

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) situation in business to which I've referred many times where individual businessmen and enterprisers have left this province because of the taxation levels here, it's very similar to that; they don't stand up and say it to the Minister; why should they? There's too much at stake to say it to the Minister, but they say it to their friends and they say it to their members; they say it to the members -- yes, even after they go, because there still are interests which they must be careful of and interests which and whom they must protect. They're not about to engage in a vendetta with the Minister of Finance or anybody else in this administration, but in their heart of hearts this is the reason that many of them are leaving. That has nothing to do with this particular legislation, but I'm drawing the analogy, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister of Finance laughs about the effect that his proposal and his legislation in this province have had on the economy of this province, and it ill behooves him to laugh about it, it ill behooves him to laugh about it; and I'm saying now that what he's doing here on this one-city legislation strikes as much anxiety into as many hearts, perhaps different hearts, they're not in a position though to take their case to him and object openly and without fear of loss of their jobs or at least compromising themselves, but they do express their fears and their anxieties to those of us who are not in the position occupied by the Minister.

I can tell him if he had any opportunity at all to have his ear to the ground and to have his ear to the voice of the people at the level of those who just work in the administration and engineering end of Metro and the administrative areas of the Metropolitan area in general he would be getting this message. But he is not able to get the message from them because they don't feel they're in a position to express those fears and anxieties to him. I can tell him that those with whom I have talked and many of my colleagues have talked in Metro's Engineering Division and in that area of Metropolitan government, are extremely concerned about the chaotic effects that this legislation will have. They see it as being inapplicable and unworkable, they see it as creating a jungle that cannot be straightened out not only in the time available but in the foreseeable future. But, Mr. Speaker, they're human, they have jobs at stake. There are going to be jobs under the new administration that many of them would like to have an opportunity to apply for, to be considered for and they are not in a position to jeopardize those chances, so they do not speak out in the way they speak privately to their own individual friends or to individuals in this Chamber who are ordinary private members.

The message loud and clear from the majority of them with whom I've talked is that there is no possible result of this kind of legislation other than total chaos for the foreseeable future in the Metropolitan area. They have had the practical experience of administering and following through the administrative programs of running a metropolitan area of a half million people and they know the difficult and different and varied tangles of detail and technicality involved and they insist, they insist that it is impossible to superimpose at the speed with which this government proposes to do it, the kind of monolithic administration on this area that is contained in Bill 36. This is really the most compelling argument at this stage of the debate to me for going slow on this legislation. Originally my objection was that philosophically the legislation is intended to serve the political interests of the government. I conceded long ago to myself and to many others that the battle against Bill 36 is lost within this Chamber because the government is committed philosophically to the kind of super-city administration which they think, perhaps incorrectly, which they think will best serve their political position. When there's a political interest like that involved, they're not likely to be deterred by anything we say.

But now having made that argument and having come to the conclusion that it's falling on deaf ears, I concern myself now with the positions of the individual people working for Metro who have expressed to me their deep concern over the unworkability of this plan and I would hope that their message somehow can get through the ears and the hearts of private members on the government side and reach the Minister of Finance. Obviously it hasn't reached him up to this point. Hopefully, through private members on the government side it still may do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Honourable Member? Did the persons with whom he discussed this, the people from the Metro administrative staff, inform him that the Minister of Youth and Education and I met with them, eyeball to eyeball, over a full evening's meeting discussing the implications and that we discussed them to the extent where at the end of the meeting there seemed to be general satisfaction with the explanations given in relation to their work and the feasibility of the plan? Was he informed of that meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: No, they did not tell me that, Mr. Speaker, but that would not necessarily be their fault. I didn't press them on that kind of a question. They talked to me about their conviction that chaos will result. Whether or not they've had lengthy meetings with the Minister at the level to which he refers I don't know. They didn't tell me and I didn't ask them.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too wish to make some comments in connection with Bill 36, the City of Greater Winnipeg Act. I have not so far made my views known although members may have drawn an assumption as to what they could be. Certainly the bill before us deals with the matter of a new political structure for the Greater Winnipeg area and I think this is the big concern, this is the important part at the present time. Naturally, the other parts of the bill, the administrative sections and so on are important too, but these can always be amended and changed and no doubt will be. However, the matter of the political structure probably will not be changed for some time again and therefore it is important that we concern ourselves especially with this particular matter.

I still have yet to know who asked for legislation of this type as is contained in this bill. Certainly the Boundaries Commission that was set up some years ago which cost the people of this province in Manitoba many thousands of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars, is being ignored in my opinion because their recommendations certainly are not what is contained in this bill in connection with the structure, and therefore, --(Interjection)-- I think I'll have some comments to make on - yes, because I'll be coming to that very shortly. I feel that if we're going to spend that much money certainly, either they should have been called to quit long before this and not have them continue. Why did this government continue to employ this Commission for two more years and then just ignoring it the way they do. I feel that this is wasted money. This is wasted effort on their part too. Here we had a group of people working on this for a long time and I feel that if we really mean what is implied when we set up a commission, certainly some of their recommendations should be implemented.

I also feel that this particular bill before us is really an imposition on the people of Greater Winnipeg because as far as I know, most of the councils in the Greater Winnipeg area oppose it. I have only heard as far as I know from two councils that endorse it and probably only with reservations as well. We'll be hearing from these no doubt when we get to Law Amendments Committee where this will be considered further and where we will hear representation from these very people. Because in talking to some of them, certainly they have very strong opposition to what's being proposed.

Then too, I feel that too few people actually know the implications of what is happening when this bill is being passed. Talk to the people on the streets and they have a completely different idea than what is actually happening here and what is being proposed in the bill. I feel that the people of Winnipeg certainly should be more informed before such a bill as this is being passed; I feel more time should be given so that people could be informed better on what is taking place; because once the bill is in effect it won't be changed that fast again.

Then some of the principles in the bill, certainly one is of centralization. We will be centralizing the administration of more than half the people through this bill and from past experience, certainly the cost has increased - whenever we centralized the cost increased. This took place in the field of health where certain centralization has taken place; in the field of welfare this is the case. This is only indicated the other day when the Estimates were discussed of the Health and Welfare Department - a \$33 million increase in one year alone. Then too, the division system of schools in Manitoba, certainly the costs have increased by

(MR. FROESE cont'd) leaps and bounds since centralization was brought in into that area.

I also feel that it will mean so much detail for one council to handle. Presently there are - what is it twelve or thirteen councils? - and certainly they can cater much more readily to the needs of the local area than an over-all council for the Greater Winnipeg area can do. This also means that people will be further removed from the actual policy makers. One council will set policies whereby the administration will be governed and when people will be grieved in one way or another and when they're in trouble with certain matters they have to go to City Council or to their administrative personnel to get it remedied and we know what it means when you have such a large steup, how much red tape is involved before actual changes can take place, if they do want to implement them, and before certain grievances can be remedied. We know from experience where you have large administrative bodies that referrals are made one after another before it gets to the final stage where the actual change takes place and then has to be filtered down back again.

This also means that there will be more administrative decisions made rather than policy changes by councils themselves. So this is all implied in the bill before us, Bill 36. This is what we will get from passing this legislation. I feel that rather than have one big city that we should have more units. Whether it be the nine that the Boundaries Commission recommended, we could probably have four or five. It still would be a lot better than what we are proposing under Bill 36. I think it would meet the community interest much better under the Bill 36, which provides for community committees, but certainly how effective will they be.

The Principle or the fact that was made the other night I think by the First Minister about the different tax levels. Well are the different tax levels bad in themselves? If a certain area doesn't want to have the same amount of services that another area wants, if they don't want to spend that much money, shouldn't they have the right to spend less and save themselves some money? Why have one big city and provide probably many of the services that a number of people would want to go without it if they didn't have to pay the tax money to pay for it. Presently one administration of one municipality or city may decide to do without certain services and they can do so and bring about savings. Certainly the matter of thrift and being thrift conscious is much more likely to be evident when you have more than one council than if you only have the one. You then have no criteria to measure up to. Also one may have better management than other cities and once you only have the one city, you can have very poor management and may not be able to get rid of it that fast, because once these civil servants are appointed, they are more or less in there for life and they're not removed that easily. So if that happens, all the people will suffer in Greater Winnipeg as a result. So these are all matters of advantage actually to have more than one unit of administration rather than the one as being proposed in Bill 36.

There are a few other points that I would like to see contained in this bill. One has to do with money bylaws. Some people, and especially this government, thinks that this is old-fashioned; this is something that should never be incorporated in bills of this type. I do not think so. I feel that this is a measure of cost control. How else can people control costs of their municipal bodies. Surely enough, we know that the monies for operation and so on will be provided, and even for special projects that are not too large, but certainly when it means investing and spending millions and millions of dollars, then I feel that there should be money bylaws so that people could vote on the issue and decide for themselves whether they wish this particular thing to happen, because these expenditures have to be paid from tax money and this sometimes means that they have to pay these taxes for years and years in order to pay for a certain project, together with high interest rates. I certainly don't want to deny that there should be leeway so that it should not hamper their operations so that they would have this authority, but when it comes to large expenditures surely enough the amounts and leeway that should be given would depend on the assessment of the area probably, or the mill rate and so on. These are things that could be taken into consideration when deciding on the amount that may be spent without public approval.

The matter that generally is said that, in connection with money bylaws, well we have the alternative, just throw the council out. If they made a poor performance or ill-judgment, that they didn't pass proper judgment, throw them out. Mr. Speaker, the job has been done by that time, the damage has been done, and there is no choice to recapture the earlier

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . position, so the matter of just replacing those council men certainly isn't enough.

There are other things. A City Council of this type doesn't provide for an Opposition. In this House you have an Opposition so that we are always assured that things will be brought to light, that people will be looking very carefully at what is happening so that under-the-table dealings do not transpire and as a result you have more careful consideration. This will not necessarily be the case under the provisions of Bill 36.

Another thing that I would like to see in there is that we will make provision for an annual meeting. Why not provide for a forum where the annual report of a city could be considered so that people could pass judgment and discuss the matters of the city, the financial statement and so on? I feel this is worthy of incorporation and I would like to see that in our Municipal Act so that it would apply to all towns and municipal councils. I think this is something whereby the people could take a greater interest, would have more say, and could get the answers to their questions more readily. This certainly would help in controlling costs, in my opinion.

Another point about this complete change of city administration should, in my opinion, be validated by the people. Give the people a right to vote on the change that is being proposed. Have a referendum and, if necessary, with options give the people a choice. Certainly when Metro was brought in the recommendation that a choice be given to the people was not given, and I feel to this day that they should have been provided with this choice.

There's the Minister for -- what's the Minister's name? Well -- the Minister says that the press is sleeping or that they're not paying attention. I don't necessarily speak to the press, Mr. Speaker - it has never been my business to speak to the press. I feel that I'm speaking to members of this House. - They are the ones to give consideration to the matter before us. The Honourable Minister Hanuschak points out that the press is not listening.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Burrows): I did not say at any time that the press was sleeping. It seemed to me that the press was unable to hear the honourable member.

MR. FROESE: I don't know whether that constituted a point of order. Certainly quite a few of the members of the press today are to NDP-biased or oriented that they wouldn't want to listen to me anyway. The Minister agrees - says everybody is NDP-oriented. I wouldn't say that. I know there are some of them that are not. I've heard the government complaining as well earlier in the session about the Free Press, and even yesterday the Minister of Transportation complained bitterly about the - how did he term it? The yellow journalism of the Free Press.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the member could direct his remarks to the matter before us and to the Chair.

MR. FROESE: I intend to do so, Mr. Chairman. I feel that this bill and this legislation should not be passed at this time - it should be referred to a referendum to have the people vote on it. There is no rush to it and it'll have a lasting effect on the people of this province, especially on the people of the Greater Winnipeg area, and I feel that they should have a say in the matter.

As far as the removal of Metro, I never voted for Metro and I do not believe in a two-tier government, so as far as removing them I certainly will have no tears to shed about that. I know the NDP supported it in 1960 and now they've apparently changed their minds; now they're doing away with it. Is that progress on their part? Maybe they could explain that to me. However, I do not support the bill even though I would support removing Metro. I will not support the bill because I feel that the unit that they're establishing is too large, because it will have the effect of the tail swinging the dog, or wagging the dog, and that the demands of the Greater Winnipeg area, once this is passed, will not be resisted by the government in office. Their requests will be met and probably very often to the detriment of the rural municipalities; if it's a matter of conflict of interests, that the government of the day will more readily cater to Greater Winnipeg because there's more votes. There's more votes. There are more members in the House are representing the people in the Greater Winnipeg area, so it stands to reason that they will vote for the cause that would promote their particular area, and so it stands to reason that the rural areas will stand to lose under the proposition.

The matter of the community councils as they're being proposed, I think is a lot of

(MR. FROESE, Cont'd.) eyewash. They have no finances at their control; as a result they will have little or no power and in my opinion will be very ineffective. What can they do if they in the first place cannot finance any of their programs? The only thing that I can see could happen is that there you could have a bunch of agitators under these community councils and if their particular member on council may not be of the NDP stripe that they would then agitate and make it miserable for their member in council. Maybe the Minister of Municipal Affairs can counteract on that one if he feels the other way about it.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to direct my remarks to you, Sir, so that I need not be ruled out of order again. Certainly I do not hold any great promise for the community committees that will be set up, and on the structure as proposed in the bill, I still feel that it is a two-tier setup because you elect your local councilmen and from there you will elect your committee chairman, and even the mayor would be elected on that basis. The administrative setup there certainly gives them very strong control in my opinion, very strong, and you will need very strong council chairmen or committee chairmen if they are not going to be run by the department officials. This is why I feel that we should have a setup whereby you probably would have four or five cities that you would elect your mayor and the council chairmen at large. I don't think they should be elected from the people that are elected to the council seats. These people should be elected at large, the mayor and the chairmen of these committees. I would like to avoid this two-tier setup that is being incorporated, just because having their chairmen of committees elected from the elected council members.

Another thing I'd like to see is that money by-laws be voted on by the public and also that the whole matter be referred to the people of this city, the Greater Winnipeg area, to a referendum. On top of that we would probably need a coordinating council between the four or five cities that would then be established under that proposition, but I think that would be a proposition whereby you would retain the structure closer to the people, closer to the policy makers, to those people that would be in control.

The statement has been made that this particular bill does not mean amalgamation. Certainly it means total amalgamation. You will only have one financial statement and all the services will be centrally controlled and it would be a haven for the bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, I've given my views on Bill 36 to that portion dealing with the structure. I certainly will have further things to say in committee on the various portions of the bill when we go into greater detail on it, and I certainly, while I will not vote for the bill on second reading, no doubt it will go on to Law Amendments and if that happens then I'm certainly looking forward to hearing from the various municipal representatives and other people of the Greater Winnipeg area who may make representations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate with regard to this motion that this has been on the Order Paper for some time and I'll be calling it again tonight.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Would you call No. 47?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health. The Honourable Minister.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield) presented Bill No. 47, an Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the principle of this bill is to make certain relatively minor amendments to the Health Services Insurance Act which was passed by this House during the 1970 session and which was proclaimed to come into force during the latter part of the month of October, 1970. The Health Services Insurance Act, as you know, brought together under one administration the Health Insurance Services of Manitoba which were previously under the Manitoba Hospital Commission and the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Corporation. The Act established the Manitoba Health Services Commission to replace the

(MR. TOUPIN, Cont'd) two previous organizations, and under this new commission the health insurance programs have been continued uninterrupted. This bill, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, provides for a number of simple amendments to the Health Services Insurance Act. A number of spelling and other corrections are made that relate to errors made in drafting the Act itself. For example, rates of payments to hospitals are established by a regulation of the commission following an extensive hospital budget review, an appeal procedure which usually lasts well into the summer of the year to which the rates of payment apply. Therefore the regulations finally establishing the rates of payments for the year end, the year needs to be back-dated by perhaps six or seven months, and this requires the authority in the Act.

A recent challenge of certain third party liability of the Health Services Insurance Act held that under certain circumstances where the commission's interest was not included in a plaintiff's statement of claims, the commission had only one month from the date the plaintiff's statement was filed to file a separate claim. It was not the intent of the legislation to place this restriction on the filing of claim by the commission, nor is such a restriction practical, because one month is not considered to be sufficient time to assess the merits of the case, estimate costs, come to a decision, and prepare and file a separate statement of claim. Therefore this bill, Mr. Speaker, provides for an amendment to the Act that clarifies the intent and confirms the limitation of the commission's right to bring action as being any time within 24 months from the time when the bodily injuries were suffered, but not thereafter. This means that the plaintiff will have 12 months to file his claim and the commission will have 12 months after the deadline for the plaintiff's claim.

An additional amendment is made necessary by the Age of Majority Act, which was also passed during the last session of this House. Under Section 4(1) of the Age of Majority Act, any references in any Act of the Legislature to the age of 21 years are to be read as a reference to the age of 18. The Health Services Insurance Act provides that students between the ages of 19 and 21 years may continue as dependents under their family's registration and therefore be exempt from the payment of premium. The previously mentioned provision of the Age of Majority Act technically nullifies the student exemption clause of the Health Services Insurance Act, and hence an amendment is required changing the reference to 21 years to "not more than two years older than 19 years of age."

Another amendment made by this bill increases the membership of the Manitoba Health Services Commission from the present seven members to nine members. All of the members of this House have received the 1970 annual report of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and all are aware of the broad all-encompassing and highly important powers that have been ascribed to the commission. The present members of the commission bring a broad range of business and professional experience to the commission, ranging from doctors and other health professionals to businessmen and lay people. It is hoped that with the two additional members the commission can be further strengthened.

With these few comments, Mr. Speaker, I commend this bill to the members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to hear explanations from the Minister. There were times when I wasn't quite able to catch what he said and I may ask for some further clarification. Everything in the bill seems quite straightforward. I was a little concerned about finding another example of retroactive regulations, but I assume that this is made necessary simply because as the Minister has explained. I did have a question as to who the other members would be when the commission was to be enlarged and also how they would be appointed, whether they would be appointed by the cabinet or by the Minister, or whether the commission has some power to extend its own membership. I would be interested to know whether they would be representing specific areas of expertise.

The extension on the limitation of accidents in 24 months I understand now. It looked a little out of line as the Statute of Limitations I think is one year, but the explanation of the second agency then having a further year, I think clarifies that quite well; and of course we have no quarrel with the correction of a typographical error. I think, if the Minister wouldn't mind answering the questions I have raised, that we are then prepared to see this bill move on to Law Amendments Committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 37, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few remarks on this bill. I imagine that -- it was some weeks ago since I read it last, but --(Interjection)-- an amendment to the Municipal Act, No. 37, to the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

I guess Bill 37 is partly the result of some of the discussions and perhaps commitments made during some of our discussions during the winter on our Municipal Committee, and I still think it's the type of bill that very many of us will have to say that this is one of these hard-line political bills. I think it's just a matter of mending a few fences and, although I do believe there are a few principles involved, that one especially I'm very much concerned and I should perhaps start off that I do somewhat have to agree with the Member for Charleswood when he mentioned that we should be cautious as far as encouraging welfare recipients to run as councillors or aldermen, although I think the question that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources asked at the time was fair, because certainly if a person runs as an alderman or mayor or reeve, whatever it may be, I think we realize, we've been in political life long enough, that anything can happen to anybody, and naturally I don't think it should affect the position if this did occur to a member.

I was happy to see additional authority given to municipalities in regard to the underground container abandonment, and also I was happy to see permission given to deal more directly with our Regional Development Corporation. I think this was in order. We have not had our Regional Development organization operating for too long a time and this is perhaps relatively new legislation, but I think it is good legislation and perhaps, I think one of the high-lights of the bill is the permission to let municipalities encourage local improvement programs. Of course, the bill says they are supposed to be paid by current funds. I think maybe if we tried this on a trial basis for awhile we can even maybe go a little bit further and allow a time limit if it should be needed for some of the improvements that may be in order for a municipality, and I should, while I sound very flowery, I should -- I think I'm very happy to see the broadening and the clarifying of the municipality authority respecting special levies for the maintenance of certain services. This, I believe, was long overdue.

But my main reason, Mr. Speaker, for wishing to say a few words on this bill, is right at the beginning of the bill where permission is finally granted or given to members of the municipality to enter in contract with a municipality. I believe this was high time that we had a change in this respect. I think it's caused many misgivings over the past years. Especially in some of the smaller villages or some of the smaller municipalities, I think sometimes certain people were accused of -- oh, even pork barrelling, if you care to use the term, and I think, at least I hope we've outlived those days, and we're naturally operating on a completely different basis than we have over the past years, and I think this legislation will give the municipalities more elbow room and perhaps, in a lot of cases, quite a bit more competition as far as bidding is concerned. Still, I think, there's enough protection left in the bill so that people or taxpayers are protected as far as certain people wishing to take advantage. I can never forget, in the municipality that I represented one time, how often we couldn't really develop competition in some of our bids, because either one of the fellows owned too much property out -- and the case I'm referring to was one owned a lumber yard and the other one owned a mixing plant and they were supposed to be bidding on concrete, and naturally both of them were selling the product, and I think it would have been rather sad -- and it was sad at times, because they really couldn't be bidding -- but I think it's rather sad if municipalities who wish to keep as much of their own business in their own municipality as possible, were not able to do so, and in our case I'm sure there was a difference from \$2.00 to \$4.00 and perhaps \$5.00 a yard difference on a yard of cement. So I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation was highly due.

I don't know if at the time when I asked the Minister the question, if the -- I was referring to the \$100.00 item, and then of course the paragraph goes on and says, "or you may tender or advertise," and I take for granted that this is the way it's going to be; apparently at that time he wasn't too sure, but I think by the time he answered the question now, because I think the whole principle of the change of the matter lies in that part of the bill, and I do hope that there is no question that if a product is tendered for, or a piece of machinery or

(MR. BARKMAN, Cont'd) equipment is tendered for, and if it is then advertised duly, I for one see nothing wrong with this taking place and I think we are coming to those times when we have to do it for the sake of competition, and I'm glad to see this legislation in. I don't think there'll be much opposition. I must admit that I had just about forgotten about the bill from the time it was put in here, but I think perhaps from here on we can see it go along faster because this is a much larger principle to many municipalities than perhaps we're aware of and I think it will take away the suspicion of municipal people, if there was any - and I believe there was at times - and I think this will create a strong, healthy, competitive feeling that if a person belongs to a municipality, so he makes his one or two or three thousand dollars. I think this is only fair that he should have a right to compete and bid on the matter.

So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I think this is the type of bill that there isn't really too much politics involved. I think it's just material that has to be cleaned up and I'm sure that we're ready to do so now.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, the bill I believe is fairly good but there's some parts of it in here that I am rather confused about and I think probably it could be made up to be more appropriate for this portion, things that go on in the cities and in the rural areas, because it talks about holding sports days or different meetings where you must obtain permission three weeks in advance before you can hold such a meeting, and that you have to have player protection and health regulations met and all this, and this just isn't so out in the country, in some of the rural areas where they have sports days and ball games. I was wondering just why it's necessary if we haven't had no trouble out there this way, and I was wondering how it would affect a person that was planning a sports day. Often you don't know three weeks in advance when it might be, and this -- pardon? Yes, you could have a family reunion. You could have Billy Graham out there and you'd have more than you figured, and you'd have to have permission three weeks in advance. I don't know whether the people are aware of it or not, but many of these rural councils only meet once a month and if they had their meeting, then they'd have to call a special meeting on account of this. So I don't think that this is very necessary. I can imagine a situation like what happened in our area last fall, where at the time of our Lisgar by-election when they were trying to get the Honourable John Diefenbaker up there and they didn't know which municipality they'd have him in because it was Lisgar and it took in several municipalities, and then there was a rather hasty decision at the last to have it at Winkler and I'm sure there wasn't three weeks; and he had over a thousand people there. According to this Act he couldn't have had that meeting, so I think this part doesn't apply to the rural municipalities as it should and I'd like to see something put in the Act later on so that it was more applicable to rural municipalities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland again, this bill has been on the Order Paper long enough for people to have become acquainted with it. I'll be calling it again tonight. Bill No. 54.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable the Minister.

HON. A. H. MACKLING Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James) presented Bill No. 54, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act (2), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in a few brief words, a good deal of this bill - I don't know whether I should sit down now while I'm ahead or not - a good deal of this bill is administrative housekeeping in nature; it tidies up some portions of the bill respecting ages since the passage of the Age of Majority Act, but there are a number of changes in principle and I hope to be able to deal with them very quickly.

One change will provide for under-age persons to drink alcoholic beverages provided

(MR. MACKLING, Cont'd) . . . that they're in the company of a parent or a spouse, and the parent or spouse actually provides them with the alcoholic beverage with meals in a licensed premise. In other words, what is permissible in the home will now be made permissible in a licensed premise, providing the parent is there and actually serves the under-age person.

Another provision, Mr. Speaker, will extend to guests in licensed premises privileges of consumption of alcoholic beverage in such areas of licensed premises as swimming pools, recreation rooms and so on.

Another provision will permit the Liquor Commission to issue a beverage room or beer vendor license for a building in a hotel complex that is separate and apart from the main hotel building. This will permit a new or existing hotel to place a beverage room apart from the area which houses the hotel guests. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the Commission has endeavoured to make progress in this area to relieve congestion particularly in licensed premises where there is beer vendor service and there's been congestion in lobbies where the guests have access to the main hotel and other provisions of the other parts of the building.

Another provision would authorize the opening of licensed premises after the closing of the polls on federal or provincial election days. This would bring the Manitoba Act in line with an amendment made last year in the Federal Election Act.

Another provision would permit beverage room licensees to have varied hours of operation, retaining, however, the 6:30 to 7:30 supper closing hour. The period of operation would not exceed 13 hours a day any time between the hours of 9 a.m. and 1 a.m. A licensee could, for example, open two hours earlier or remain open one hour later. However, his total open hours in any one day would be no more than thirteen which is, in effect, an extension of only one hour over what is currently permitted.

An operator would not be allowed to change his hours of operation on a day-to-day basis but would require permission from the Commission to set his regular hours and proceed accordingly.

It would also permit, Mr. Speaker, for the first time, sale of liquor on an Indian reserve and sale under occasional permits for a reserve social. Hitherto, a favourable referendum by a band has resulted in permission for consumption but not for sale of liquor on a reserve. The amendment deletes what in effect amounted to a discriminatory aspect in our Act.

Other provisions of the Act will permit provincial and municipal golf courses to get club, cocktail or beverage room licenses which are now allowed to private golf clubs. Municipal courses have been restricted, however, to beer licences.

Another provision will permit a court to acquit a licensee for allowing an under-age person to enter and remain in a licensed premise in the same manner as he now can be acquitted for having served him - that is, if the person appears to be at least 18 years of age or if the licensee had taken reasonable precautions to determine proof of age. In effect, then it reduces to some extent the imposition of the determinant of guilt so far as the licensee is concerned and makes it much more equitable and reasonable.

Another provision, Mr. Speaker, will provide that Justices of the Peace may now hear prosecutions for offences under the Liquor Control Act and hitherto only magistrates could hear such cases.

Those are the essential components, as I see them, of this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I heartily recommend them to the members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry; I have a few comments with regard to second reading of this bill. I found it very interesting to hear the Honourable Minister talking about drinking around swimming pools. I wonder will he be able to provide booze about 12 feet under it or something . . .

There is the odd section; I'm wondering why the \$2.00 fee was dropped, the permit that is part of the bill. Maybe it is a good thing, I don't know. I always thought it was sensible to ask the permit, whoever requested the permit, to provide some money in the application for the permit.

The section on the liquor on the Indian reservations, again I wonder why the Minister didn't consider a referendum amongst the people on the reserve. I'm not sure what the Indian people themselves have in mind but, if my memory serves me correctly, I believe they asked at one time if they could have the privilege of a referendum.

Most of the other, as the Minister said, is clean-up type of legislation. The one with

(MR. McKENZIE, Cont'd) regard to the municipal golf courses is one that has been for a long time -- the rural golf courses have asked if there could be some way other than the way it was in the past where you had to lug the booze out in the bush, to make it legal. -- (Interjection)-- You're right. One of the honourable member said here, nowadays, of course, golfing has gotten to be quite a sport and maybe we should even tie in a bar at each tee because sometimes you have long waits at some of the various holes.

The one other one is the minors. I don't know if in fact that that was going to be able to be managed or not, whereby you can bring children into an area of liquor and -- I suppose it can be managed. I imagine there'll be some problems; kids will be tagging along some day that actually aren't the children of the parents, maybe neighbours kids or something that came along. The hours of sale, I suppose, is the one for the mining or where shift work is done, and I guess it's only reasonable that the shift workers be having the same privileges as everybody else.

And then in the last section, I'm not too well versed in the -- where the various sections are amended, with regard to the word magistrates changed to justices. Maybe the Minister could explain. But with those few remarks, we will certainly support the bill on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to speak at length on this bill because I can say that now in principle I am in favour of the relaxation of the liquor laws as long as it's done systematically and carefully. One other point with which I'm in agreement with is that we are now extending the privilege of serving liquor to areas other than licensed restaurants and hotels. We are now going to golf courses and, as the Minister pointed out, swimming pools and so on. And again I must say that I'm in agreement with this kind of legislation.

But there is one matter which I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the Minister's attention with as much force as I can. I would like to emphatically state that I oppose the kind of high-handed regulations set out by the Liquor Commission when dealing with premises that they themselves feel are obsolete and they themselves feel should be closed. I have an example of a hotel in the rural areas that has served the community for a good many years, that meets with the satisfaction of the inhabitants of the area -- and I happen to know -- and the Liquor Commission has in the recent past written to the operator of this premises saying, "You know, by 1973 we're closing your shop." And, Mr. Speaker, this is a particular area where we are not increasing our population; we are not expecting some lavish new hotel/motel to come and locate in that area. We are expecting the present inhabitant or the present owner of the area to keep servicing the people of the community, as he has done for so many years, because he only can do this. He has no overhead; his establishment has been paid for over the years, and he can afford to continue and operate to the satisfaction of the people of that community. And I want to emphatically say that I am a little disgusted with that kind of activity on the part of the Commission. I would suppose it would be a little different if they can show me that there is danger that the building will fall to pieces, or that the health requirements are so far below the standards that we cannot tolerate this any more, that it causes epidemics in the community and so on. But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that they have been unreasonable in that particular case, and if that suggestion is not changed by them, I will guarantee you that I will fight that kind of thing with all I've got.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Just one thing that I was wanting to discuss regarding this bill. I remember bringing up this same question last year regarding the golf clubs and clubs of all kinds who have to sell as much food as they do liquor. I think it's time that private golf clubs should have consideration regarding this legislation. I still can't for the life of me see why a private club, or any club that has been given a licence to sell liquor, comes under the part of the Act that says you must sell as much food as you do liquor. It's putting them in a bad situation, as I explained last year. They're having to get in the restaurant business. They actually stretch the law because they go out and solicit banquets for their club. They go out and, you know, they might even find golf ball sales or curling broom sales all put into the food sales so that they can avoid this business of having to produce books monthly or quarterly that says "we have sold as much food as we do liquor," and I don't know why

(MR. F. JOHNSTON, Cont'd) that hasn't been changed in this Liquor Act. It's unfair to these clubs. One principle the Attorney-General has brought up here regarding municipal golf courses, etc., having to sell or being allowed to sell beer. Are they going to have to sell as much food as they are beer at these clubs? And if they're not, why does the private club have to be ruled under this kind of legislation? Possibly the Attorney-General can explain that.

I, Mr. Speaker, also may be an old fuddy-duddy, but I do not agree with the sale of liquor to boys and girls under the age of 18, whether they're with their parents or not in a restaurant. I think you're opening a door here that is dangerous. Who knows whether they're with their parents or not? If it goes too far or becomes a problem, you'll have to have parents identifying their children in some way, shape or form. Really we've gone far enough as far as liquor to minors is concerned, and I think we should back off this type of legislation at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contributions of the honourable members who have spoken. Addressing myself to the observations of the Honourable Member from Roblin, who I see has -- oh yes, he's in the Chamber; I trust that he will listen.

The permit, the provisions for the permits will now be provided for by regulation and they won't have to be set out in the Act. So far as his concern about the question of sale on reserves, sale of liquor on an Indian reserve, the actual decision as to whether or not liquor may be on a reserve at all is governed by the Indian Act, which makes provision for a vote being taken, but if a vote is taken and it's in favour, that is if the reserve has decided that they will permit liquor to be on the reserve in accordance with our Act, it couldn't be sold on the reserve notwithstanding that vote having been taken.

So far as the concern, and I think this was the concern of the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek, about minors being in licenced premises, I think that what we're trying to demonstrate and trying hopefully, that in our society there will be moderate use of alcoholic beverage and that children will learn that alcoholic beverage should be responsibly consumed and responsible consumption should be associated with food, and that is one of the guiding principles of the Commission Report, the Bracken Enquiry Commission Report, and the principles upon which much of our present Liquor Control Act is based, a direct relationship between the consumption of alcoholic beverage and food so that people are discouraged from consuming alcoholic beverage itself to the exclusion of food and, as most people know, that can create an intoxicated condition much more quickly and be much more damaging. And I think that when young people, minors, are with their parents in a licenced restaurant, say a birthday party, an anniversary, or any other type of occasion when there's a family gathering in a licenced premise, and the father or mother wish to have a drink and perhaps the young child may wish to have a little sip of the drink, it shouldn't be a no, no. It shouldn't be -- if they can have it at home and if they can do it at home, surely it should be possible for the parents to do the same thing that he would do in his own home in the licenced premise. Surely the responsibility rests with the parents as to that sort of decision.

So far as the concern of the Honourable Member from Emerson, whom I don't see in the Chamber now, he's concerned about regulations dealing with the conditions of licenced premises. I, too, have had some cause for concern in connection with the rigorous application of this policy that the Liquor Control Commission has apparently maintained for many many years, that where there is a change in ownership in licenced premises they endeavour to exact, so far as possible, improvements and upgrading in facilities, and sometimes the application of this policy seems to be very rigorous, and yet I'm assured by the Commission when I have spoken to them about it, that they maintain this rigorous policy in order to ensure that they will get some measure of upgrading and maintenance and improvement in facilities. If they did otherwise, the scale of accommodation would deteriorate rapidly. And I think that the course of action that the Commission has followed through the many years since much of the Liquor Control Commission legislation was brought into being, has proven to be effective to maintain good facilities. I think they take the tough approach, Mr. Speaker, but they're willing to relent. But they don't go at it in a half-hearted, easy-going, indifferent way, and this vigorous demand, I think, is the one which honourable members would want to see maintained. But, as I say, I'm assured that this doesn't lead to impoverishment of the licensee.

The question of the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek in respect to the relation-

(MR. MACKLING, Cont'd) ship of municipal golf clubs, golf courses. It's my understanding by the reading of the Act and the instructions that were given to the draftsmen, that once they obtain that licence then the same provisions that apply to other club licences apply there. So the same relationships have to be taken into consideration. And I appreciate the argument that maybe there's an over-stringency in the Act there as well, a continuing toughness that perhaps might be relented. I share a feeling that perhaps it does work a hardship in some cases, particularly the smaller clubs or the ones that have a membership that is less likely to be able to afford the kind of accommodations and restaurant facilities that are necessary in order to maintain the ratio. But again, I think that it's not easy to deal with the vital principle of the relationship of food and liquor without maintaining this kind of a ratio. I'm open-minded. I think that that kind of thing can be considered. I don't think it's proved to be any terrifying difficulty because I haven't heard, you know, cries of anguish. Now maybe they have been made to others, but I'm certainly prepared to look at it. I don't think it is that high a priority at this time but I recognize that it may be giving some individual club licensees some problem.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 48, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, Bill 48 deals with snowmobiles and the Minister of Transportation, in introducing the bill on second reading, gave us a general outline. I also listened to the Member for Emerson with interest in connection with the provisions of the bill. There are two or three provisions that I would like to comment on and one has to do with the noise level. Not knowing what the description means and I think it also is being referred to under regulations, maybe members should have an opportunity of hearing a snowmobile run so that we would know just how much noise is tolerated, because I don't know, even when they outline a certain level of noise that there will be permitted, I don't know just how much, what noise this is, whether it's too loud or not. Maybe if we could have some demonstration so that members would know just what we are doing when we pass this bill. I just wonder whether it's much less than what the amount of noise that they presently make, whether they're required to put on new mufflers if this Act goes into effect or not. I think this is something we should know. Certainly, if they can be quieted down, I would welcome this because I too feel that they can be very noisy indeed.

The matter of the safety factors, naturally we're interested in safety, but I think whether we're not overdoing it and as a result will be over-regulating society. I think there has to be a certain point, or common sense used, so that we will not be overly regulating people in our society because of this. I think people should use their common sense and should be allowed to - that's right - to exercise whatever is necessary in being safety conscious and avoiding accidents.

The one point that I am very interested in is the matter of the age limit for drivers, and I feel that we should extend a driver's opportunity to 14 and 15-year-olds. I feel that these are the young people that enjoy riding these snowmobiles. I don't mean that they should have these high-powered machines. Let them ride the machines having less speed and less power, but certainly let's not rule them out completely. Let's give them a chance to enjoy driving these machines. I feel that we should lower the age limit under this Act, that will permit them to drive snowmobiles.

Then, too, there are restrictions so far as racing. What about the safaris that we have during the winter? There is one taking place in southern Manitoba every year and occasionally no doubt these people do race as a result. When we refer to races, does this mean special events where racing is to take place, or what are we speaking of when we speak of racing? I think it should be defined so that people will not be fined unnecessarily just because they might find themselves to be racing with one another with the snowmobiles accidentally.

These are some of the points that I wish to raise at this time. Otherwise I think the matter of bringing in legislation in connection with snowmobiles is quite in order. I would like to hear from other members on their views in this respect and I certainly intend to bring in an amendment in connection with the age limit for drivers. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Will you call Bill No. 77, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in dealing earlier with Bill 67 we were advised that Bill 77 was a companion piece of legislation and that some of the reservations which we had expressed in respect to the previous bill -- I'm sorry, it was Bill 66, and Bill 77 was described as a companion piece of legislation, and some of the reservations we had on Bill 66 in respect to the deposits of money, we were assured would be covered by the terms of Bill 77.

Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity since then to examine the bill and I find that, while it does have some provision for the keeping of separate accounts for the estates of the mentally incompetent, there is nothing in this bill which indicates that these funds would be held for the particular estates in interest-bearing accounts, and there is nothing to provide that the interest accruing to an estate will become part of that estate, and so I would say that the criticism that was expressed of the Public Trustee Act still applies and that if Bill 77 is to have the keeping of separate accounts, we would suggest that it should also now be considered that there be provision for the maintenance of these accounts in such a manner that interest can accrue and that the interest can accrue for and on behalf of those estates. I think it's rather necessary to make these provisions separately within each of the bills, and that we cannot expect that one bill will have a provision which will apply to the other, but I think the criticism still applies and I would suggest that this should be a part of Bill 77 as well as Bill 66, that there should be separate accounts, interest bearing, and that the interest should accrue for and on behalf of those people for whom the estates are being held.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Honourable Member from Brandon West to look at the -- I don't want to offend the rules; I would like him to look at the Bill 77 and look at the provisions that are contained therein which provide for the allocation by the administrator of interest among estates where monies in two or more estates have been deposited by him, pursuant to provisions of the Mental Health Act. Now I think that clearly indicates that the monies will be deposited and earn interest, and where that does take place, there will be an allocation of the interest to the particular estates. I do believe that the particular concern that he had is answered in this bill. If it isn't, then I'm under a misunderstanding. I believe it is. I checked the Act subsequent to his having indicated in discussion on the other bill, Bill No. 66, his concern and I personally checked the Act. Now, if I'm wrong, I undertake that I'll try and deal with it in committee but I believe the provisions of Bill 77 do take care of his concern. If they don't, then I'm disappointed, because I think that there should be an assurance that, where possible, interest that has been earned by an individual estate will be credited to that estate. I believe the bill presently does that. If it doesn't, I'm prepared to see what can be done to ensure that it does that.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, can we call it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the House is now adjourned until 8:00 p.m.