

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
7:00 o'clock, Saturday, July 24, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GECRGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the First Minister. Has this government done away with the Censor Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): The Honourable Member for Pembina, did I hear him correctly, the Censor Board? No, there's been no abolition of the Censor Board, there's been a report brought in recommending certain change in the function of the Censor Board, more emphasis on classification but not an abolition of the Board as such.

MR. HENDERSON: Has the number on the Censor Board been reduced?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the number on the Board has not been reduced in any deliberate way; however, there has been a reduction in the Board's numbers simply by attrition, that is to say, one or two have resigned for personal reasons and we intend to take some action to fill the vacancies.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed, I wonder if the House Leader would indicate what the government's intention is today, this evening insofar as the procedures are concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thought we would proceed with the bills on the Order Page at the third reading stage, as many as we can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, one of the committee's just completed their deliberations at 7:00 o'clock; many of our members were present. They have worked through since 2:30 to 7, they have not eaten. I gather the other committee did not finish until quarter to 6. I gather as well that the delegations that were present in the Agricultural Committee were not completed in their presentation and they've been asked to come back for 2:30 Monday.

I wonder again, we intend to debate and to do the things that are required, but at the same time, of the members who are present here I think there are only possibly two who have had their supper already. I'm not sure on the government side because I'm not sure who on the government -- (Interjection) -- what? I'm not sure who on the government side were present at the other meetings, and I don't know what committees they belong to and what committees they've been on. I think it's a bit unfair. I have to suggest that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: If we're going to talk about unfairness, I just want to have the record clear, that it was not our stated intention that we would call the House in session tonight. I approached the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition earlier in the day; I explained to him exactly what we intended to do, I asked him whether he would agree that we sat till 1:30 in the morning. I asked him whether he would agree that we then reconvened at 2:30, and the two committees. I asked him whether he would be willing to sit tonight and his words were, "yes, I'd like to sit tonight, I'd like to get done with the work." Those were his words.

Now on that basis, Mr. Speaker, we called a session for tonight, so I don't mind the statements being made, but I don't want it to be alleged that there is some unfairness on our side. What we have done tonight was with full concurrence and agreement of the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the same point. I'm not quarreling with the statements -- (Interjection) -- let me say this to the House Leader. I'm not quarreling with the statement

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . or the chronological order of what he suggested, but at the time there was consent given or an agreement arrived at with respect to 7:00 o'clock, there was no consideration that one of the committees would sit right until 7:00; and I can understand what took place. I'm not quarreling the fact that there were delegations that were present that had to be heard. But the truth of the matter is that members were present at the committee who have not eaten, and some of them are in the House, some of them are not in the House. We're intended to deal with the bills and finish and proceed with them. We have not -- and I repeat again, and I want to repeat this once more so there won't be any question on the record -- we have not been obstructionist in the manner in which we have handled ourselves in trying to deal and facilitate the government handling their matters.

I want to suggest at this particular time, because I believe the decision would be to debate the unicity bill now, as an example, and to proceed with the other bills and I think it is rather unfortunate that at least there is not a period of time for those who wanted to have supper, to have supper and to provide some kind of arrangement. At the same time, if the House Leader is going to indicate to us that we're going to sit until 9:00 o'clock or 9:30 then the judgment would have to be arrived at at this point as to whether we want to proceed on that basis and then know that those who have not eaten will at least be able to eat at a reasonable time. Now that's the decision we just have to arrive at and we need some information from the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition need not fear that we are regarding their actions as having been obstructionist in recent days. No one suggested that, and I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is being overly sensitive for no purpose.

The other point that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition seems to rely on for his argument is that the Agricultural Committee met right up until 7:00 o'clock, that is true. The reason for that was because there were out-of-town presentations which the committee, by agreement, decided to extend the courtesy to hear the out-of-town presentations so they could be completed, and they have been completed.

Now my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition I think realizes that it's precisely those members who were on the Agricultural Committee who are inconvenienced, but if we proceed now with the unicity bill it seems to me that there is a minimum of conflict in as much as most of the members, if not all, on the Agricultural Committee are those who do not have as direct an interest in the unicity bill as other members, so I think that there can be an accommodation here reached by proceeding with Bill 36 right from the start here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I was not aware that we're going to sit on Saturday night, I don't think my colleagues were aware, the Member for Rhineland was not aware that we're going to sit tonight, neither the Member for Churchill and I -- (Interjection) -- not for tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: We could not be here tonight without the unanimous consent of everybody in the House. We are sitting at 7:00 o'clock instead of at 8:00 -- therefore every member, and I asked the question, any member could have said we would not sit tonight and if the Leader of the Opposition would have said let's not have a tonight sitting, there would not be a sitting here tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, would it not be reasonable for the First Minister to consider that we adjourn now or adjourn in an hour's time from now, because we still have to come back on Monday and I'm sure we'll finish the session in good time on Monday or if not Monday it will be Tuesday. I can't see the reason for sitting tonight till Midnight or 10:00 or 11:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can advise the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the House Leader has already indicated that the adjournment time this evening is one that we will be quite agreeable to a relatively earlier adjournment hour; rather than adjourning now till 8:00 o'clock, let us carry on as we agreed this afternoon and then we will be that much more likely to adjourn at a relatively earlier adjournment hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation volunteered a sandwich for us and I'm willing to accept.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you call Bill No. 36 at the report stage.

THIRD READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on the report stage of Bill No. 36.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that Section 3 of Bill No. 36 The City of Greater Winnipeg Act be amended by striking out the words - "The City of Winnipeg" in the third line thereof as amended in the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs and substituting therefor the words - "The City of Winnipeg-St. Boniface."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that everything is calm again and I'm sure that both sides of the House intend to co-operate. Seeing that I am the first speaker tonight, I'll try to show the example. I have a working agreement with my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek that we will be short, but that should not indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I don't consider the amendment that I am proposing now to be important.

A few members, including the Member for Fort Rouge, thinking no doubt that I was trying to be parochial when I proposed this amendment in committee made half serious proposals themselves. I can assure you, Sir, that I am quite serious and that I'm not concerned with retaining the name of my constituency only; it's much more than that. Now it's been expressed the fear that it would be difficult because you have the name of Greater Winnipeg or Metro Winnipeg on phone books, on maps and so on. I don't think that this is very important, the name will have to be changed anyway. The maps and phone maps come in every year and they're modified, the change, so I don't think that this should be an obstacle even at this late date to change the name.

Another thing, Sir, is that we just felt that maybe a name, a hyphenated name might be a little difficult but the last city amalgamation - the cities I should say, St. James-Assiniboia, did just that. We've had countries like Czechoslovakia that have a name forming only one name now. We have - Fargo-Moorhead is often used, or Minneapolis-St. Paul. I am not saying that this is the legal name of the city, Sir, I'm only saying that it is used without too much difficulty.

I, as you know, Sir, supported this bill without conditions. I tried to deal with the mechanics of this bill to see if it could improve the lot of the people of this area, and I'm satisfied that this bill will. It's not perfect, no bills are perfect, but I placed no conditions on that once I saw the bill, because I was satisfied that no doubt representing St. Boniface and being true to the priorities that I've had in this House for the last 13 years, I was interested in some of the safeguards that would protect, that would help not only the official languages but the cultures of the different people forming our mosaic, the people of Manitoba.

I now must admit that the change of name will not change the mechanics; it won't make it any easier or more difficult as far as that goes, but it is certainly something that deals with the emotions, recognition, symbolic security of many people of this province and I think that this is important, although it's not the mechanics of the bill.

As I said while speaking on second reading, Sir, I don't feel that I would like to say here that I'm a separatist or that the people that I represent are separatists; I don't want to see a wall built around St. Boniface, this is why I certainly went along with this bill. I felt that certain safeguards would make it easier now to be ourselves, we're all Manitobans, to enjoy living in Manitoba without resorting to trying to build a little Quebec, a little Paris or even a little Vatican here in Manitoba, because I certainly would object to that, Sir. But, I feel that we have a chance now if we were to give support to my amendment, to do something that would be highly symbolic for Manitoba.

First of all let me say that the name St. Boniface is not a French name, it's a German name, but I think that St. Boniface would be acceptable by all the people first of all that are living in St. Boniface, and I think that we have a real cosmopolitan district in St. Boniface. We have people of French, British, Irish, Ukrainian, Polish, Belgian, Italian, Icelandic, Jewish, German, Metis and Indian people living in St. Boniface and I think that they've lived

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) pretty well in peace and I think that this could be carried on in the spirit of what we want to see here in the Greater Winnipeg area. The hyphenated name would be symbolic right here in western Canada with the two official languages of our country but it would also bring to mind the many cultures of our province and our country. It would, I'm sure, Sir, show that the people stand united, the people of Manitoba stand united although they might be the first city and I think that this is our strength. Contrary to the melting pot idea that is not working in the United States, our neighbour south of us, I think that what this government and what the people have been doing, we can see this in the political atmosphere, the climate has changed here in Manitoba and I think that most of us now we could see by the different resolutions that were unanimously approved by the members of this House, I think that we are accepting now the - and I think that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources explained it much better, gave a definition much better than I could ever hope to do and I think this is acceptable, that the fact that we recognize the two official languages is the safeguard of all the other cultures. I, for one, never believe in bi-culture but always multi-cultures.

Now, I think that maybe the reason why I say this, I know, as I said, that other members made some half serious attempt to include their constituency in there, that to me was sad in itself - that it was they, I think Mr. Speaker, that were being parochial, just because I suggested something, they felt that they had to do exactly the same, and I certainly can assure you, Sir, that this is not what I was looking for; as I said, I'm looking for much more than that.

St. Boniface is probably one of the first names in the west, it was never changed, it was Lord Selkirk that requested from Bishop Plessis of Quebec that they send some missionaries here, he felt that this would be something good for the territory especially after Governor Semple was killed in 1816 at the uprising. Now I think, Sir, that if we remember that it was Jean-Baptiste Lagimodiere the first white man who settled on the side of the Red River who walked 1800 miles to tell Lord Selkirk that there was trouble in the territory. He and his wife Madame Marie Anne Gaboury gave birth to the first white child here in western Canada. The name St. Boniface dates prior to the name of Winnipeg. I think that it represents something good, the missionary down here in western Canada, the name St. Boniface dates prior to the name of Winnipeg. I think that it represents something good.

The missionary -- of course I'm not trying to introduce religion into this, but as I say it was Lord Selkirk himself that requested this help and I think that it would help, it shows that the people were very loyal. Unfortunately we lost the St. Boniface Cathedral a few years back, the Cathedral made immortal by Whittier, and now if we lose this name I think it would be sad indeed, Mr. Speaker. I'm not talking about, I'm not worried about that St. Boniface had a charter and so on; this could be replaced and things can go just as smoothly, but again I promised that I wouldn't be too long and I must live up to this so my honourable friend can do the same thing.

Sir, I think that this hyphenated name would be indeed a symbol for western Canada, the centre of Canada actually, recognizing the two official languages, but also the multi cultures of our people and I certainly hope that I will have some support in this resolution, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, this was talked about in committee, and I'd like to make our position clear on this. There's no question, first of all, Mr. Speaker, that I wouldn't like the name Winnipeg-St. Boniface, St. James-Assiniboia, Sturgeon Creek and the whole works, and I don't intend to be joking about that either; but let's be practical. We have had experience in the amalgamations where there are names. The hang-up with an amalgamation between St. James and Assiniboia was on the name and both names were brought into being, and since that time it's pretty obvious that when people are registering even in hotels, your letterheads and what-have-you, you're going into an unwieldy thing. The name has to be one name and the City of Winnipeg is the logical name - there is no question that we would argue with that - and to start adding hyphenated names is not the proper thing to do, Mr. Speaker. I have no question of St. Boniface history. I have no question about Assiniboine's history because it's one of the oldest communities in this area, but the question is we do the right thing when we do it and I think the name should be the City of Winnipeg.

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

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a brief statement on the proposal by the Member for St. Boniface. He's one of three members that represent the City of St. Boniface in this House. I don't see any panic by any one of the others to come in here with a suggestion. I think that if the member was all proud of St. Boniface and was anxious to have their name involved within the City of Winnipeg and had all this great respect for the City of St. Boniface, I don't think he would have done what he did. He left the City of St. Boniface down by being a floor-walker, a defector. He's not the type of person that's concerned about the City of St. Boniface. He gets elected as a Liberal. He changes his politics to Liberal-Democrat shortly after . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Point of privilege.

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

MR. JOHANNSON: The honourable member's been using unparliamentary language and I would ask him to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Well, so there's no mistake, Sir, I said a floor-walker and a defector and I believe that this is not unparliamentary. I think if you look back in the records of any parliament in the British Commonwealth you'll see that the words have been used before. I only say them because I believe them. I don't think it's wrong. I think that the Member for St. Boniface would not deny or say that I was wrong with what I say. He was elected as a Liberal, changed to a Liberal-Democrat and finally thought that he was really and truly a socialist.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would suggest the honourable member apply himself to the amendment and not to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I only speak, Sir, in the tone I speak and the words that I speak because the Member for St. Boniface did bring in the amendment; I'm speaking towards the relevancy this man has as an individual, a resident of, a businessman of, and a representative -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . advise that I don't care if this continues on this but I intend to answer before we close debate on Bill 36. If this is allowed, it certainly will be allowed when I speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: There's nothing I hate worse, Sir, than repetition - although the Premier of this Province says repetition is the mother of learning - when I have to get up and be broken up half-way through a sentence, be shot down and have to start over again.

As I mentioned, I don't think it was unparliamentary to say that the man is a floor-walker and a defector. I think that if he's so interested in the City of St. Boniface that he wants there to create a city of a half million people with a hyphenated name of, The City of Winnipeg-St. Boniface, I think he should have more respect for the place he lives in and does business in, and represents in the Legislature, in this fine province we have, in this fine city we're trying to set up. And for that reason I say that we're concerned that a man would bring this in. I don't see the Ukrainian people of Manitoba coming in tonight saying that they want it named Poland. They don't, and there's more Ukrainian people -- (Interjection) -- more Ukrainian people that would like the name Poland, they would far sooner have the name Poland because they're more closely connected than they are with the French. And for that reason, Sir, I think that he's asking exactly as bad a thing as if the Ukrainian people came in here and said, "No - wipe out the name 'Winnipeg', call it 'Poland', because it's my next door neighbour."

And I say that the German people - I don't see the German people here tonight. Jake Froese is not here with this Dutch-German attitude wanting to name it the name of his country. He says this is a bilingual country and we'll use it for that reason - bring St. Boniface in because it's long-standing French. Mayor Juba says that there's more Frenchmen in Winnipeg than there is in St. Boniface and I don't see any of the French people out of City of Winnipeg attending the Committee in Room 254 saying they want it named St. Boniface. They seem to like living in Charleswood - living in the City of Winnipeg. There's more people in the City of St. Boniface that aren't French, than what there are French. This man, he didn't stand up and fight in committee; didn't stand up in this House and fight to say he didn't want to see

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) St. Boniface disappear out of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to once again remind the honourable member to discuss the amendment and not the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can get pretty annoyed, you know, with the type of thing that happens in committee by the Chairman and in this House by the Speaker, and I hate, Sir . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to remind the honourable member that one of our rules is that one does not reflect upon the Speaker's rulings. Now if the honourable member wishes, I can use the privilege of this House and have him removed. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I would have to say, Sir, that the only way that I can speak towards the amendment that's in front of us is to make reference to the mover -- the only way, the absolute only way is I have to make reference to the mover, and the fact that he moved the amendment; and if the government side of the House -- (Interjection) -- It's not relevant to the motion, he said. The fact, Sir, that he comes in with an amendment like this and say that the people should stand united, when the mover was speaking to it said, people stand united; and I would wonder how they can stand united with a representative that changes as fast as he does.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I had intended only to mention that the decision on the question of a name of the new city was left entirely to the committee. There was a clear indication which became apparent rapidly during discussion, that none of the caucuses, as far as I can tell, had agreed on what the name should be; there was an open discussion in committee; members of the committee may recall that for some time during the briefs I asked the direct question as to what the person presenting the brief thought the name of the new city should be and I kept a record just for a beginning portion and 2, 4, 6 - out of the first eight or nine occasions when I had replies there was one favouring Greater Winnipeg, there was one favouring St. Boniface; all the rest favoured Winnipeg. I think the discussion at the committee level on the name was of a decent level, a decent character, an honest exchange of opinion -- there wasn't that much discussion, the name of the City of Winnipeg was agreed upon by the committee; it was neither the government nor any members of the opposition as a group that fostered or promoted any particular name. Members were free to suggest Redboine, Fort Rouge, other names.

I intended only to get up only to say that, but I can't help but feel that the person who preceded my rising, delivered himself of a dirty, cheap, self-demeaning type of address which doesn't help anybody in this Legislature, least of all him and to a lesser extent his party. I regret very much that he found it necessary to speak in the tone he did, not related to the amendment at all but just as I say in a sort of vindictive, cheap manner. I regret it; I hope

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I say that the Minister of Finance spoke up in an ungentlemanlike manner . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'd like to hear the point of order. I haven't heard one. -- (Interjection) -- That's no point of order. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I regret that he found it necessary to do it. I don't regret, but I'm sorry that I felt it necessary for me to respond as I have. I hope that the tone has not been set for the balance of the evening, but if it has then so be it; I hope it will not carry on in this way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I did sit in the committee when there was a discussion. I was not a member of the committee so I had no part in the actual decision that was made, and now we're confronted with a motion to have the city named the City of Winnipeg-St. Boniface. There was also discussion in the committee of having several of the wards in the St. Boniface area named St. Boniface east, west, south and north; I don't know whether this materialized, I don't think it did. I think there was also a suggestion made that the Community Committee, that area should carry the name St. Boniface; whether this will be the case I'm not sure at this time either. However, I, too, believe that while I share the concern of the honourable member and also with the people in St. Boniface that the name

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) should be discarded or not carry on, that I feel that the name would be too long and that I could not vote for it because of that reason. Certainly if this hadn't come about the City of St. Boniface would still be there, and I certainly wasn't the one that engineered this bill or even supported it on second reading so that this should come about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I rise for a moment or two, I feel this is a very important moment and I must say that this is the time that the question should be brought before the House as has been brought before the House by the Member for St. Boniface; but I did notice earlier in his remarks, Mr. Speaker, that he said he didn't consider the matter important, and I wonder if he didn't consider it important why he's asking for this special consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface. Point of order?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not too sure what the member said. I wonder if he'd repeat that again.

MR. SPEAKER: That's no point of order. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I took from the honourable member's remarks, Mr. Speaker, when he introduced the amendment that he did make that remark that he didn't consider it altogether important. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that he can ask for an explanation at the end, but he didn't have a point of order the second time. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence and I regret if I have misinterpreted the words of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, but there are other remarks that I did not interpret. He supported this bill, so he said, Mr. Speaker, to improve conditions for the people of this area, the area as a whole; I take it, the intercity as a whole; but I wonder why he wants this hyphenated name, Winnipeg-St. Boniface. I noticed in making his remarks, Mr. Speaker, they dragged out the old red herring -- culture, culture, culture; the people of Canada have had that stuffed down their throats for so long now at the cost of millions of dollars that they're getting a little fed up with it, and I don't see how it fits into this particular situation that's being discussed.

He mentioned a wall around St. Boniface. Mr. Speaker, if anybody's going to build a wall around St. Boniface, I say the Member for St. Boniface has already done it, not we the people; and I'm surprised that he should have made that suggestion in his remarks. It's not those of us, of other ethnic groups that have any darts to shoot at the people of French tongue, but rather we've grown up together this last 100 years and it is this sort of language that creates the dissension between us. He called for the people to stand united. They were never more united than they are today, Mr. Speaker, and never will be any more united, unless this sort of language and this approach to subjects such as this stops by people in authority who use their position and authority to do the things that create this dissension. It doesn't seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there's any reason in the world why this unicity, or the city we're talking about, should not be called the City of Winnipeg and known throughout the world as such.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Amendment by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that Section 23, after clause (b) the following section should be added, (c): "Have the power to receive from the Central City Council its per capita share of taxes collected and administer the monies received for (i) community clubs, parks, social and recreational centres; (ii) local street and boulevards not on the present Metro system, and (iii) local snow removal and garbage collection.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few brief remarks. I want to say at the present time that of all the delegations that appeared before our committee, almost every single one zeroed on the question of community committees, I would say the majority of the delegations expressed their concern that the community committees have no purpose almost, because they have no power, with the exception I believe -- maybe one or two of the delegations expressed they would want to see that there would be no committees in existence at all. But almost everyone else agreed that there should be community committees and expressed desire

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) that they should have some more power, and more authority, to deal with local municipal things such as I mentioned and, in fact, I would like to see the local community committees have some more power in respect to local planning. At one time I thought it would be quite feasible for the local community committees to have the taxation power to raise the finances for the purpose that they need, meaning the community clubs, snow removal and perhaps even local police and fire. But this did not find too reasonable with the government members; they said that the rich communities will be able to have better services than the rest of the communities, and for this reason I put in my amendment that the community committees should receive their per capita share whatever the basic minimum requirements are for the local services, the per capita share, so that no community would receive more than - for instance, the have-not communities should not be at the disadvantage because the rich communities would have more taxing ability to have better services. So for this reason I changed my thinking and thought that perhaps it would be much better if the community committees would receive their per capita share for such services as I mentioned, the snow removal, community clubs, and even some of the local streets - and I wish to draw to your attention there are many streets, or some streets, in my constituency where people do not have a sidewalk, they prefer to use the street. They have a wide boulevard, and this is what they prefer to have. Now in some other areas perhaps they wish to have the sidewalks. In Charleswood they may want to have hardtopped streets instead of paved streets, so I think that once the basic minimum is established for these services, and if any area wishes to improve that standard, well then surely that improvement should come from the areas that people wish to have those extra services, and the money should be raised in that area.

So for this reason I am proposing this amendment to the House and I'm sure that it should find much favour with many of the members, particularly the members in St. James-Assiniboia, because this is what was requested in the brief from the St. James-Assiniboia; this is what was requested by almost every council, or every alderman that appeared before our committee, with the exception that there were some independent members, and I wish to state Mr. Charles Huband who said that he would like to see community committees disbanded completely. But aside from, I think, his brief, and perhaps to some extent maybe the last one, Professor Lloyd Axworthy, all the others have had a considerable amount of experience on council. The mayors and aldermen themselves, they all requested and wanted more fiscal powers for the local communities so that they would have some direct connection with their constituents, so they would be able to do something. So as I mentioned, I thought at one time that they should have power to levy taxes on residential property for the purpose of financing these local services, but it did not find favour with the government members because they said well the rich communities will have better services, the others will not have as good services. So I am proposing something that's most reasonable to them in saying, give it to us on a per capita basis for whatever the minimum requirement is established by the regional council, and I'm sure that this should find favour with the Member for St. James, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, and perhaps some of the other members. So I would hope that all members would be able to support this amendment.

I may also point out - I know that it has been brought to the committee's attention - that some areas would like to have snow removal on a much better basis than some of the other parts of the city; some areas want their garbage removed twice a week, or three times a week, and some areas want their garbage picked up from the garage, or behind the House. Well if that's the case, then I feel that they should pay extra for that service and there should be a basic minimum established. So once the basic minimum service has been established for your regional council, there is no reason why per capita grant or money allowed for those services should be given to your local community committee so they can supervise the services; and if there are areas that wish to improve upon the basic services they have the power, and they have the power to tax the local area to do so. So I hope that I will get support on this amendment.

I was quite happy that there were some changes that were recommended by our group, such as electing the mayor at large; and that the bill will be going before the Law Reform Committee to deal with some of the offensive clauses that were in the bill. But I think with the amendment the way it is drafted, I am sure that there's no reason why the members cannot support it, because it's almost, of all the debates that have taken place - and the debates in the committee and the hearings are drafted or couched in such a way, that it would be almost difficult for the members not to accept. I think it is most reasonable and I hope they'll vote for it.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words of support for the motion brought forward by the Member for Assiniboia. Repeatedly we were told in committee, those that attended the meetings, in addition to the members, that there should be powers given to these committees in order that they could function properly, and also to give them some purpose. I feel that these committees will not be successful unless they do have power to receive funds and to administer, and to spend certain monies as they see fit for the various purposes mentioned in the resolution. Certainly I think most members should agree that a standard of service will be met by the council, and in addition to that I feel that in the various areas if they want improved services, they should be entitled to receive them. If they want to pay for it, why not? I think this freedom should be given to the various communities as is proposed here and I fail to see why the government will not go along and give them some finances in this way, give them power to receive monies for the purpose; otherwise they will not perform a useful function and I don't think they can be a success, they will fall by the wayside, and within a few years we'll probably have amendments placed before this House in connection with this Act that they be done away with completely. I think this is what will happen if we do not provide them with some funds, some wherewithal with which to progress in their effort and in their endeavour.

The resolution calls to support community clubs, parks, social and recreational centres. Certainly these are matters that committees of this type will be concerned with and in order to maintain the community spirit, because I think it will be very hard for some of the communities to get a community spirit going because they will be brought together from different areas, different from what they have been in the past, and therefore I also feel that it is essential that we do what is being proposed here in this amendment.

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my comments would be very brief, because nearly everything that has been said, I agree with. I stated in committee, and I would like to say that this is a formula by which the identification of the community councils would remain. It is a formula in which they would be able to continue to have some of the things they want by paying for them themselves. It's a formula that would guarantee that in the future that the community committee will just not die. And as I said in the committee, Mr. Speaker, I said that the community committees are going to have to find a way, or there will have to be a way found for community committees, to have some things that they want other than the standard of the city or you'll find that people will move elsewhere -- they'll even start other communities because they will have the things that they want. You are not going to stop people from doing that, and I believe this is a formula by which it could be done. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I have to say a few words very briefly because Charleswood of course, and particularly Tuxedo, is involved in what goes on and what this amendment tries to do to Bill 36. I think that if the community committees can have their several dollars that is allocated to them to spend in the way that is right, that they feel is right, rather than what the central city core figures is right; I know that Tuxedo, for instance, enjoys a bi-weekly garbage pickup and the balance of the city doesn't have that. I think in the west end of the constituency that I represent, the union of Charleswood, we have several features there much like what happened in the constituency of Assiniboia. There are areas there that they don't have the concrete, and they don't have the storm sewer in that area. I think the people might, and the council representing that area might want to spend its money in a different fashion from what would be suggested by the top echelon down town. I think for that reason if the money can be allocated to the community area from the central city powers, I think it will be better spent and certainly spent more wisely.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have, as I am sure you have before you, several amendments. Would you like me to pick the order I'd like to put them in, Sir, or would you like . . . ? All right, Sir.

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, I think we'll just take the first one.

I would move, that Section 8 be amended by striking out subsection (a) and (b) and (c), and substituting therefor the following subsections: (a) Prepare capital and current estimates for the year 1972 and; (b) between January 1st, 1972 and December 31st, 1972, make arrangements for the organization of the council and the administration of the city, the assumption of the jurisdiction over municipal services, and the employment of such persons as it deems necessary, and generally to do all things necessary to assume on the 1st day of January, 1972 all responsibilities and power now exercised by the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg and the City of Winnipeg respecting its Hydro Electric system, the Winnipeg Enterprises Corporation, the Pan-Am Pool. Seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, this amendment we have introduced has been referred to by the Minister in committee, as an amendment which would be a one-year-hoist on the bill. We don't put that amendment in with that thinking at all. We do not quarrel with the fact that there is going to be an election in September. If there is going to be an election in September, we believe that the councillors that are elected in the community committees can carry on the duties of the cities in these areas very much the same as they are being carried on at the present time, Sir. There is no question that the councils could refer their budgets to the 50-man council, just as they refer them to the municipal board at the present time.

The councillors would have to do a yeoman job in handling their community committee and also working on the main council to see that the cities are operating properly. But in the meantime, Sir, the organization of the new city would be able to be done by bringing in the experienced people in all areas, by using the treasurers and the engineers that are available to them, and, Sir, as I have said in my arguments on this bill, this has not been done. The people who are working in the area in the civil governments have not been contacted to that degree. I believe that the administration would go much smoother if we have to have this Bill; and I'm also very sure much less costly. These people are already being paid by the cities and they can be used by the new council to have an orderly integration of this city in 1972.

We are not saying, don't have your elections if the bill goes through; we are saying that it can allow the 50-man council to give the community committees much the same authority they have at the present time reporting to the 50-man council, this can be done. And in 1972 because you have used experienced people, you will have an orderly takeover, and, Sir, you will have much less expense for the people of this province by doing it that way. The Task Force and the committee that the Honourable Minister has working at the present time is costly and nobody can tell you any different; and this could be avoided if you took the orderly changeover by using the year of 1972 and having an orderly takeover at the end of that year. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to what the honourable member said and there's hardly anything I disagree with what he said. I do disagree with the amendment, however, because the Act is so designed that all that he describes is exactly what could happen, because the takeover is one which leaves with the community committees their present responsibilities. He didn't say anything about taxation; I therefore have to assume that he agrees that taxation should be equalized over all. If he doesn't agree with that then, of course, there's a basic disagreement. Other than that there's nothing in what he said, nor even in the amendment that prevents the council from doing exactly what he thinks it ought to do the way he describes it.

The only thing I disagree with in the amendment is that it appears to me to be a prohibition from the council from moving in any way during the year 1972. I think that's wrong. I think council should have the right to make changes if and when it feels ready to do so. And that's the only difference. Other than that, other than the prohibition - and frankly, Mr. Speaker, that's why I did call the 12-months hoist in takeover jurisdiction - but other than the prohibition which this amendment states, that council shall busy itself for a whole year preparing itself, then everything that he says is something council can do; it doesn't have to take over any service, anything else. So that I must reject the attempt to thwart the decision or desire of council if in its wisdom it decides during 1972 to make changes in the structure.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) Clearly council can do it but I don't want to stop it.

Just one other thing, and that is I thought I made it absolutely clear, we have a number of task forces that are now working and are now starting to work. There are four are at work, there are two more about to start, which will by the end of this year and earlier, by the time a new council is elected, be able to present the council with all kinds of information and guidance such as the honourable member suggested will take a long time to gather. And the fact is that as of yesterday, I have received replies from nine of the thirteen municipal authorities to whom I wrote requesting assistance and the loan of their personnel to the extent that they could assist us in preparing for an organizational system to present to the new council and for budgeting preparation for 1972. Let me make it clear, somebody used the word in committee that we intend to spoonfeed them. We intend to tell them nothing, give them no instructions; we intend to give them all the information we can accumulate, make it available to them; we intend to gather that kind of material which they can use; the extent to which they want to use it will be up to the new council.

But these task forces are doing exactly what the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek suggested ought to be done and will have to be done and I tell him it is being done. And I will also say, Mr. Speaker, that as of yesterday, we received nine replies to the 13 letters sent out. I'm told that all 13 have already at their administrative level indicated support or concurrence in our appeal to them for this kind of assistance, this kind of input. Of the nine, the ninth letter was the first one that became somewhat legalistic in its decision as to the manner in which it would release its secretary-treasurer, for example, to advise the task forces in its work. That one came from the Mayor of West Kildonan who is a lawyer and maybe that's why it was legalistic in its interpretation. The first eight responded, I haven't got the letters, I'm informed by my staff, responded saying - by all means we've instructed our senior personnel to make themselves available; they'll be ready to discuss with your Task Force all kinds of information that may be required. I don't think there will be a problem, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Member from Brandon West, that the following subsection be inserted after subsection 6 of Section 27: "27(7). If any community committee incurs a surplus as a consequence of its operation, in any particular year, the community committee may with approval of the central council apply all or any part of that surplus towards payment of the implementation of any program it chooses to implement during a subsequent period of time."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a request from the Member for Assiniboia for more power for the community councils and the principle of the bill and the government does apparently not believe that that should happen. I believe the amendment here is something that is very very logical. Under the community councils they refer their budgets for cultural, recreational, public works and operation, protection of persons and property, health and social development. In this field they can spend in cultural and recreation, if they want to move the money from community clubs to tennis playing they can, and we have requested previously that they could move it from one section to the other but the government does not feel that that should be done.

Mr. Speaker, there is such a thing called "equipment reserves" - I'm sure the Attorney-General will recognize the statement. He was famous for having little pockets himself. In fact he was an alderman before I was, Sir, and he taught me some of these things. Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is if a community committee has the ability to manage their affairs with their community committee and you give them the right, Sir, to say, you know, ladies and gentlemen we may not do this this year but if we are careful and watch our budgets, etc., we don't overspend and you don't push us for wanting the moon and what have you, we may be able to accumulate some money from this year and present it to council the following year and get their blessing with the new budget to use this money in your district. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with that; we're asking for the blessing of Council to do it. Now you're saying, I know the story that at the end of a budget year anything left over goes back in the pot, that's the way we've always worked. But as I said, the Attorney-General knows well what equipment reserves are, and he also knows well that equipment reserves have always been used for the

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) benefit of the community.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason I say that this is possible is this; nobody in this room is going to tell me how much money the Civic Centre in St. James-Assiniboia is going to make in 1971. I don't know whether the team is going to reach the playoffs or not. I don't know if it may start to rain and rain that our swimming will go up in attendance or go down; and if the sun shines, our swimming will go up. There is no way of estimating in any way, shape or form accurately on a community club or recreational budget. You try very hard to be close, Sir, but you might not be that accurate. And if by good management you come out ahead with the money, you were able to rent your auditorium more than you expected, and you were able to rent your facilities more than you expected, and because of your good management you have a little surplus, I can't see why that can't be left. If you want to, I might say, leave it in Culture and Recreation, but you've got to go to council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Minister of Urban Affairs is going to get up and say to me, "what if they have a deficit." There is no possible way any of these community committees can have a deficit without getting permission from the central council. Sir, if they run out of money and they have to keep things going and they have to keep it operating, they've got to go to the central council to get the money or else they just close the facility or they don't There's no way that they can have a deficit without it being approved by the Central Council. But there is a way through good management that they could have a small surplus, or work to have a small surplus working within their committee, the committees that this government want set up and let them work with them. There is no way that they could not accumulate a small surplus to spend the money in their area the way they want to the same as we used to have equipment reserves.

Mr. Speaker, I know it's a favourable way of doing things because I was taught a good way of doing things, and I assure you, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment is something that will give a little brighter light to the community committees in the local area. Thank you very much.

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

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, in the area that I've represented for six years as a member of the council, we found every time without fail that coming towards September or October area of the year that you had more money that you intended to buy gravel with in your public works, or some portion of your administration rather than what you had thought you might have for recreation or programs for recreation and we found ourselves from time to time moving it back and forth. I think that if one community can show better administration and operate in an area that is economical and save themselves some money on their public works end or their gravelling, their street repair, their back lane repair and operate efficiently, I think that they should have the opportunity to move that money out of one column in their budget over into another. There's several ways that it happens. Recreation as was brought up by the Member for Sturgeon Creek I think is a very important one; that is always one that we are concerned about getting as many dollars as we can to spend on the youth of our community and facilities for them to play in and to better their abilities in sport, it betters their personalities, it keeps them out of the dining room that they could get into with their parents. It's something that we need for them. I think that if each community throughout the area of the new city is allowed to transfer this money from one column of the budget as they see they're going to have excess and shortages, if they can juggle those back and forth and break even at the end of the year I think this is very very important.

I know that there's going to be some of the communities that are going to operate at a deficit and it's happened from time to time possibly in the municipality that I represent, but I think that this is a definite reflection to bad management, not only by the council but by the administrative staff. I think this is something that's got to be looked at and watched closely; but certainly don't make those with good management that have a surplus suffer for those that have bad management and a deficit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to comment only on the wording of the section and not the general discussion we've heard: "If any community committee incurs a surplus as a consequence of its operations in any particular year." Now we're only talking about a surplus resultant as a consequence of its operations, and frankly I don't know who judges whether the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) surplus came about through that means or through another means like no snow or no rain or no need for some eventuality coming up which would require money, "then the community committee may, with the approval of the central council, apply all or any part of that surplus in the implementation of any program it chooses." Now it says "with the approval of the council . . . any program that it chooses." Let me make it clear that in my interpretation of the present bill, the present what will be the Act, gives the authority to council to do exactly what could be done as described by honourable members either in a specific or in a general way. That's up to council and it's up to members of council all of whom are members of community committees. This is possible. But this section itself seems to imply that council would sort of have to give a blanket approval, in advance, to a community committee to do anything it chooses. And I don't believe that council should be in that position and I don't believe that a community committee should be in a position to look for pockets to put little funds of money for such purposes, because then it's as if it's working against itself and its own body.

So all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is the bill gives the right to council to permit this kind of development to take place, this kind of encouragement to take place, but I don't think that the wording is acceptable nor is it necessary.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River, that Sections 43 and 44 be deleted and the following sections be substituted therefor: "The council shall have the right to employ such administrative, professional and other personnel as it may require, under such terms and conditions as it sees fit, and to delegate such duties and responsibilities to them as in the opinion of the council to the proper discharge of their functions."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we brought this up in committee; we still feel, Sir, that the council should be in the position of setting up its own committees. We do not believe it should be worked out or specified in this bill; you are electing 50 councillors to a new council and I think they have every right to set up their committee systems the way they see fit.

I believe that the councillors should be spread out much more thinly than they will be on to many different committees. I think every councillor should be working on committees, they should be on these committees to assure that they have good representation and closeness to the situations at hand; but, Sir, the main thing is, is this bill tells 50 men who will be elected how they have to set up their committees.

Nobody tells this government how they have to do it before they ran for office; I don't think the City of Winnipeg should be told how to set up their committees to operate the new city.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on this amendment, because some of the remarks I will make on this amendment could have been made on the other amendments, but I think they're rather appropriate to be made now. I would hope that the remarks that I will make now and in the remaining amendments to be proposed by our side will not be repetitious but will simply present a basic theme of opposition to the plan on the basis that what is being proposed is something that embodies consideration and thinking by academics and by practical politicians who have attempted to blend a combination together that will be better than what we have now; better than what others have been able to devise in other areas, but realistically on the basis of what has been proposed, I predict will not be as good as anticipated or expected, nor will it equal anywhere near the expectations that the Minister of Finance and other members of the party have expressed before.

The Board of Commissioners or this basic concept that we have been asked to delete, the administrative end which we've been asked to delete, as proposed by the government places too much power and too much authority in the hands of an administration that basically will not be subject to the control and direction of the members of council who are elected, but rather to the select few who will be on the various committees as proposed in the statute authority that is being devised and who in many respects may be considered to be answerable to the council, but in real terms will be only answerable to the Board of Commissioners.

What I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that in reality what is going to happen is that the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . . . Board of Commissioners are going to be supreme and the politicians are going to be secondary; because it's structured that way, it's designed that way and it defeats, I think, the essential purpose or essential requirement of municipal authority, that the elected officials have the opportunity to devise a policy and to be able to oversee its execution so that the people will benefit.

Mr. Speaker, this section is not basic to the plan. If the government can change its mind on the mayor overnight -- and we're going to discuss that -- if the government can trust the people to elect the mayor, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, they can trust the council to set the structure; they can trust the council to be able to develop the administration; and they can trust the council to do the things; because if in fact we talk in terms of a democratic procedure why do we tie the hands of the elected officials to be able to accomplish what they have been elected for? We present a framework, an outline, and beyond that outline they should be able to move as they see fit. The government is attempting as we've said before, to in fact blend central administrative authority with political decentralization, but, Mr. Speaker, it will not work; and once the government has rejected the concept that the community committee be given some of the powers that have been asked for by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia and the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, once they've rejected that, and once we really then talk in terms of a central administration, then at this point, Mr. Speaker, put the power in the hands of the council, give them the authority, let them make the decision, let them devise a structure, let them set up the kind of committee system and administrative system that they see fit. And even though there may be some difficulty and even though there may be some haggling and bitterness, and even though it may not work in the theoretic as well as some theoretical concept that could be presented or has been presented at this time, if we're prepared to go through the sheer agony that the City of Winnipeg is going to have to go through with an elected mayor fighting and bickering with the council, if we're prepared to do that, we can go through the procedure of allowing the council to set up its own administration and to be able to work and set up within one very broad outline the framework under which it can operate so that the councillors will in fact have something meaningful to do rather than something that's artificial, rather than something that essentially will be window dressing and which will I suggest accomplish neither the purpose but rather add to the confusion for the next three-year period once they have been elected and taken office.

So, Mr. Speaker, the argument is presented once again in this House, but the argument is presented at a time when the government itself has changed fundamentally the basic structure that was first proposed and they can consider this because in reality they would be giving power to the people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, that was a very nice-sounding speech. It even gave me the impression for a moment when I wasn't listening carefully that the honourable member knew whereof he spoke. I'm a little bit sorry that when he loses his job as leader of his party and is no longer an MLA that he won't have a chance to go into municipal affairs and learn something about how one conducts municipal administration, so that at least I could acknowledge or believe that he really had a picture of just how it operates; but instead of that, of necessity, and through no fault of his own -- I certainly wouldn't fault him -- he's had to rely on what he's been told and what he's been able to learn from the newspapers and many of us are often in that position, so of course I recognize that that is the difficulty under which he has been labouring.

One of the problems that I have found is that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has not really studied this Act or this Bill and the support material sufficiently to try to understand how we are envisioning the structure of the new government; but he does know, because he does read the paper and he's lived in the city long enough, and he has had occasion to deal with councils, and he has dealt with councils and with administrators, that there are power elements and administrative groups that sometimes vie with each other. There are power elements within an administrative group that sometimes assert the preferences of attention for their departments over and above that of possibly a less effective or less forceful director.

The elimination of this section eliminates what? It eliminates the Board of Commissioners; it does not eliminate the commissioners, it does not change the committee set-up. It eliminates the board. What will follow if this amendment passes -- and since it won't pass, then, of course, we won't have the following motion I'm sure -- would be a motion to reduce certain powers of the commissioners, but I get a signal that that is coming anyway. So let's

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) deal with the fact that this motion proposes to remove the Board of Commissioners, not the commissioners, not the standing committees, but to only deal with the removal of the board. Well, Mr. Speaker, to remove the board succeeds only in eliminating the efforts that we're making to create a form whereby there will be coordination of activities and the responsibility of a form of unified accountability to council from the administration. In other words, you won't have a director reporting to a committee and getting at a council without making sure that the report that comes to council comes as a result of the concerted review by all three commissioners and the chief commissioner so that you get a unified and coordinated report and recommendation, and that's all it does. Because the main thing is that council still receives -- I can't quite adjust my speech to the beat of the drum on the desk of the Leader of the Opposition, so if he could soften the drum a bit I can -- yeah, the cadence isn't mine. The . . . then, Mr. Speaker, was that council keeps all its powers, has been set in committee, council has the power to add subcommittees, any number it wishes, but the important thing is administration should report through a centralized body so that when it makes a report it will do so in the full knowledge of all other administrative problems and programs and be able to reflect priorities and a measure of consideration of one program as against another. I think that's desirable, I think it's necessary. If council doesn't want it, then it really doesn't make use of it, therefore it disappears. What's more important is, if by the time the next session rolls around -- and it won't be that long from now -- if council really has given this a try and feels that a change is necessary we will listen and be prepared to do so as we have in the past and as we've shown as recently as the honourable member indicates, we are prepared to do. It won't be too long but at least it is worth giving it a try because it's a new concept and one that people should not approach with preconceived ideas such as are evidenced by the speech of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment. No doubt as the Finance Minister says that other amendments would have to follow if this one was accepted. However, we have to make a beginning somewhere and I think the amendment is only proper because I, too, don't subscribe to the principle of having commissioners and have that type of a system brought into the administration of the City of Winnipeg after Bill 36 is passed. I feel that we're putting too much power into the hands of these three people and that as a result we will have increased bureaucracy, the people will be further removed from government and it will be more difficult for them to get changes brought about and to get their briefs and whatever they may have looked after.

I do not want to prolong the discussion; I simply want to state that I'm opposed to the principle of this type of administration and I feel that we should give the power to the central committee to administer the City of Winnipeg more or less along the lines as they see fit, to set up the various committees as they desire without having this put into the statute so that they cannot make changes as they see fit.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member from Riel, that Section 50 be deleted.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my comments on the removal of Section 50, I'm sure the Minister is wondering why I insisted on keeping it there because we lost 43 which is the destruction, or lost 43 which would eliminate the commissioners. Now that we have the commissioners, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the power that they have in this legislation or the organization of the commissioners is such that is going to be for good government in Manitoba.

The structure which is set up in this piece of legislation will mean that the commissioners will have the largest or the greatest control over this new city. They will be there setting up the organization not long before the elected members -- they could even be appointed before the next election. I may be wrong there, Mr. Speaker -- I'm sorry, it's been a long day -- but anyway, I firmly believe that the commissioners should not have the powers they have, and if we're going to have the commissioners, I believe that the council should be the one that sets out their duties. Now, the Minister will be certainly saying that I'm a little confused at having 43 first or 52nd and what have you, but the whole section is basically on commissioners; the

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd). . . . commissioner set-up is not a good form of government and, if we're going to have them, I think their powers should be greatly reduced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise again on this particular amendment in essence to discuss the amendment and to reply to the Minister of Finance. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I resent very much the continual attack by the government that when something is questioned it obviously comes (a) from a lack of knowledge - you know, first, because we do not have the experience of the members opposite, or that I didn't have the experience, and their experience, because it has made them so much wiser, has given them, you know, the prerogative of governing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I resent it as strong as I can express -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I have made a prediction and I make a prediction now, that the Board of Commissioners as proposed in this act will give far greater power to that group than any administration in the municipal structure now has; that there will be nothing but a continual conflict with the council; that there will be a breakdown, and that we in turn will probably have a request to re-legislate this proposal; and I say that based, not on my experience, but based -- well, no one knows, but based on the research and discussion, and the delegations - but these statements were made prior to the delegations - based on people who, I would suggest, are more knowledgeable than the Minister of Finance, have been involved in municipal politics longer, based on academics who are as knowledgeable as the consultants that were presented to the committee, and based on some real understanding and feeling of what's happening with respect to urban matters not only in Canada but in North America. So the remarks that have been made by myself have come as a result of discussion, reading and research, and it's not necessary, Mr. Speaker, for me to stand up and defend myself, nor do I intend to, in every situation. But so long, Mr. Speaker, as the government continues to use the tack that everything we suggest is objectionable because they are so smart, and because they are so experienced, because they are so experienced and they are so smart from their experience, then I suggest Mr. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe we have an amendment before us. I have tried to relate the honourable member's remarks to the amendment but it eludes me. I wonder if he would make his remarks to the amendment before us. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am, and I'm talking about the Board of Commissioners. It was referred to in the previous motion and it is now referred to in this motion. And, Mr. Speaker, may I say, I do this now because if anything indicated the areas with which the government have acted, not only in this matter but in other matters, it's typified in this particular situation, because, Mr. Speaker, this is an experiment for Manitoba; this is a unique situation. We admit that. They don't know, nor do we know, but we've made some judgments based not just on the newspaper reports, or on the limited information that the Minister has presented us, because in real terms the Minister and the government have presented us with very little, but based on some analysis as well of the commissioner system in other jurisdictions, and on the city manager's system in other jurisdictions, and relating it to the experience already in Manitoba, through the Metro Corporation, and through the City of Winnipeg, and the municipal structures, and with respect to the manner and the way in which and the horizons of the administrators who in all likelihood will be placed in the top positions in the structure that's being proposed. Because, you know, if we want to talk in reality, what's going to happen is that people who are now involved to a large extent are still going to be involved in the structure that's being proposed in the administrative end, and there is a great deal of power being given; far greater, far greater than I think is desirable. Far greater than will be workable, that can work with a council that wants to do a job - and that's a question for the council that wants to do a job. I suggest and I bring forward again the point that whether the government likes it or not, at this point, we place on the record our dissent from that proposal on the basis that the council itself should determine the administrative structure, and its committee structure, and go through the agonizing that has to take place to put itself in a position to make it work. But what's being imposed on it has certain basic difficulties and the essential one is the attempt by the government to politically decentralize and at the same time to administratively centralize, and it isn't going to work. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, again we propose this as a matter of placing it on the record, recognizing that the government has the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) majority; recognizing that it's easy for any member on the opposite side to stand up and say, "You don't know." Well, I'll tell you something, Mr. Speaker, they don't know, they don't know at all. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, as uneducated as they may think my opinion is, and as educated as they may think their opinion is, they are gambling with the proposal that's being put forth, and I think we have a right at this point to indicate that, to indicate our concern; to indicate the inconsistency with the philosophy that's being presented with respect to the bill. And further, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fundamental change that was made with the mayor now being elected, there is no justification for not having to reconsider this proposal because it's basic to what they are attempting to do and it still is our belief that the power will be in the hands of the administrator rather than with the councillors and rather than with the people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, let me make it absolutely clear that we don't pretend we know all the answers; and let me make it absolutely clear that we have indicated that we believe that this is the best way in which to proceed. We have also indicated more than once that this Legislature will be meeting again and that the Legislature will be reviewing again, with the creation of a Ministry for Urban Affairs, will be working closely with the council to assess progress. We can always make changes and that is part of an on-going process of adjusting to a new system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I have a great deal of respect for the knowledge and the ability and the experience for a number of the members of the Opposition, especially those who have had municipal experience. I was critical of the Leader of the Opposition for speaking in the pompous way he did about matters where I believe he did not know enough about what he spoke, whether because of lack of experience or whether because of lack of his own study in depth of the proposals. I do not say that all the Opposition shares that lack of depth, and I said I didn't fault him, he's a busy man. He has a great deal to learn - to do, I'm sorry. He has a great deal to do and I can't expect him to cover the whole gambit of legislation but when he spoke as he did, he had a right to do so, the Opposition has a right and even a duty to point out defects and deficiencies, I accept it. I was critical of the manner he used. I continue to be critical.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, through the sitting of the Municipal Affairs Committee, having listened to most of the representations made at the Committee, there were a number of things that came out and recurred over and over again from the different delegations regardless of who they were. The position of the commissioners in the structure of the new city was one of the greatest concerns that came out of most of the briefs. Now as a result of that, we would have thought that the government would have given consideration to the position of the commissioners in such a powerful position in the structure of the decision-making that's going to have to be done with the new city.

The government has made the change, has introduced the change of electing the mayor at large, which effectively changes significantly the powers and the influence that the elected councillors are going to have. Now as a result of this, electing the mayor at large, and having the commissioners at the top of the pyramid, it becomes pretty clear that the councillors that are elected are going to be in a difficult position in actually having nearly as much influence as they would have (a) if they were to elect their own person and (b) probably more important, if they were in a position of making more of the administrative decisions and fewer of them being made by the commissioners. And this was part of the main thrust of the briefs that were made to the committee, whether the commissioners were too strong, too powerful, and that more power should be legislated and delegated to the elected members of the councils. Now as a result of this, I think that the government when they have seen fit mid-stream to make an important change in how the mayor gets into his position, that they would also have an open enough mind to pay heed to the recommendations that did come from the briefs at committee, and also review the powers of these commissioners.

Undoubtedly they have looked at other cities where a commissioner type of government is in force - I think they can look at some Canadian ones. For example, I think they might find in Calgary that the people there would think twice again before setting up a commissioner type of government. And that's only one example. I don't intend, you know, to imply that I'm well briefed in all the city managements that use them. But it's pretty clear from the

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) structure here that it's not going to help the grass roots movement of getting people involved in the political process. The problem that has plagued Metro, and the Minister stands before us and says those of you who have not been involved can do nothing but read newspapers and pass on second-hand information, if I can paraphrase what he was implying. Well, we're well aware that he and the Minister of Mines and Resources are the only two people, I guess, that have been on the Metro Council and therefore I suppose can say that they've got an inside track and know how this is going to work, and all the rest of you Indians can read the newspapers because we've got the experience, and we're the chiefs in this.

But one of the problems that plagued Metro, despite what the Minister's impression of it is, was the fact that the elected people, even on the present Metro council, have not had the degree of power or influence over Metro decisions that you found at the local level, and to insert and inject the commissioners into the structure in the position where they have designed them for us, is going to aggravate the problem even more than it is. Therefore if for no other reason than to actually assist the government's aims and desires, to get more going in terms of participation by elected people and by the electorate, for goodness sakes review this and let the council decide whether they want to put these commissioners into this powerful slot that you've got legislated for them now.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel, that the proposed Section 81 of the amended bill, be amended by striking out the word "may" in the first line, and substituting therefor the word "shall".

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition may wonder why we are being so insistent upon this. We did not win it in committee. We had an amendment on the Part 3 of the bill, the Official Languages section, and we fully agreed with the amendment, and we have no quarrel whatsoever re cultural, re the two official languages of Canada. In fact, I don't particularly want to get into the discussion. I know the opinions of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when he gave his opinions, but again, they are opinions on official languages and how it should be handled in Canada. Well, I'm not interested in that.

81 says the City may make available at its central offices, or any other city office or department, persons who can communicate in languages other than the official languages of Canada. We asked for the word "shall" in this and the argument was given to us that it would seem they would have to have a staff or somebody from every country possibly there to communicate. That is not what we are asking. The argument came up, Sir, that when we were giving this, that we had originally mentioned languages such as Ukrainian, German, Italian, and the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre said he was sorry we left out Gaelic, and I guess I can agree with him there. But all we are saying, Sir, that if somebody walks into the City Hall, or the Administrative Buildings of this new City, instead of saying "Angus go home," - and the way this reads he can - it says, the City "may" make available. We are saying the City "shall" make available, and I don't care where they get them. They can find somebody who can communicate, even if it happens to be somebody up on the 4th floor or the 5th floor, but the City "shall" make available in its central offices, or any other city office, or department, persons who can communicate in languages other than the official languages of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we are not, or I am not, moving this amendment on any other basis than a sound based fact basis. We have many different languages in this province. The City should be able to communicate. We don't like the word "may". I don't like the word "may." I don't think everybody realizes it leaves a lot to be desired, and in something like this I think the city "shall" make available is the proper wording.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Well, Mr. Speaker, I dealt with this matter at the committee stage and the Honourable the Minister of Finance has asked me and I'm very happy to deal with it at this stage as well.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is a member in the House that doesn't have the

(MR. GREEN cont'd) same intent with regard to what should happen in a Civic Administration, and I can assure the honourable member that the City of Winnipeg, and particularly the north end of the City of Winnipeg, and thereby the people who would use the administration services of the City of Winnipeg couldn't operate unless there were available people within that city administration who could speak the different languages that are spoken by the people in north Winnipeg, and in the rest of Winnipeg. There is no doubt, there is no doubt that this is done and I have no doubt, just as the honourable members opposite had no doubt, that the City would be able to choose its form of administration. I have no doubt that the politicians elected at the civic level will do justice to all of the ethnic groups that live within our society. But I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. James-Assiniboia, and I don't suggest that is - excuse me, Sturgeon Creek - I don't suggest that this is his intention, but I suggest that the issue here is not whether any government, such as the Provincial Government, or civic governments, or a government that exists, let us say, in Pine River where probably, when I was there, I am sure that more talking is done in Ukrainian than is done in English, that the question is not whether services will be made available, but how do we insure within our city administration that the same respect upon which Canadian nationalism is based will find its way into municipal government?

The arguments in this respect, Mr. Speaker, have been twofold. There have been people who have said, whenever the question of bilingualism has arisen, there have been people who have said, "Well, if the country is going to have two official languages, why are you leaving out the Ukrainians? Why are you leaving out the Poles? Why are you leaving out our native people, the Cree, the other Indian ethnic groups, or any other of the ethnic groups that are in society?" And it is usually the case, Mr. Speaker, and I don't refer to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek in this regard, but it's usually the case that the people who advance that type of position advance this on the basis of its impossibility, that trying to create -- well, if the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek would just let me continue.

The fact is that any suggestion that one can make, every single language in this country on the same official status level, is really saying that this should be an Anglo-Saxon country; that English is the official language that there should be, because it would be impossible to have every other language as official languages. Why is it that this Legislature at this time, and with respect to this city, we are talking about other languages? It's not because, Mr. Speaker, Canadians by virtue of some innate understanding, some superior intelligence, have a respect for minority groups that often is not found in other countries; it doesn't come because of some innate intelligence, it comes about rather accidentally, Mr. Speaker, by an accident of history - and it's strictly an accident. We have been founded as a nation, not on the basis of a homogenous culture, not on the basis of, let us say, the same way as France was founded, or the same way as Germany was founded, or the same way as Italy was founded, whereby each person in their country moves towards being a nationalist Italian, or a nationalist German, and I think that we saw the epitome of the damage that can be done with that type of nationalism during 1945 when people were talking about being 100 percent pure Arian German and the effect that it had on minority groups in that country.

I think that we can also see the same difference as to what takes place in the United States and what takes place in Canada, where people talk in the United States of being 100 percent red-blooded American. But in Canada, Mr. Speaker, because the country was founded on the basis, not of homogenous culture, on the basis of two cultures, this feature of Canadian history has spread itself out whereby every other minority group gets the benefit of it, and Mr. Speaker, what is paradoxical is that that benefit is lost if one attempts to say that you are going to legislate equal status for every language in this country. Because what -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member for Sturgeon Creek does not want this, but will he do me the courtesy of respecting a difference of opinion on this question? Because there is a difference of opinion. As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, I know that I, as a Jew, and that my constituents as Ukrainians, Poles, Germans, Icelandic, would not be better off if this country was an Anglo-Saxon country. Mr. Speaker, there are English-speaking people in that part of town as well and they would not be better off if this was an Anglo-Saxon country.

We are in the fortunate position of living in a country which is not based on a homogeneity of culture; we are fortunate in living in a country where the very nationalism itself is based on the mutual respect of one person for another, and it has nothing to do with English

(MR. GREEN cont'd) being superior; it has nothing to do with French being superior; they happen to be the two accidental languages upon which the country was founded, but each of us gains the benefit of it. And I suggest to you that any attempt, any attempt to say that all of the languages have the same status is an attack on the ethnic position, Mr. Speaker, of the very languages that are not either English or French, and as well, Mr. Speaker, when I put this position. I repeat, I don't put it for the purpose of favouring the English language or favouring the French language; frankly, I put it for the position of favouring myself as an ethnic minority group living in a country which has within its very foundation the respect of one ethnic minority group for another. And the honourable member says that the word "shall" doesn't affect that argument. Well, he's entitled to his opinion, Mr. Speaker. I am merely voicing my opinion.

I know that every time someone suggests that every language shall have equal treatment at the City Hall, which is in effect what this says, that the reverse argument to that is, well, that is impossible, therefore let's rely on the fact that we have one language and that's it. Now, Mr. Speaker, this amendment - this amendment is only recommended and we would only be talking about it, whether "may" or "shall", because of the form of nationalism that we are happy enough to have in this country; and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would reject the amendment and in doing so I suggest I'm doing it for the benefit of the minority groups' languages that my honourable friend is referring to, and not to their detriment.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, we had similar debate, if you can call it that, or exchange of views in the committee, and I can't see it the way the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources does. I feel that this particular section should be amended and that the way it reads now it says, "The city shall make available at its central office persons who can communicate in French and English." This is what we want; we want communication; and we feel that communication should not be just to those two groups, it should be so that other groups can enjoy the same privilege, and I don't see why we can't make this possible. Surely enough if we have large groups of people in the city who speak another language, who have another culture and who want to maintain it and make the effort among their own groups to have this maintained over the years, and they have done so in many ways, that we should also at least go this far, that when they come to the City Hall that we have people there who can receive them and can converse with them, and I feel that we're not asking too much in the amendment that is being proposed. Certainly we live with each other here in the city, love each other, and I see no reason why we cannot accommodate each other in this way as well.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that subsection 85 be amended by adding after subsection (d), the following subsection: "(e) a resident of the community in which he runs for election."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have been in committee today listening to another bill, which I certainly won't mention because we'll deal with what's in front of us, and the ward system has been brought forward in this bill. It is regarded as a democratic way of people having representation, and if you're going to have a ward system, really, in a smaller community such as the area of Winnipeg, I think you should live in the wards, but because it is such a large area and there might be somebody that lives one or two blocks away from a ward, there is nothing wrong with the member who is running living in the community. In other words, Sir, there are six wards in the City of St. James-Assiniboia, he would have to live in the community council of Assiniboia, which it will be called, he would have to live in that area of the community council.

Now, Sir, that leaves a very wide scope. That means that a member who has been part of a community in the previous administrations or the previous cities could be well enough known to run in a different ward by having it that way. In other words, we're saying he must live in the community. The whole logic of this bill, Sir, was to have the elected member closer to the people, and there is no way that you could have this if somebody on one side of the city is running in another area. There is no way that communication will be there. In

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) fact, sheer travelling alone to get over to see somebody could be a problem. But there is one basic thing that has been said today in the other committee, that all of the aldermen live in one area and there is not much representation, and if you put in a ward system and do not insist they live in the ward or the community, as we are suggesting here, you have the same possibility. It's argued that the people don't have to vote for him; it's entirely up to them; it's a democratic society, and everything like that. But there is no sense using a ward system unless you add to it that you live in the ward or in the community of an area the size of Winnipeg, or you defeat the whole purpose.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason for us wanting to register our amendment on that basis, the addition. We believe that that is the principle of the bill, for the people to become closer. We heard that from every one of the members and we believe that it should be somebody from the community to accomplish this.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, just a few brief comments. As one who has had no experience in municipal affairs, one who was not elected to municipal office, may I say one thing, Mr. Speaker. I think I understand the philosophy, the concept of the bill. I think that the government has fragmented the bill in its final form. I think the proposal that the government has now, which would be altered by the amendment that was proposed by the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek, that the proposal as it is now in the Act fragments, as other particular decisions fragment the basic concept position that was first proposed, and like so many things that they have done, they have in fact defeated the very purpose because, Mr. Speaker, so long as a person can be elected from any part of the City of Winnipeg area to represent a ward, then in effect you've defeated the whole concept of the neighborhood system which was the basic -- (Interjection) -- I don't understand it. I must say to the Honourable Minister of Finance, you know, I think I understand it, and as a matter of fact I have to say to him that I have probably read as much on the neighborhood concept as he has -- maybe not in terms of municipal politics, but I think I understand the philosophy and I understand the most recent works that have been completed on this. And I say, Mr. Speaker, having read them, and I'm prepared to debate on that, that the basic concept of the neighborhood as it was first envisioned in the presentation, has been defeated completely, defeated completely by allowing someone to be elected from anywhere in the City of Winnipeg to represent the ward area itself. That was never the original intent; it goes against the very grain of the remarks that were presented by the Minister in his presentation at the various community hearings, and is one more effort on their part to arrive at a politically expedient decision, which in fact fragments the very intent of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this bill, as it reads, is no different from what it was all along in accordance with what we considered the basic concept of the community committee, the neighborhood structure; and Mr. Speaker, the important thing we felt was that a ward electorate should have the opportunity to decide for itself whom it will accept and elect as the person to be representative of that ward. If that isn't a neighborhood concept, then I don't know what is. Not to limit him to living there, but to limit him to capturing the support of the electorate within the ward, who will say, "That man will represent us, and if he doesn't, we'll reject him." That is essentially giving to the ward the right to make the decision as to whether or not they will select that person. And I believe that if the Leader of the Opposition would offer himself in any number of wards in the City of Winnipeg, he might well be elected and serve that ward well, but if he ran in the ward in which he lives, he might well be rejected, and that too would be a decision of the electorate. And we're saying; leave it to the electorate, don't impose that kind of decision for the electorate, and that means a recognition by the community of who can speak for it. Now if he wants to think in terms of -- No, I think I just will leave it at that, Mr. Speaker. I think I've made our point.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that at this particular time we find the government ignoring a basic concept of democracy that has existed for many years. You look at the municipal system that has existed for years and that has had one fundamental basic in it, and that is that a councillor must live in the ward that

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) he represents. There has been the exception, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the reeve, who is looking after the entire area, has an additional privilege.

Now we go from the municipal system up to the provincial system and you find that in the provincial system and you find that in the provincial system there's a little more latitude, but still the provincial system insists that anybody that runs for election in the Province of Manitoba must reside in the Province of Manitoba.

Then you go into the federal system, Mr. Speaker, and you find that again there is more latitude. The larger the government gets, the more latitude there is involved. And in the federal system you don't even have to live in the province of the constituency that you want to represent, as long as you're a Canadian citizen, and so far, Mr. Speaker, we haven't taken out the Canadian citizenship in that respect. But the basic concept, Mr. Speaker, is that, depending on the level of government that you're intending to provide, the restrictive measures regarding the eligibility for election is scaled according to the level of government that you intend to provide. Now I would say that if the government persists in this attitude that they have at this time, then they are intending to set up a government which is in fact superior to the provincial government. It is not a municipal government in any sense, because they are ignoring the fundamental principles that are inherent in the election of members to a municipal government.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You can't even win a "shall" tonight, or a "may."

Mr. Speaker, that Section 86 of Bill 36 be amended by adding thereto, at the end thereof, the following subsections - I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Brandon West:

Election of MLA to council. 86 (3): If a member of the Legislative Assembly is elected as a member of council, he ipso facto forfeits his seat in the Assembly and is disqualified from sitting and voting in the Assembly.

Election of councillor as MLA. 86 (4): If a member of the council is elected to the Legislative Assembly, he ipso facto forfeits his seat on the council and is disqualified from sitting on and voting in the council.

Election of MLA as mayor. 86 (5): If a member of the Legislative Assembly is elected as mayor, he ipso facto forfeits his seat in the Assembly and is disqualified from sitting and voting in the Assembly.

Election of mayor as MLA. 86(6): If the mayor is elected to the Legislative Assembly, he ipso facto forfeits his position as mayor.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to indicate to some honourable members that Rule 40 is on Page 21. Some of them should have a look at it. The honourable members should realize that there was a lot of interjection. I think I should have to read the whole thing because some of the words that were spoken by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, I don't think were intended to be in the motion, but nevertheless moved by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek . . . Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker - I'd like to say this is my last motion - Mr. Speaker, that Section 687 be numbered -- I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, that the proposed Section 687 be renumbered 687(1) and that subsection (a) and (h) of proposed Section 687 be deleted and the following subsection added immediately after Section 687 (1): "687(2): The mayor shall be elected at large and every elector shall have one vote in the election for mayor."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, briefly, Mr. Speaker, this amendment says that if the mayor is going to be elected for the first term, he should be continued to be elected from now on. It is not the proper thing to have a mayor elected for the first term; you are saying to the people that you have the chance to vote in a mayor for the new city, in the structure of the new city, the first time that it comes into being, and three years later you are saying that this system is no longer valid.

I, Sir, will not give my comments on what I think of the mayor being elected at large

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) versus being appointed by council, but if the mayor is to be elected at large the first time, he should be continued to be elected at large when his term is up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, just briefly on this amendment, I would like to suggest to the government that a mayor is not a mayor if he has not got the sanction of the people that he represents; if he's not voted in by the people, he can't properly represent them at the table he sits at. He can pour tea and he can cut ribbons, but I say for him to sit and control the 50-man council that's going to be sitting in front of, that this bill puts forth, I say that he has to be a man that knows that he has the sanction of the people.

Now, on the other side of the coin, I say that if politics moves into the City of Winnipeg Council - and I know it's going to - I think that a mayor that's elected at large by popular vote is going to be shot down before Bill 36 comes into effect on January 1, 1972, simply because if he's elected by the people and he's not the favorite mayor or the ideal mayor of the 50-man council, they will not support him. And if there's 26 members of one political party in that council, they're going to move on to that council table every day and shoot that mayor down. He's going to be shot down continuously. So for that reason I say that you have to appoint the mayor from the 50-man council -- (Interjection) -- and I don't know who the mouth-piece is on the other side of the room but I think, Mr. Speaker, you could declare to him that he'll get his opportunity to stand up and speak as well. But whoever he is on that side of the room, I can say to him that he has never been elected to any council that this bill affects in Metro Winnipeg as mayor, because there's very few people on that side of the House that has the ability to be elected and it is not my fear, when I stand and speak tonight, that any one of them will be the mayor of the new City of Winnipeg -- not one of them; not one of them.

They are looking tonight, they're looking tonight at this amendment of this section of the bill, Mr. Speaker, where a man has to pick up somewhere in the neighborhood of 200,000 votes possibly -- 150,000 votes, I would suggest, the new mayor of this new city is going to get, or the mayor of this new city (I don't suspect he'll be a new mayor), but the mayor of this new city is going to pick up something like 150,000 votes. And I would have to suggest to you, Sir, that everybody on that side of the House, including the Premier, has never had this particular experience. Never have any one of them. Possibly you could group them together and wonder if there was that many votes involved in electing a government. For this reason - I'm not trying to belittle the government side of the House when I speak like this - the Premier of today was elected with 4,000-odd votes, a nice vote to pick up when you're running in the constituency, in the province provincially. It's good. I envy that. I couldn't get that many votes. I got 3,300 votes. But there's one man, there's one man in the House here, probably he could get it - Mumbles. He could get it. But nobody else.

A MEMBER: Who?

MR. MOUG: Mumbles, the House Leader. He gets a good vote; he gets 4,000 votes. The Finance Minister, he gets 4,000 votes. The Attorney-General, no. He's in a bad position; there's no way he can get that. -- (Interjection) -- No, I don't think so. He's well respected in his area. I think that he'll carry on to -- he's doing a good job -- as it goes on that side of the House, as jobs go on that side of the House.

But I have to suggest, Sir, that you're looking, when you look at this amendment before the members vote on it, I hope that they realize that they're voting a strong man. He has to be a strong man to win it; he has to be a man that's capable. First of all, his financial situation has to be in the neighborhood of \$30,000 to even threaten to say he's going to win the seat of the mayor of this new City of Winnipeg. You've got to get to a half million people; you've got to get to their doors. You've got to have a very very strong man that knows how to run a campaign. You have to have a man that knows how to get to the TV, to the press and to everybody, to tell them who you are. You've got to meet in every committee, with every committee throughout the areas; you've got to get to every community; you've got to hold meetings there. You've got to knock on just about every door that you can, in order to convince them that you're stronger than the powers that are opposing you; and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I say that it's discrimination, if you'll accept that word, to think that a man has to position himself to have \$30,000 to campaign with. I say that the man should go in by way of one simple ward, one of the 50 wards, and then be appointed by popularity of those 50 councillors, certainly not by the half million people.

(MR. MOUG cont'd)

As popular as the Premier of this province is, there's no way that he could campaign this province and pick up a half million votes, or let's say 300,000 votes, which he would need in a two-man race, if everybody came out and voted. And the Premier, he would have a threat riding with him, because possibly the loud speaker could move in and be a positive threat from the north; and it's a like situation of what could happen within the City of Winnipeg. It's a like situation, Sir, of what could happen right within the City of Winnipeg, and I think that for that reason that the government should either accept this amendment to continue to elect the mayor at large; if it's good enough to do it in the first instance, to do it in the future; to continue to do that. I can see no reason why, if the man's got to be popular enough to be elected at large in the first instance, which is a hard thing to do, I think it's something that's geared up for one reason and one reason only.

The government is quite concerned about the legislation they've put out here in this act. They're not sure of what they're doing. They realize they've made many many mistakes; they realize it's too big a bill; they realize that their errors are all within the bounds of that bill here, along with the amendments they've made. They've got themselves in a position they're at the point of no return. They can't back up and withdraw this act; they can't handle this act once it's implemented. There's no way they can handle this act; it's too big for them. It's like many other bills they bring in, this act is too big for the government of today. They're too late to retract it, Sir; they're too late to bring in people that know how to implement it for them; it's too late. This election's got to be in September. Next month is August. By the end of August and the early part of September you have to have this 50-man council and a mayor that's very very close to being nominated, and give him three weeks to do his campaign, and there's where you are.

So this government is using the easy way out. They figure within this book and after all the . . . they get to several members of this city that have experience on municipal councils, they feel that if they elect the mayor at large that it'll get them off the hook. This puts them back for a two-year period, a three-year period, Sir, before they have to come out and say that they're going to make changes. They put themselves in a position where, if they don't depend on the mayor of today, they're in trouble. They got to go down Main Street to get themselves out of the trouble they've got themselves into within the bounds of this book. The only man that can help them and get them out of trouble is the mayor of the City of Winnipeg of today. They know by popular vote in an election at large they can elect him, and otherwise they're in a lot of trouble.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek made a rather convincing argument about the election of the mayor at large and continuously for term after term. The Member for Charleswood made a convincing argument that the mayor should not be elected at large at all, and between the two of them I guess there must be quite a difference of opinion. The fact is that the committee voted in support of the election of mayor at large and the vote was not limited to members of government caucus. The proposal to elect a mayor at large for the first term, the first term only, is one which is a recognition of a number of factors and designed so that this Legislature will have a further opportunity, without committing itself, to further review the progress of the council, the way it works, with every right and opportunity to make changes in the future. In that way I believe we leave the options open and I think that that is a proper way to approach so that we know how we can deal with it in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I will try to be very brief. I think it's been known for some time that the NDP caucus was split on this matter when they had to vote for it. I think it was known, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP caucus was split on this particular matter, and I must say that I think it was split rather evenly, from what we've heard. I understand that they've had to go through the procedure of several votes before finally, finally they were able to arrive at a decision.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government originally had one proposal; they altered it. There have been a number of reasons put forward as to why this happened, and I present them not necessarily as the reasons that I personally believe, but these are the reasons that are discussed for the change, and I think they should be listed. Some of them may appear as incredible, but on the other hand some of them may have some validity.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

First, the reason the change was brought in by the government that the mayor should be elected for the first term, was that was what the people wanted; the people asked the mayor should be elected for the first term and the government listened to them. Now against that, Mr. Speaker, I must point out that, insofar as I know, not one brief said that the mayor should be elected for the first term, and I don't think that in any of the community meetings held by the Minister and the other Ministers was there any suggestion by anyone that the mayor should be elected for the first term. So I bring it forward, Mr. Speaker, as a proposition which I do not think has great validity.

The other proposition was that the NDP had decided that they were going to run a slate, which has now been announced, for the council and for control of the council although they may not be running in every ward, but they were going to be running a slate; that in effect if they were successful in controlling the majority or being able to put a combination of the majority, their leader would obviously become the mayor, and that if in fact they had an NDP leader who was the mayor, he would basically be a threat to the office of Premier, as leader of an NDP caucus which would be equivalent in a parliament of Greater Winnipeg.

MR. SCHREYER: Ridiculous proposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Ridiculous proposition. The First Minister says it's a ridiculous proposition. Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that's my . . . I haven't suggested it at all. I'm going to put in five or six propositions and we will then try and make a judgment as to which is right; but I say to the First Minister, that is one proposition that has been put forward and I think it should be listed for the record.

The third proposition is that the government decided after Mr. Benson announced his budget and they reviewed their financial position, that all the representations that they had made with respect to their financial position meant that in the next few years we were going to be in deep trouble in this province and we did not have any money for many of the things and many of the social objectives that had to be achieved; and if we in fact restructured, as they considered in a progressive way, the municipal government in Greater Winnipeg, and they provided leadership that could demand of the Provincial Government monies for an attempt to try and achieve the priorities and social programs that they deemed necessary, that would put great pressure on the provincial treasury and that would be great pressure on the Provincial Government and, because we can't afford it and because they know now that the tax monies that were going to be coming in are going to be limited, they decided that for the next few years they can have a hassle at the City Hall and that hassle will mean that there will be less of a pressure on Broadway.

Now the next proposition, Mr. Speaker, and one that we have proposed before in the sense of being our impression of what the government intended to do, is that they want the control of the government in the hands of the administrators. They want it, not in the politicians, but in the hands of the planners, because, Mr. Speaker, they have more faith in the planners than they have in the politicians and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, they have structured it in such a way that the continual bickering that has gone on and fights that have occurred will continue, but in the new form between a mayor, who has very limited power, and a council who has really nothing to do except dicker, because that's all they're going to have to do, and between the two of them they will cause enough confusion that the administrators will be able to take hold of the situation and be able to carry forward the proposal to meet the theoretical concepts that have been the basis for the plan itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other proposition is that some of the advisors and - this is an interesting one - that some of the advisors to the government thought that this was a very popular move because it would meet popular acceptance, and in turn it was politically expedient at this point to do it, to insure that the plan itself would receive public approval, and although that rubbed against the basic consultants who obviously have spent a great deal of time and energy - and the government has spent a lot of money with them - who basically came up with a concept that really falls, really falls with the mayor being elected, notwithstanding that, the government through its majority, through the majority of you in caucus, fell to the altar of expediency, and thus we have it introduced.

Now the other one which is incredible and preposterous is that in effect, as the Honourable Member for Charleswood has indicated, a mayor being popularly elected and therefore being in a position to possibly win the city as a result of a massive campaign, P.R. campaign,

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) and money being poured in for that activity, would be able to have the real estate interests allied to him so that in effect he would be able to use the monies that they would advance to him to get control of the city, so that the real estate firms would be able to cause some development in the city. Now that's absolutely incredible, Mr. Speaker. That's preposterous. It's preposterous that the government would ever consider this.

Well, Mr. Speaker, probably the answer lies in two or three of the items that I have mentioned, but not in all, and possibly there are some others. But notwithstanding this, Mr. Speaker, the government for reasons best known to themselves have made a change. Now, Mr. Speaker, having made the change, having basically suggested, Mr. Speaker, we are going to trust the people to elect the mayor, then, Mr. Speaker, there is an obligation to trust the people not only in the first election but the second election, the third election and the fourth election, because, Mr. Speaker, if the principle applies that the mayor is to be elected at large and to be popularly elected by the people of the province on the first occasion, he should be elected thereafter and it should not be at the fiat of a government who will maybe, on their own, if they so decide, allow him to be elected again. And so therefore . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Lakeside would read Rule 40. I do think it's time that he recognized it. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've about completed my remarks. I say to the members opposite, your position may appear to be a compromise from the position that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has presented or the Honourable Member from Charleswood has presented, and you have come up with a compromise. But, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't work in this situation because there is no compromise. If the people of the City of Winnipeg are going to be able to elect the mayor on the first occasion, for God's sake be consistent. Let them elect him thereafter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll be as brief as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said he would be, hopefully with more success than he had in being brief.

The first point I want to make is that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, his remarks are perfect examples of speculation and imagination running amuck, just running wild. The fact is that there are two very valid analyses that can be made as to the best way in which to go about the electing of a chairman of city council or a mayor, and the Leader of the Opposition surely doesn't need any persuasion of the fact that there are two very cogent lines of reasoning that take you to two different conclusions: one which would lead you to conclude that it would be better to elect the mayor by city-wide balloting, and the other line of reasoning leading you to conclude that it would be better to have a majority of the council with whom the mayor must work elect the mayor. Both are equally valid, or almost so, and that is why there was such a great deal of protracted discussion in caucus. I freely and candidly admit that there was a great deal of discussion in caucus on the matter, but should that be something that surprises my honourable friends opposite, because just this evening in the course of twenty minutes or twenty-five minutes we had two members of the Conservative Party opposite get up to speak on this issue and they took two separate, different positions. And so it was in the discussions that took place within our circle; as to which, taking the preponderance of weight of argument on both sides of the question, on balance what is your conclusion? And it's not an easy exercise, I can assure my honourable friends, as they must have learned, because I understand that they had more than a little brief discussion on that within their own caucus, and I say again for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, who gets distracted from time to time - particularly when explanations are given, he wanders off or gets distracted, so it's necessary to explain all over. I explain all over again for his benefit that two of his colleagues this evening, the only two that spoke prior to him, spoke on opposite sides of that issue.

-- (Interjection)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SCHREYER: Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, it's because I'm supposed to synthesize the preponderance of thinking on this side. Now whether or not I do so with success is something that the people of Manitoba will have to decide, not my honourable friend; but to take things back to square one, I want to refresh the memory of my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition on this issue.

He will recall that back in February, in a speech in Minneapolis, I indicated that the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) method of election of a mayor or chairman of council, was an issue upon which it was possible to go to opt for either method with almost complete equanimity, almost complete equanimity, and frankly, you know, that is the view of quite a number of my colleagues here and we don't apologize for that, the reason being that there are many valid arguments for favouring the election of a chairman by the council with whom he has to work. That makes eminent good sense. On the other hand, on the other hand - and this is the point which my honourable friends have missed, and I want to say it with due slowness and deliberation so that it doesn't escape them - the reason we finally did decide to opt for the election of a mayor by city-wide balloting, is because we wanted to be amply sure, more than sure, that there would be in the first period of operation of the new city council and the new city itself, a man who was elected by the majority of the people from whatever district, neighbourhood, inner city, outer city, suburb, Winnipeg proper, a man elected as mayor of the new city, the enlarged city, with the majority of the over-all, the residents of the entire Metropolitan area, and that is what carried the day. That is what carried the sufficient weight of the argument to cause us to recommend this amendment to the bill.

Now, obviously, obviously there is less cogency, there is less persuasiveness about using that particular argument at a time three or six years hence, by which time we hope, and fully expect, that there will be sufficient sense of Metro-wide, larger-city-wide identity and cohesiveness with respect to the larger city area, and so it becomes at least a little less crucial to elect the mayor, city-wide, three or six years from now.

But I don't want to be misunderstood. It is not a settled question as to whether or not three years from now or six years from now that this question will be settled one way or the other; we will let ourselves be guided by the experience of the next year, '2 and '3', and I want to say to my honourable friends that the Member for Sturgeon Creek on balance - I'm sure he's weighed it carefully in his own mind - on balance he favours the election of a mayor city-wide. The Member for Charleswood has made it clear that he favours it -- (Interjection) -- It's the other way round. Well then, in any case, the two men are both in the same pod; it's just that they are in different sequence in the peapod. I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

The point I was coming to make, Sir, is that we cannot honestly say that the election of a mayor popularly, who then has to work with a council that has not directly elected him, is doomed to failure. We need only look at any one of the 50 states of the U.S., and other jurisdictions as well, where for example the governor of a state has to work with the majority that control the state legislature. Oftentimes they are not really sharing that close a rapport, but yet it works; democracy works in those jurisdictions. It is difficult to say, really, whether or not it would work better if the governor were elected by a majority of the state legislators rather than the way he is elected state-side, but I do say this. I give this one undertaking to my honourable friends opposite who are believers in the principle that it is better to have the mayor or chairman elected by a majority of that council with which he has to work. If you believe in that principle I don't fault you for believing in it, and I give you this undertaking, that we have, for the reasons I have indicated, we are prepared and wishing to take the other route because of the factor of city-wide cohesiveness, that factor; but I give this undertaking to those who believe in the other principle and that is, if the experience of the next three years show that there is bickering, persistent bickering, because of the form of election, we will change it. We will not tolerate bickering in a city of a half a million people where efficient civic government is a must.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got a copy of the resolution before me but it deals with the matter of the election of the mayor at large and that it shall be continued to do so. The matter of electing a mayor at large came about at the meeting of the committee and was one of the last items that was dealt with in committee. -- (Interjection) -- I don't think the government will vote for it at this time so I will not try. At least on this point, when other parties have splits, I don't need to talk about a split, but I would like to indicate for the record, Mr. Speaker, that this government very slickly -- if I may use that term - provided that the mayor would be elected at large, because when the bill first came out it was quite different. It was that the council should elect him, and on this basis the bill was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: The honourable member is referring to the bill, I would ask him, does he recall the statement reported in the press which I made in Minneapolis about five months

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) ago? It happened to be that that's where I made the statement - it was reported here - that this particular issue was one in which we could with almost complete equanimity take either road.

MR. FROESE: Yes, I won't dispute that. This may well be the case. I don't recall the particular meeting in the States but I accept the Premier's word for that. But I know that the Minister of Finance -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Is the honourable member aware that both the Minister of Finance, myself, and I believe the Minister of Education, appearing at public meetings in Greater Winnipeg - not in Minneapolis - said the same thing, that on this question there could be a change; it was not essential to the bill that the mayor be elected by the council?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't have the opportunity of attending those meetings. In a way I would have liked to but I was unable to do so, and it may well be that the people that the Honourable Minister is referring to have made these statements. I don't dispute them. But the fact still remains that the bill contained a different provision whereby the mayor would be elected by the council, and this was approved in principle by this government on second reading, so they all of them endorsed that principle. So they can't get away from that, that they endorsed that principle on second reading, and on that basis it was sold, and on that basis, too, we went into committee and we heard all the representations, and what happened? They deflated the opposition because they, most of them of the civic officials and especially Metro officials, are more or less anti-Juba, so -- well, I think this is a well-known fact, and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. FROESE: So by this method they diffused the opposition that was coming forward to these hearings, so they took the heat off. They didn't have the opposition that they would have had otherwise. Otherwise these people would have been much more on the offensive. Time and again I listened to these speakers coming forward, people like Mr. Hanks who was a very outspoken man before; he was very timid in his approach when at the hearings - very much so. I thought he would take a much stronger stand. This also pertained to many of the other presentations, that I expected a much stronger opposition to come forward. Certainly the opposition that was registered in November and December when those meetings were held and we read the accounts in the newspapers, that there was a very strong opposition to the plan that this government was going to initiate, and now when I mentioned it the other night in committee, the Minister of Finance says, well, this is not by design; this was not planned; this was not their engineering that it happened so. Well, to me, I still can't quite believe that. To this day I believe that this was engineered by the government and this took them off guard completely. Now we find after the hearings, after we've heard from all of them, we deal with the bill in committee, and in the final end lo and behold all of a sudden we change the principle and we elect a mayor at large. Now, what can I deduct from this. Is this the payoff, is this the payoff? Is this why the present mayor went along quietly all along, endorsed the unicity bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member if he is not aware of his words is uttering and attributing motives to the government. I think he should reconsider what he just said. The Honourable First Minister is probably rising on the same point. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was wishing to raise that point of order. I thought perhaps there might be some wonderment as to whether I was being serious about it but then you did rise, Sir, to make that point of order which I wanted to raise, that is the use of the term "payoff" connotes some kind of arrangement or motivation that the honourable member is imputing, and as the honourable member should know, imputing motives, prior arrangements, deals, payoffs is strictly unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I gladly withdraw the word "payoff" because this government can't assure the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Swan River. Point of order.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, you ruled on a matter and I think it was unbecoming of the First Minister to get up after you had spoken and go on to explain his rebuttal to what the Honourable Member for Rhineland had to say.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on a matter of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Swan River does give me a point of privilege in that his remarks imply that I have no respect for the Chair - that is a point of privilege I believe for myself. I believe it's up to the Chair to decide whether or not my point of order was in any way in conflict with the point the Chair was trying to make known. My point of order was relating to the use of the word 'payoff' and I do believe that that is a valid point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: May I say, Sir, with indulgence that you had taken care of the matter amply without the Premier rising on that occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do think we need to cool off a bit. I know I'm getting warm, I think I'll have to ask for the Deputy Speaker to come in for a minute anyways, but the issue was that I did indicate to the Honourable Member for Rhineland that he was transgressing and the Honourable First Minister just explained the particular area; I hadn't decided to go that deep into the question. Therefore the Honourable First Minister was quite right in what he said. -- (Interjection) -- Order please. I'm going to ignore the asides that have been interjected on a number of occasions since they're not on the record, but I should indicate that we do have a rule in respect to interruptions for all honourable members; and that includes when the Speaker is on his feet, too. So members should take note of that rule. It's Rule 40, Page 21.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, may I apologize and suggest to you that it was a slip of the tongue; I didn't intend to insult the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I think I already made it clear that I withdrew the word pay-off. After all this government cannot guarantee that the present mayor if he should happen to run that he's assured of an election, although no doubt they will probably give him their support. I would expect that they would, since I think after this none of the present members of the House anticipate running; the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources probably had intentions earlier and most likely now has discarded them for the first term anyway. -- (Interjection) -- Well I don't think the Minister minds if I say that - not at all, I think he enjoys a joke.

I for one do not object to the change whatever, in fact I am very happy that this change did come about. I made my views known on this matter on second reading; I felt that the mayor should be elected at large, that he should enjoy greater independence when he occupies that chair and also, in fact, I advocated that he should receive wider powers and especially so because of the type of administration that we are bringing in - the one of commissioners. I feel that these people will be very powerful and that we need a very strong man at the helm, one who will have had experience to guide the affairs of the city during the initial period. I think this is very essential and if the present mayor should decide to run, certainly he has the experience, he has the knowledge, he has the background, he has everything, in my opinion, that is needed to guide this city, the new city during its initial period - get it on its course.

These are things that I mentioned on second reading; however, once more I do wish to reiterate that I fully support the motion before us which is that the mayor continue to be elected at large. I subscribe to the principle not only that it be done in the way of an expediency or that for one term, but that this continue, because I think this is the practice in other cities across Canada and I think we should follow it and make it part of our legislation in Bill 36.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have a motion . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. FROESE: I would move then, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that Section 687 of Bill 36 be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof the words "but this Act will not be proclaimed until after a referendum on whether or not the Act should be brought into effect is held within the area municipalities."

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to inform the honourable member that this amendment is not acceptable, as one of the areas in respect to inadmissibility in respect to amendments is those that refer to a referendum. This is Beauchesne, on Page 551, Section 11. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, is it May's? - May's, sorry. -- (Interjection) -- There is no question since I never accepted any amendment. Concurrence of the report of Bill 36 is the next item.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Attorney-General that the report of the committee with respect to Bill No. 36 be concurred in.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that Bill No. 36 the City of Greater Winnipeg Act, be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The question is not put yet. The Honourable Minister may speak.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all thank the Minister of Finance for having given me the opportunity to move this motion that the bill be read a third time so that the Honourable Minister would be in a position of winding up the debate when it is near to conclusion.

I'd like to also say Mr . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'll recognize him in a minute. I would like to ask all honourable members not to start shouting, order. I'm well able to recognize the Honourable Member for Lakeside when he stands up. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for any inconvenience I caused you, but I would hope that the Minister who is speaking for the Minister responsible for this bill is not closing debate on third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no closing of debate on third reading under our rules. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I hope you appreciate that we are working under new rules and you will forgive those of us who haven't quite accustomed ourselves to these new rules at this particular stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: . . . making the opening remarks I was explaining that one of the reasons that the Minister of Finance gave me the honour of introducing the motion is so that he could speak later on in the debate because he will not have spoken at that time.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it's also a particular gratification for myself to be able to move this motion, in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that when I was on Metro Council in 1964, I moved a motion which read as follows: "Whereas this council recognizes the effectiveness and desirability of integrating and coordinating municipal services for the Greater Winnipeg area and such services should be administered by one municipal government; Therefore be it resolved that this Council endorses in principle the implementation of such measures as would be necessary to establish one municipal government responsible for the administration of municipal services in Greater Winnipeg." At that time the motion was defeated by the vote of the Chairman, Mr. Bonnycastle. I believe the vote was five - four.

I then moved the exact same motion in this House substituting the word "House" for "Council" in April of 1968 and that motion was defeated in this House as well. I moved the identical motion in the Spring of 1969 and the motion was defeated in this House, but shortly after, Mr. Speaker, the same motion was adopted by the Metro Council and I believe that the motion that I am now moving, that is "that Bill 36 be now read and passed," is identical to the motion that I put.

I want to indicate to honourable members that what I asked for at the time was the House recognize in principle that there be one government in Greater Winnipeg and I was careful to specify - and I'm not talking about the continuance of the existing government, I'm not talking about building up Metro, I'm not talking about Winnipeg annex these other governments -- I'm only talking about the principle that there be one government and I was satisfied at that stage that if we agreed with the principle, we would find a mechanism for the operation of that government. And the mechanism deals with what the motion dealt with, the effectiveness and desirability of coordinating municipal services for the Greater Winnipeg area.

I think that the bill that we have presented, Mr. Speaker, is something which is the product of people giving their attention to the principle of one municipal government and then deciding how that government can be best administered. And thrown into that principle was, of course, all of the input from various people who had different views as to how it should occur, and I can assure you that my views or the views of other people were not the ones that emerged finally. I think it's better for that reason, that we got a wide divergence of opinion as to how this thing should be done and that wide divergence of opinion has resulted in a better bill.

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

I also want to make one more point, and I'm not going to poach on my opportunity here to take too much time, but I want to make the one further point, Mr. Speaker, that something has happened with this bill which I venture to say honourable members would have said could never have happened on any issue if they did not know what the issue was. On what issue, Mr. Speaker, would one have been able to predict that the City of Winnipeg and Metro Council would have been both wholly in favour of it? On what issue, Mr. Speaker, could we have had - what important legislative issue that was really one of great conflict, would we find that the Chamber of Commerce for the Province of Manitoba and the Manitoba Federation of Labour come united and represent the same views? On what issue, Mr. Speaker, could we have had, I suggest, the great unanimity of a political party coming together with both rural and urban representatives and agreeing on an urban plan of this magnitude? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been predicted that there would be no municipal reorganization that could have received in this House the approval of all of the representatives of Greater Winnipeg including the representative of the City of St. Boniface.

On what issue, Mr. Speaker, would it have been able to be predicted that the Winnipeg Free Press, the Winnipeg Tribune and the New Democratic Party all came out saying the same thing about - relatively the same thing about municipal government? And, Mr. Speaker, more important than any of these questions, on what issue - and I ask members to search deep into their consciences, as has happened in this House before - on what issue, important issue which would aspire a great deal of debate, could it have been predicted that really in reality, the Liberal Party of the Province of Manitoba, the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba and the New Democratic Party of the Province of Manitoba, would have really been saying the same thing perhaps at different times. Because, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party in its TED Report came out for one municipal government in Greater Winnipeg. The Liberal Party under the leadership of Gil Molgat, not more than a year ago, or two years ago, came out for one municipal government in Greater Winnipeg; and the New Democratic Party has come out for one municipal government in Greater Winnipeg. So that, Mr. Speaker, all of what would normally be the greatest opposing forces, the greatest forces which vie with one another, on issues, on opposite sides of those issues -- I repeat, the Chamber of Commerce and the Federation of Labour, the newspaper, the New Democratic Party, the three parties in our province -- all came out at one time or another, -- (Interjection) -- not wrong - all came out at one time or another for the kind of thing that this government has now proposed for.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came into this House I indicated that sometimes the things that are most recognized to be acceptable by everybody are the most difficult things to accomplish, because there are groups in society who see it to their advantage that those changes be not be made even though almost everybody agrees with them. And I say that this was such an issue. This is an issue in which all the opposing elements agreed with one another and yet were unable to accomplish the deed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that if one would look at newspapers outside of the Province of Manitoba as well, one of the things that this governments gets the most credit for is the fact that it is dealing with this serious issue of municipal government in Greater Winnipeg. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, knowing that this is a momentous and historical occasion in the Manitoba Legislature, I would urge that this bill receive the commendation of the members of this House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, allow me, as the Honourable House Leader did just a moment ago, to express some degree of satisfaction with respect to my leader giving me the privilege of being among those who may wish to make some final comments on this speech. I'm not an urban member immediately affected. I have always considered myself, however, a quasi urban-rural person.

Mr. Speaker, I have but relatively few comments to make on this closing debate with respect to Bill 36, which, I agree with the House Leader, is probably one of the more important pieces of legislation that he and I and those contemporary members sitting in our House will be passing in this House. Let me suggest to the Honourable House Leader, to make a few remarks with respect to those that he made and not to confuse those with the ones that I'd like to make, when he sought out a singular occasion where an opposition or a multiplication of opposition comes together, that it is not at all that unique. Who would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that now, some two, three years hence, that the Lake at Southern Indian Lake that we the Conservative Party were proposing to flood, would be supported by the Liberal Party

(MR. ENNS cont'd) in no more dignified and significant manner than that of the testimony presented by a former premier of this province, the Honourable D. L. Campbell?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I certainly hesitate to interrupt what seems like a great flight of oratory, but surely, surely, Mr. Speaker, the remarks must be relevant to the bill that's before us, which doesn't deal at all with Lake Winnipeg.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside. There is no point of order. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable House Leader took pains, and quite correctly so, to point out the uniqueness of a certain fusion of political feeling with respect to this bill. He took particular pains to say that this was a unique thing that was happening. And in that sense, Mr. Speaker, my few remarks - I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not intend to dwell or get into a large or deep Hydro debate; I just want to say that that uniqueness is not that unique. I want to say that a Progressive Conservative government and party said "Flood South Indian Lake," and two years ago, led by the Liberal Party of this province, they said "Never." The NDP said maybe. Two years later, the Premier, former leader of that party, resigned, resigned his position, responsible position, to do one thing: to say, "Yes, we should flood South Indian Lake first."

Mr. Speaker, this government that said "maybe" then, said "Yes, we will flood South Indian Lake, not now but next year." Not now but next year, because that's inherent in the decision that we made - and I'm going to quit right now, Mr. Speaker, before you rule me out of order, only to demonstrate to my honourable friend the House Leader, who likes to kind of mesmerize with his logic, and to build up his case as Mr. Super Mayor, or of some kind, because he moved certain resolutions, I just want to point out to him, Sir, that one day I have the unqualified knowledge that I will be nominated as the Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro, because I told him when. Because I have a sneaking hunch, Sir, that's what the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is telling us in his opening remarks on this speech of Bill 36. He said, Sir, that he moved this motion, this amendment; it was defeated by Bonnycastle; it was defeated by so and so; but now, thanks to the Honourable White Knight, Mr. Ajax, who gave him the opportunity to speak on this bill and gave him the opportunity to put in his push, he now has had that crowning glory of realizing a resolution that he moved, a position that he took and was consistent with over the years, is coming to fruition. -- (Interjection) -- Well that's fine. That's fine. The same way as I'm proud of the fact that they are building the bridge over Burntwood River to accommodate the high level diversion. The same way, Mr. Chairman.

Now, enough of that. I didn't mean to bring that in as a diversion, simply to remind my honourable friend the House Leader that, you know, there is nothing, you know, all that unique. A right position, Mr. Speaker, always prevails. Always prevails. And I think in that sense, perhaps, to some extent, the right position prevails today.

But I want to go on, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to you why we cannot support the position that is being imposed upon us. Mr. Speaker, I want to refer very briefly to the few remarks that I made at the opening forays into this debate. Mr. Speaker, I have never attempted to or prided myself in being all that knowledgeable in municipal law, but I take no second seat to anybody in having what I regard a reasonably good feeling about what is current and what is there in terms of people's thinking about a certain situation, and I suggested to the Minister of Finance - pardon me, it's his wrong title under this bill; the Minister of Urban Affairs of that time - that this bill and the coattails that this government was riding on with respect to this bill was essentially a false one.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be very careful because I have had some difficulty. You know, Mr. Speaker, I may have had, I might - in fact I should be encouraged to take some advantage of you, Sir, because the permanent Speaker is not in the Chair, but I have had considerable difficulty when I get into the area of imputing motives, so I want to be very careful that I do not impute any motives. I want to say, Sir, and I want to put on the record, Sir, how cautious, how careful this government has been, and in particular the Minister of Urban Affairs who has piloted the bill through has been, to make sure that there has not been the slightest suggestion on the official record - that is the things that have been said in this Chamber, the things that are reported in writing, the things that are there for posterity - that the enactment of Bill 36 in any way would alleviate the burden of taxation in the Greater Winnipeg area, that it will in any

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . way reduce the escalating costs of urban government. I want to give them full marks, full credit. The Minister has been -- if anything, he's bent the other way to indicate to us that that wasn't going to happen. In fact, he evoked phrases that we are embarking upon experiments to provide the most noblest of noble places to live in, in terms of the urban environment, and who can really argue with that? That's a noble thought.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time he has studiously, astutely -- not only he but the whole government -- avoided in not one, two, three, four, five, but fourteen public meetings, in telling the public of Manitoba or of Greater Winnipeg what this plan is going to cost them. Because, Sir, in doing that, in doing that thing, he would be pulling the very rug out -- pardon me, Mr. Speaker, a slip of the tongue; I meant to say coattails out from under which this government is riding a popular wave in that they honestly believe that if we only get rid of the Frank Johnstons and the Art Mougs, these sons of guns, all the little characters, these municipal officials that are costing us so much, this double-tier government, these many municipal figures . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I do believe one of the rules about this Assembly is honourable members that are elected are to be referred by their riding. The Honourable Member for Lakeside should remember that.

MR. ENNS: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I do want to contain myself and my remarks will be brief. But, Mr. Speaker, if I am inclined to make my point, and I am sorry, Sir, that, you know, the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs missed one of my other great speeches the other night when I was speaking about the real serious problems about artificial insemination, and now he's missing another one. However, he always hides on me, Mr. Speaker, and therefore forgive me for any remarks I made to him.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to, you know, and this is my difficulty because I tend to inject -- you know, after having been denied a due supper hour because we sat on the Agricultural Committee, or the Municipal Committee -- they quit I think at 6 o'clock and got supper, but we stayed till 7:00 because we had a taskmaster, the Premier, with us in that committee and so we didn't have supper. We have been sitting continuously from 2:30 to now, and so I don't wish to, you know, get mean about anything, but, Sir, I am sure that if the Honourable Minister doesn't remember, his speechwriter will remember, who is sitting in your gallery, Sir, that there was a situation, a particular point that I was trying to make with respect to my relatively brief representation on the second reading of this bill, that was never fully refuted, Sir, neither in this House and neither publicly, and one of the serious problems that we have had, despite what you want to say about the role of the Opposition, the fact of the matter is that the questions of cost have not been answered in this House nor in the public debate. The 35 questions asked by my leader have not been answered, not even attempted to be answered because, Mr. Speaker, they would be destroying that municipal coattail that they are riding in on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, all that remains for those of us in opposition to say is that we have attempted to make Bill 36 a better bill than it was originally proposed. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the contribution made to this bill, particularly by my colleague the Member for Sturgeon Creek, has been a sincere and hardworking effort. I think the unfortunate thing, Mr. Speaker, has been that all too often the representations made against Bill 36 have appeared to have that kind of a selfish ring to them because they genuinely and sincerely had a love and a feeling for the community that they represented. Now this doesn't matter whether it was the Mayor of Transcona, or the Mayor of West Kildonan, or a member from St. James-Assiniboia; it was easy, Sir, to distort their representations to the concept that, well, you know, we've got our little nest, don't shake it. But Mr. Speaker, you know, one of the most significant briefs presented to us at Law Amendments on this bill came not from a mayor, not from an aldermen, but a single individual citizen who stated in relatively simple terms why he felt the Greater Winnipeg area was a nicer place to live in. I can't particularly recall the name, I think it was a Mr. Rosenberg that stated that situation. He simply said that we liked the feeling of belonging in a smaller circle of affairs. And somehow all of that has been lost, and Mr. Speaker, I still to this day challenge the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. I would have been prepared, Mr. Speaker, my party would have been prepared today to some extent, to have supported a basic change in our municipal government set-up had we had some idea of the size of the cheque.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me put one thing straight right now. There's been attempts

(MR. ENNS cont'd) made, politically and cleverly, you know, that okay, we've got a proposal, what's yours? Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not government. It's not the responsibility on us to necessarily show the way and show the light to government. Our first and foremost government, you know, is to shoot arrows through government plans, ask the significant questions, recognizing that we don't have the research, we don't have the staff, and we don't have the capability that government has at their disposal, and simply for the government to attempt to say that, okay, this is our plan, what's yours? - that, Mr. Speaker, is eminently unfair. That's eminently unfair. Our plan was, Mr. Speaker, that we proceed with a procedure of dialogue which has in fact not taken place with respect to this plan.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to you, Sir, in the remaining five minutes, that I have a concern that insists to be with me, and I wish to express in a forceful way at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I am genuinely concerned about, that will not augur well for the new city because I suggest to you again as I did some months ago, that by far and large the majority of Greater Winnipeg citizens genuinely and honestly believe that by doing away with the current two-tier system of government and accepting, despite the protestations of my friend from Sturgeon Creek, the one-tier system of government that we are now imposing, that there will be -- and I'm even being generous -- a cessation, a desisting, a stop of the rising municipal costs. Most people, Mr. Speaker, most people generally expect a drop in taxation as a result of the passing of Bill 36, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that while this government has not for one moment suggested that that would happen, they haven't taken one moment out to suggest that it wouldn't happen, and that's where the politics of it arrives.

Now that's being maybe a little unfair, or a little straying off the mark, but let me explain that in the two remaining minutes that I have. Notable municipal authorities, namely, Mr. Bole, for instance -- what's his name? Elswood -- suggested that the cost, just a simple. . . is 18-20 million dollars. I don't know whether that's correct or not, but I would have at least expected in a debate of this kind, some factual information from the resources that the Urban Affairs Minister has at his disposal, to dispute the fact, to deny the fact or to say what it is -- but we have little or none.

Mr. Speaker, in the one remaining minute that I have, let me say that I also as a rural member regret, regret the passage of this particular bill in a sense that I would suggest to you that the likelihood of this province ever seeing a rural oriented Premier again is gone, that the political muscle now rests completely and entirely with the urban community -- and that in itself is not bad, as I've got city cousins as well as country cousins -- but, Sir, the imbalance has been struck, and has been struck permanently with the passage of this bill. One half and more of the province's population will come under the political control of a party that captures some 25 council seats in this municipality. That's what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker. And for those of us who live on the other side of the mountain, well we'll have to be content with kicking manure off of tractor wheels. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, before the vote is put I wish to raise my opposition to the bill. The first thing I would like to say to the House Leader, I regret and object that this bill has to come to a vote on Saturday at 10:30 because in my opinion I think it's a slow process of closure that we had during the last week or so. For the last three weeks we have sat in this House till midnight; we sat till 4:00 in the morning one morning, and surely I think there was no necessity to sit today after 5:30 or 7:00 o'clock after the committees were finished.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege in that the honourable member is attributing our sitting here to me, and I thought that it was fully explained that we were sitting here with the consent of representatives of both parties of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I very seldom am out of this House, very seldom, and I wasn't here when the Minister explained, or I am very seldom out of the House and I was not asked personally. I understand some of the others were asked personally. I object that we have to sit, after sitting all week till the wee hours in the morning and still have to sit on a Saturday night to pass the most important piece of legislation that's been before this House this year so -- (Interjection) -- it's not baloney, Mr. Speaker, this is the facts, and if there was

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Just so there won't be no differences between the two members, I should like to explain that as the chairman I did ask for agreement in respect of procedure of this House, it was concurred in; if the honourable member was absent I regret that; I'm sure he does too, but it was by concurrence of the whole House, so therefore I wish he would stay away from that particular topic. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I will stay away, but I will make one statement. I don't believe this House has ever sat on a Saturday night in the last 50 years, I doubt it very much.

Mr. Speaker, I had stated on every occasion that I had an opportunity to speak on this bill that some reform was necessary, some reform was required and we were prepared to listen to that and move in that direction. What I object to in this bill, this bill is retroactive, it confiscates the assets of most municipalities, particularly the City of St. James-Assiniboia, and I predict, and I know this will happen, that the tax in my constituency will skyrocket as a result of this legislation -- will skyrocket, I believe this, this has been mentioned by many of the other members.

The other point, that I do feel after the legislation is almost passed, we can take it for granted it will be passed, that this is a very large and this is a big government. We're talking about 50 members; I think it's too big, I think the size could have been half of that. We would have had, I believe, much better administration, somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 members I think would have been better instead of 50, because on a 50-member council you have to go to a political system. I think there's going to be much bickering, much debate, and that's another objection that I have.

Mr. Speaker, the other point, I am not completely satisfied with the community committees and the purpose or the rights that have been given to the community committees, because even from the Minister's office I understand the people that had some responsibility for drafting the bill, the word came out it was strictly window dressing to keep the municipalities happy, to say that you are really getting something, but in fact what it was, the community committee was no more than window dressing. I did try on two occasions to accept a very small amendment that would have at least made our community committees somewhat -- at least given some responsibility, some jurisdiction, and the government was not permitted to accept it.

The other point I wish to say, is it right for us here to pass legislation -- I know that the City of Winnipeg wanted it, but generally speaking the area municipalities were all against it, and in majority against it. Is it right without concurrence, for instance, let's use the example of St. James-Assiniboia, the City of St. James-Assiniboia, I would venture to say that at least 80 percent of the people are against it? Is it right with that kind of opposition, without the concurrence of the people, to force this legislation on them? I'm not so sure it's right that we should be doing this. This is the other objection I have. I cannot support this legislation and I will say to all the members and to the House that I did not have experience on municipal council and I cannot speak with the same experience as the Member for Sturgeon Creek, who I think did a tremendous job on this bill, except to no avail, and I give him credit, he put tremendous time on it and really tried to at least get some amendments through, but again to no avail.

But the objections that I wish to state -- surely the argument of the Finance Minister, surely it's not worthwhile listening to when he says that you didn't have any experience in council, we did. Well, are all the members that appeared before committee, are all the mayors and all the aldermen and all the delegations that were opposed, in the eyes of the Minister of Finance, these people are either stupid, ignorant, or in his opinion this is what he's trying to tell us, because this is what they were relating to us, to the committee, they were telling us that they are objecting, on the principles they were objecting, why -- they gave the reasons why -- and surely we should take, you know, to heart some of the things that mayors and a council with many years of experience have said. I think that surely some of their objections were worthwhile considering and it appears to me in the eyes of the Finance Minister that either these people were ignorant of the fact or they're stupid or something, because he says anyone that objects to the bill, you know, he can't see it, you people didn't have no experience.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do object. I think the taxes will skyrocket in my constituency and I don't think it'll be better administration. I can't see in what way it will improve the services in the City of St. James-Assiniboia. We have a good council in there; we have a good

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) government in that city; we have good services in the way of police or fire, anything you can think of, parks and so on. I cannot see in what way, shape or form that this bill would improve our constituency, so I very strongly object to this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry - or really only slightly sorry that I've had to miss much of the discussion that went on this evening, but my feeling was that calling a meeting at such an hour on Saturday evening was rather a desperation measure and one which I couldn't regard with too much feeling of duty; in fact I felt very much as did the wife of the Member from Elmwood the other day who came to our committee meeting after the 4:00 o'clock in the morning session. I won't repeat what she said because I think. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

MRS. TRUEMAN: . . . it very likely would be considered unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The remarks that the honourable member is now making are not relevant to the motion under discussion. -- (Interjections) -- Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that after it was explained that this meeting was called by the concurrence of all members - and if you want me to use the Leader of the Opposition's words, he wanted the meeting tonight; that we should not have to continually be blamed for it. -- (Interjections) -- It is true. It is true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, in due respect to the lady that has the floor, she was merely leading up to her comments and I see no reason for the Leader of the House to have taken the attitude that he has taken tonight and given some semblance of losing his temper to a few innocent remarks made by the honourable member, and I feel he should sit in his place and hear what she has to say.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I do believe I did mention that particular matter when the Member for Assiniboia was speaking. I should like all honourable members to take note of it; that it was by consensus we are sitting tonight. I, as chairman, asked whether we agreed upon that. Those that were present did; the ones that were absent I cannot speak for since that's their own problem. Quiet, please. If we wish to proceed in an orderly fashion I shall still try and maintain the rules which are your rules and will abide by them. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have referred to the discussion that I had missed this evening, I expect that there was not a great deal new that was brought before us and I certainly don't want to rehash the discussion that has gone on before. I realize that everyone must be quite tired and hungry and I'm certainly not going to keep you very long listening to me. But it seems sad to me that in spite of the strong and even bitter opposition that has been witnessed to this proposed amalgamation, from both the suburbs and the rural areas, that it will still be imposed on them without a compromise. I have little taste for forcing of a dubious new concept on people who find this present situation really quite entirely to their satisfaction. One can't help but be affected by the sincere objections towards changes which destroy historical charters and identities, erase municipal councils, which are serving their people satisfactorily, in exchange for an unknown theoretical untested new concept.

I can substantiate the fact that there is some dissatisfaction amongst the people with this bill and I believe that the responses to a questionnaire which was conducted by the Winnipeg Junior Chamber of Commerce - a summary was placed on all our desks. That survey indicated that 61 percent of the respondents felt that the proposed new legislation had not received enough discussion. They expect taxes to go up with no additional service. Fifty-eight percent expressed strong opposition to the new unity; 38.4 percent favoured the plan, but of these, only 31 percent preferred the proposal in Bill 36. Seventy-eight percent felt that party politics would rise from the new system and 72 percent felt that this would be a hindrance to the good functioning of a local government.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take up a lot of your time, and I think if there were no interruptions I'd be finished very shortly. I'm not going to say anything very controversial. But to continue with this survey, 48 percent of those who were polled felt that the present services were adequate; and of those who felt that it was not adequate, their quarrel was with such things as animal control or street maintenance, inadequacies in parks and recreation and so

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.) on down the line.

Mr. Speaker, I have very many serious reservations about the effects of Bill 36; substituting community committees with new boundaries where the existing municipalities is, in my opinion, of questionable merit. The disruptive effectiveness will be hard to live with. I don't think any of us doubt that costs of services will go up with centralization. It's only because I have faith and hope that the new council will eventually overcome the shortcomings of this proposed plan, and that in the long run my constituency may be more well served, that I'm going to support the bill because my leader has left me free to follow my conscience. I do represent the City of Winnipeg constituency and I do feel that over the years the City of Winnipeg has carried more than its share of the load. With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I shall end.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate & Internal Services)

(Burrows): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member who just took her seat allow a question? Could she indicate to the House what percentage of the residents in Metropolitan Winnipeg responded to the questionnaire conducted by the Jaycees?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the question is really necessary in view of the fact that the honourable member indicated everyone got a copy of the questionnaire. I would like to take about 60 seconds while the technician changes the master tape. People may have a seventh inning stretch.

Order, please. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, these will be my closing remarks on Bill 36. I think we've had a long debate in connection with this particular bill, longer much so than on many other pieces of legislation that are being passed in the Manitoba Legislature. Actually we are making history tonight. This is actually an historic event in that we are bringing about a new administration to more than half the people of this province, the people of Greater Winnipeg.

Earlier I placed a motion before this House requesting a referendum; the motion was ruled out of order but, Mr. Speaker, I still feel that the people of the Greater Winnipeg area, of the various municipalities, should have been given a right to vote on this. They should have a choice in the matter whether they want it, this centralization, this total amalgamation or not, and I feel that we are not giving them this. We're deciding this for them and it's more or less an imposition. This is a major change, a major piece of legislation that we're passing. We're completely revamping the legislation for the Greater Winnipeg area; we're making large additions to the present city; in fact we're doubling the population of the City of Winnipeg, more than doubling. We've heard from the Member for St. Boniface that he would like to see the name retained, the word "St. Boniface" in the name. We also know when the Mayor for St. Boniface appeared in committee that he had a large petition with him containing many names, many thousands actually, 8,000 or something, and he also stated that there were further petitions coming in. These people didn't want this change to take place. Their request was that St. Boniface should remain, that the charter of St. Boniface, like other charters of other cities in the Greater Winnipeg area, would not be dissolved and not be given up. Through this bill we're eliminating many of the municipalities, some of them partially rural, and these too will be eliminated by the passage of this bill.

And why should the government be afraid to present this to the people for a vote? I feel that they should be wanting to do this, that they should want this legislation to be confirmed by the citizens of the Greater Winnipeg area. Certainly, after the 1960 measure bringing about the Metro tier of government for the Greater Winnipeg area, there was a vote and the people rejected it, but it wasn't acted on, and I'm afraid that the same thing would happen now if the matter was placed before the people, that they would turn it down. I think we have every reason to believe so, because we noted that the many officials, civic officials that came forward, the many mayors and representatives of other cities and municipalities, voiced strong opposition to the plan.

We also noted the tactful way which the Minister of Finance used to take them off the offensive and bring them about to the defensive, and then more or less putting it in such a way that the onus would be on them to make this work; that the people coming forward, that the onus was placed on them, that they were charged with making this new plan work. I don't accept that principle not at all. If I oppose a certain principle, it is not my duty then to make that principle work. Never. -- (Interjection) --

The Member for St. Boniface disagrees. What about if Communism should come into

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) Manitoba? Would it then be up to me to make Communism work in Manitoba? Never. I wouldn't subscribe to that, and I don't subscribe to this principle that this centralization take place, this legislation be brought in, and that I then as an individual was bound to support it. I don't accept that principle and I don't agree to it and I will never subscribe to it. And I take it that the people of Greater Winnipeg object to centralization and to the measure that is being brought in. They want to retain their local contact, their contact with their local municipality, with their local administration; and government no doubt will be further removed as a result of this legislation that we are passing here tonight.

This also means increased bureaucracy. This system of commissioners no doubt, as has been discussed by other members, will bring this about. It will remove local government from the people and put it at arm's length. I also feel that the costs no doubt will increase, because I have yet to see where centralization was brought in that the costs were less. We have the experience of this government through the Welfare Department, through the Health Department, Education Department, wherever centralization took place, that the costs increased; they did not decrease; and this is bound to happen here under this measure.

We also know that the people will no longer be able to exercise the control over costs the way they have been doing heretofore. They had smaller units before and in many of these areas they had the control over local money bylaws. This has gone. This is eliminated through this legislation, and they will no longer have that power to exercise control over capital expenditures as they did heretofore.

I also sympathize with some of the people in certain of the municipalities and cities where they have substantial reserves built up, and these are now being confiscated as far as they are concerned. They will have to fork up or take upon themselves the indebtedness of other surrounding municipalities. They'll have to pay for that. In addition, they'll lose the reserves that they built up; and I don't feel that this is proper; this is not right, in my opinion, and I object to that.

This is my basic reason for getting up on third reading, the principle of centralization. I'm opposing it and therefore I strongly oppose the bill on third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to debate at length. However, I do feel it's incumbent upon me to address some few remarks in respect to this bill. In my own community I served for eight years . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has a point of order?

MR. CRAIK: . . . the Attorney-General is closing the debate on . . .

MR. SPEAKER: No. There is no closing of debate on third reading. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: In my own community, Mr. Speaker, I served for eight years as an alderman and feelings have run very high in my community in respect to urban reorganization, and it's no secret that others, my former colleagues on the council of the City of St. James-Assiniboia, have used some strong words in reference to a so-called new thinking on my part in respect to urban reorganization. And so, Mr. Speaker, I do want to reflect for a few moments with honourable members about some of the points that have been raised, and put on the record some of my views as to the future value to my own constituency, my own area.

The Member from Lakeside indicated - and I trust that he had no real basis for it - that there was some distortion on the part of obviously supporters of Bill 36 of remarks or briefs or arguments that had been advanced by spokesmen particularly from the suburban cities and municipalities, and I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and honourable members, that at no time have I ever or have any one of my colleagues ever deprecated the right and privilege of suburban mayors or reeves or councillors to advocate as strenuously as they could the position of their constituents as they recognized it. I, for one, believe that the dialogue that has occurred in respect to Bill 36 was perhaps far more complete than any other piece of legislation that has come before this Legislature.

In the meetings that were held - and I now reflect upon the arguments that we still keep hearing about costs - there were questions put as to cost; but I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we made no commitment that costs would not increase, and I don't think anyone here can honestly say what the cost of government will be tomorrow, cost of provincial government let alone local government or municipal government. We simply don't know the standards of program that will be demanded tomorrow by the people of Manitoba or the people of the local

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) community. And I want to again reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that when the City of St. James and the Rural Municipality of Assinibola were amalgamated, there was no understanding as to what the costs would be a year after amalgamation. That wasn't the concern, Mr. Speaker. The concern was for the development and the integration of a more effective community. And costs did rise, and there's no doubt in my mind that costs of urban life are going to continue to rise; but that is something that does not negate the principles of an attempt to build a better quality of urban life for the people of Greater Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, there continues to be a reiteration of the argument that somehow through the provisions of Bill 36 there is a confiscation of the assets of various cities and municipalities. I want to remind honourable members again some of the points that I made earlier, that at the time that the Metropolitan Corporation was brought into being by an Act of this Legislature, there was no consideration that what was taken from the City of Winnipeg then, by a provincial government from the City of Winnipeg, was confiscation of those assets; and I placed on the record an evaluation, an evaluation of assets - and I'll ignore the continued interruptions of the former Speaker of this House whose conduct is somewhat questionable from time to time, Mr. Speaker - I placed on the record evaluation of what those assets were, and historic evaluations of the cost to the City of Winnipeg of services that had been provided over the many years since the incorporation of the City of Winnipeg as a city, of services provided to suburban municipalities and cities.

But what I want to concern myself with for but a few moments, particularly for the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek and the Honourable Member from Assinibola, is the concern that what we are fashioning here today is not simply an answer to the problems of the people of Winnipeg and the people of the greater community of Winnipeg just for today. We're fashioning a corporate structure to meet the problems of the residents who are going to live here tomorrow and in the decades following. And one of the things that surely we should ask ourselves is: what have been the costs, what have been the costs to the people of this community in the failure of politicians that have gone before us to have answered the questions that we are attempting to answer now in this bill, a failure to develop program for the rational planning and development of this community? And I say to the Honourable Member for Assinibola - and I'd like him to listen - that if he will reflect on the cost of the projected twinning of an east-west throughway from the heart of the City of Winnipeg to his constituency, if he will reflect on the need for that, and the need arises out of the growth of a new area, and where the costs of the infrastructure, they must be borne all along the way back to the heart of the city, and if the honourable member would enquire, as I have, the provisional estimates of the cost of that east-west throughway to provide -- (Interjection) -- I'll ignore those constant interruptions and put it down to some excess of exuberance of some kind, spirits of some kind, Mr. Speaker, the costs of that -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: Your ignorance is prevailing tonight, Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- well, I'll wait until that rabble ceases slightly, Mr. Speaker. The estimated costs are \$17 billion. Just think of the impact of that sort of costs arising from the development westward of our Greater Winnipeg community, and these are the kind of costs that are attributed to the new growth. And I say, and I say to the honourable members particularly from the constituencies neighbouring mine, that what we have to look at is the costs of the future and the fact that it is our communities that will benefit most by the forward planning that we make today, because it's our areas that are the subjects of the most dynamic growth. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to reassure honourable members that the community committees are not window dressing. They reflect a sincere desire on the part of the members of this government to fashion an instrument which will be unique in providing not only a greater centralization of the administration of services, but also a greater community of identity with the people of the constituencies that compose the communities with their local government. It is unique; it's daring; and it will need the wholehearted cooperation even of honourable members who sit opposite, and that is what I hope that we will find in the days that lie ahead.

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't intend to speak long. I have spoken many times on this bill. I have presented amendments on this bill. I couldn't speak too long without probably becoming very emotional about the City of St. James-Assinibola.

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) You don't live in a place all your life or grow up in it or be an alderman in it for a long time and see a city that is probably one of the most wealthy cities per capita in the North American continent go down the drain; and also you probably, Sir, have to get very annoyed that when they started to talk about this One Big City, or all the people they've talked to, they don't come to people that have been successful.

The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was almost, in my opinion, Sir, in a gloating mood tonight because he now has his motion passed. He brings up the point very definitely to everybody that Metro was in favour. Of course, Metro couldn't speak on the amendments, especially one about electing the mayor. They do not approve of that, to begin with. He speaks about the City of Winnipeg being in favour - this is the aldermen again. He speaks about the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, all of these people, and it reminds me of when I said to him the other night, "You know, he speaks about elected people," and not so long ago he told me "All I hear from is elected people, not the people." So disregarding that, I would say that when did they ever talk . . . suburbs? The members on the other side that have had experience in Metro seem to think that Winnipeg and the Metro area . . . and council are the only people that are there. When did they speak to the people with experience? When did they speak to the successful operators of cities other than to criticize mainly in some way, shape or form that we're parochial or something of that nature?

And when I talk about St. James-Assiniboia, we were the only city or council that was for the downtown area. We were on Metro's side to see the core of Winnipeg built. It's a little tiring, Sir, to continually hear this talk about the future of Winnipeg and this is the structure we're making. It's tiring because it's a sham. They use this to say this is the kind of legislation we need. I don't agree with that, Sir. I agree that there has to be changes for the future of this city but not the way this government is doing it, and I'll never agree to that principle; I was almost -- you know, in my opinion, the Mayor of Winnipeg spoke and he said anybody that says it'll make a difference between rural and urban in this city is a traitor. I say to him I don't give a damn what he calls me. I don't think it'll do the Province of Manitoba any good. I don't give a damn what the Mayor of Winnipeg calls me. In fact, I find it very very wrong that cities that have been successful financially, exactly will have to become part of a city that has probably been the most mismanaged city in the last ten years. They're broke, and this is another way out of it for him. And he'll break this one big city if he ever becomes mayor. Sir, I -- (Interjection) -- don't really care if you say it's terrible. Sir, I say this. This government had hearings -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I will say publicly here to anybody, any time the Mayor of Winnipeg wants to get together with me, any place, any time, I'll gladly tell him or debate it with him.

Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden we are passing a bill, and it started way back with the hearings, and this government has listened to nobody. They've had the hearings; they got advised through the hearings. Better look out. They have been told administratively it's probably not going to be good. I say it's a dog patch. They don't listen to that. They don't listen to amendments. They have listened to nobody except the people that were brought in to write the bill, and they went out and talked to nobody that were in municipal affairs. I've said it before - I won't dwell on it. But from start to finish, the only changes that I can basically see is the mayor will be elected for one term, and then I think I won a "may" or an "and" in a resolution. But they've listened to nobody and they're going in -- (Interjection) -- yeah. They're going in completely blind into this. They don't know what's going to happen with it. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. This is a trial, which is costly and unnecessary. That's right.

Now the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources also said he's an expert. He twists and fools and plays; he says -- you know, he uses the TED Report when we said something he wants to use out of it. He never mentioned the Boundaries Commission Report. Never. Oh, no. That's a sin. It didn't happen to say anything in this day that he could quote from. And he uses all kinds of different ways and means in saying the councils. Well, Sir, I tell you this; the people that he wanted to hear from and he didn't hear from, and he mentions the Winnipeg Council and the Metro Council, etc. I say to him he heard from a lot of people when he heard from those aldermen. They don't walk up lightly; they don't walk up lightly and make a presentation.

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)

So, Mr. Speaker, that's all I have to say. They're going in blindly. I could rake this bill over again for 20 minutes tonight, tomorrow night, the next night, and for as long as I had the occasion to, but they won't listen to anybody.

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

MR. MOUG: I have one or two brief comments, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney-General mentions his eight years as alderman in the City of St. James-Assinibola, you know. I have to mention to him my experience in the Municipality of Charleswood. I spent six years there as mayor; I felt that I contributed something towards an area of municipalities that is being taken into this new one-city concept. My colleague the Member for Fort Rouge mentioned tonight that centralization will cost money. I agree with her. It'll cost money. She intends -- the member, I should say, intends in every instance to vote for the bill but she realizes that it's going to cost money. We all realize that, and if this government is introducing Bill 36 and implementing it and bulldozing it through, Sir, for no other reason than to have it cost the people money, I stand up and object on behalf of the Town of Tuxedo and the Municipality of Charleswood. And I object strongly. I say that there is no time that any member of the government, be it the House Leader, be it the Minister of Urban Affairs, has ever been able to say what it's going to cost. The argument that that side of the House gives, the government side of the House gives this argument regularly: can you tell us what this government's going to cost the Province of Manitoba for next year? And I say no. I say no. I know they don't -- because they're incapable. But I say to you once more, Mr. Speaker, that our municipality has to prepare a budget and get it okayed by the Department of Municipal Affairs every year. For the past six years, from my experience, they've had to get it okayed. And we've had to tell the Provincial Government year after year after year what we're going to spend in a small municipality like Charleswood with 10,000 people, and this government that comes in with this legislation says they don't know. They don't know what it's going to cost to administer this new city. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, for that very reason they should retract this bill. If we want ball park figures, it's fine. Nobody wants to know what it's going to cost. Ball park figures is all we want. Today they're running -- if you ever saw a government running with arm's length ideas, certainly we've got it right today. They have no idea what they're going to do with it.

I want to ask you, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Attorney-General, who served his eight years as alderman, what his findings were when he sat on that council, amalgamated with the Town of Brooklands, and also a few years later in 1968 with the Municipality of Assinibola. Absolute chaos. Nobody knew where they were going. With all due respect to the Mayor of St. James, he did a terrific job and pulled them out of the doldrums. All they wanted to do was get bigger; get bigger. That was the main thing, was to centralize and stop everybody from knowing what was happening. Keep everybody away from the elected. This was the idea, and they did a good job of it. They increased their mill rates, Sir, as I have read to you a good many times before in this House. Their mill rates increased; the costs of operation went haywire, absolute haywire. They spent more money in their operating costs in St. James-Assinibola, like twice than that of St. Boniface and St. Vital put together.

I don't want to belabour the House tonight; I know we're trying to get through with what we're doing here. I think that we should expeditiously move on, but I have to say, Sir, that I would agree that the City of Winnipeg is broke. I have to agree with that. The Mayor of the City of Winnipeg today is up scrambling. He's groping for everything he can get hold of to reinstate himself. -- (Interjection) -- I refuse to sit down and have the vote called because I know that my vote will be a lost vote on this side of the House. But if you took that bill after it's been amended, 50 percent of it's been amended, you could still amend it another 50 percent and you'd still be 25 percent wrong. I got quite a charge the other day by the Member for Souris-Killarney when he stood up in committee and he voiced his opinion. He said that, you know, we'd already gone through this. Somebody said, "Well, you've gone through that section. Well, he said, "No, no, no. I realize we've gone through it but," he says, "this is like Eaton's catalogue; every time you look at you see something new." And I agree with him. Every time you look through that Act, Sir, you'll find something new in there that's going to cost people money. Half the province, half the population of the province, is going to spend more money because the Minister of Finance likes Eaton's catalogues -- at least if he had its

(MR. MOUG cont'd) colour. You know, it's like the TV. The kids get sick and tired of looking at black and white TV and I get sick and tired of looking at a black and white catalogue. I like Eaton's catalogue because it's multi-coloured. You get sick and tired; you look at one page, just turn it over till you get into the coloured pages.

Well, I have to go back now to my friend Mumbles that just spoke up, and he says -- (Interjection) -- Bear with me, Sir. I'll have to talk on something else for a minute till I get back to what Mumbles said. I've made a note on him and, you know, like this man, basically he runs the province. He comes through with all his suggestions. Now just a minute, Sir, I'm talking because he spoke up while I was speaking, and I think that I have the opportunity to rebut what he said to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable gentleman has the right to debate but the question before the House is third reading of Bill 36 and that's the one he has to apply himself to. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: There was one Minister tonight, Sir, and I think it was -- Yes, he was speaking towards the City of Winnipeg and he made reference to -- yes construction, that's what it was, and the Department of Public Works, and it was in the City of Winnipeg as it's been operated, and to do the construction of the streets, as the City of Winnipeg has carried on in the past years, they've always done their own construction work. There's several other municipalities. The other 11, I think, without exception have always used contractors, consulting engineers, rather than their own engineering department. As I say, like the City of Winnipeg did, they use their own engineering department, call their own tenders and did their own construction. So there was one Minister speaking here tonight -- of course, he's some type of authority on roads and streets and possibly highways. But at any rate, Sir, I know that his particular -- the way he learned how to construct highways I happen to know. A good friend of mine was in the trucking business and he used to ride up and down on the road with him delivering gravel from point A to point B. So I hope, Sir, that -- pardon? Yeah, well now it's different because he is closer to a build-up here and I fear that he moves in closer to the Portage and Main area, gets back into the act where we could possibly have him challenging the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg with his popularity of riding in trucks back and forth from the gravel pit to where we should be dumping this gravel on our city streets and I certainly hope, I certainly hope, Sir, that the City of Winnipeg and the people thereof are clever enough to ignore this type of intelligence. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I won't hold the debate on this bill up any more than two minutes. I would just like to say that it is unfortunate that on Saturday night at 25 minutes past eleven that we should be passing legislation or voting on legislation that would affect the whole Province of Manitoba; and that we are voting now on a division which will make the Province of Winnipeg divide with the Province of Manitoba. I think that the Opposition and the members of the government should take cognizance of the fact that we have to consider legislations that will be coming before this Legislative Assembly in the coming year in respect of a division of half the population, slightly more, in the City of Winnipeg and rural Manitoba. For this reason I have no alternative but to vote against the bill. That is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: There is no such a thing.

MR. CHERNIACK: I believe there has been very extensive debate on this question, more than I recall has been given to any bill that I've been involved in. I'm sorry the Honourable Member for Arthur feels that this is an odd hour in which to be passing one of the most important pieces of legislation in many years, but the fact is that we revealed time and again the exhaustive debate and discussion, public, private, in the House, in committee, that I think is on record, but of course I may be wrong; but I know there has been very substantial debate, and intelligent debate and fruitful and productive debate, most of it in a "positive vein." When I say in a positive vein I think that many members of the Opposition did deal with this matter in a positive way, all of them I believe sincere, not many who were that helpful really in dealing with it.

The Member for Lakeside made quite a to-do about the fact that the Opposition does not have to be called upon to come out with counter proposals or other proposals; but they had a

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) number of years when they were in government, when they could have done something they sloughed it off. So that's the way they went about it and that is their right.

I listened to the speeches made today by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the last one he made disappointed me because he went over a whole list of all the nefarious, devious thinking that must have been going on on this side of the House, and I fault him for having that kind of a mind that seems to look for devious, nefarious devices by which a government like ours has decided to deal with a bill. Well, that we have to accept.

I must say that I do resent the fact that two members of Municipal Council's present day stood up and made statements that were damaging, if they were to be believed, of the credit of the City of Winnipeg whose credit is outstanding, which has had every opportunity to go out to the money markets on this continent, and outside, and be received and accepted as being a responsible group of citizens, one quarter of the people of Manitoba, the capital city of this province, and two people present tonight, people who are not only members of the Legislature, but people who are today elected as -- today two of them sitting on councils of suburban municipalities of Winnipeg, standing up and saying the City of Winnipeg are broke. It's not true and it's damaging and harmful and it does them no good at all to have taken that kind of an attitude.

One only need refer to one remark by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, which I resent on behalf of the people who have been working with me over these many months. I just don't believe that a member of the work force that has been working with us and developing the program and explaining it would have said that the community committees are just a bunch of window dressing and aren't worth anything. However, he said it and I presume that as a responsible person he knows whereof he speaks. -- (Interjection) --

I'm advised at this hour I assume it would be best not to get involved in questions. The Member for Assiniboia deplored the fact that apparently the balance of his party in the House was not aware that we would be discussing it this evening. Frankly I don't know why; I recall that the rules stipulate that we meet three times a day, including Saturday; but of course he needn't worry - I believe Saturday night is in the rules -- (Interjection) -- That may be, but nevertheless it's in the rules and if it didn't sit it was waived. However, he needn't worry because from his standpoint, his two absent members were paired because the fact is that the Member for Portage la Prairie declared himself clearly and openly in favour of this bill; so he needn't worry about the position of his party; except as far as the public is concerned; he should worry about the position of his party which seems to have such a negative position on this issue that the leader of the party outside of the House is making statements of what the party really believes but one of the members of the Legislature is free to speak as he pleases on a matter which is of some importance.

I also welcome the Member of Fort Rouge joining with us in this and in that case she made it very clear why she was supporting it and indicated her hope, which is shared I hope by all of us, that the proposals will be worked on by responsible people to see that it works. Therefore, of course, I welcome the support of a member of the Liberal Party sitting in this Legislature and a member of the Conservative Party sitting in the Legislature; we may still get at least one more who represents -- at least one who represents a constituency in the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Municipal Affairs Committee dealt with this bill in a responsible fashion. We had, I think, three days of hearings; briefs were presented, questions were asked, discussions were held. The briefs that were received were given careful study. The delegations that came were helpful, many of them making positive suggestions, all of which we studied, some of which we used. We said we would be flexible, we wanted to hear what the people had to say; we listened, although I can't convince members opposite that we did. We recorded all that we heard and we believe that we made various accommodations as suggested, as long as we would not be destroying the basic principles.

I want to mention just in passing that we stated openly that we were referring the Act - and it will be an Act very soon - to the Law Reform Commission for a review because we took large chunks of existing legislation and put it into the bill and we said that there were sections there that were offensive to us; there were sections there that we felt were not up to date and that they needed review but because they were existing law we did not feel it incumbent on us to make all changes immediately but that we wanted to make changes, we wanted studies to be made. We have made some changes, made in response to reflection study in accord with

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) public opinion that we became aware of and we paid a great deal of attention to what was told to us by both the people, political and administrative people, at the municipal level. We introduced a number of amendments; most recently, of course, the question of equalization and Hydro rates, the official languages section, the structure of the Executive Committee, which I think was a positive step, I think one that has generally been accepted. Changes of name of course were less important; the question of election of mayor has already been dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for members of the Legislature, members of the councils of Greater Winnipeg, some 112 or so of them, and the entire civic service force of all the municipalities now to recognize that within minutes this bill will pass third reading, final reading. May I say that I regret the absence, for many reasons, of course, of the Honourable Member for Churchill who is missed in general at the moment -- he is not well -- but of course I'm sorry that he's not present because on the last occasion that a vote took place he, too, supported the government and the bill, and I have no reason to think that he would have changed his mind; I would hope that being present today he, too, would have stood up and been counted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say, and I say to the Honourable the Member for Charleswood, that after tonight, after midnight tonight he will know that the course of the new City of Winnipeg is being set, and it is for him and is for other members of the Legislature and the people of Winnipeg to make every effort to make it work, because, indeed, we have said all along that we were creating an administrative and political structure which if there were a real effort made by the people concerned to make it work, it will work and it'll work well; and it'll work well in accord with the hopes we had that there would be political decentralization and administrative centralization, the phrases used by the Leader of the Opposition. But I say that once this is done I believe that opposition should stop and that we should all bend our efforts to work towards creating in this area a city which will work to the benefit of all the residents and all the citizens -- and I believe I have now received a pledge of the Member of Charleswood that he would do; and I think it's important.

Because, Mr. Speaker, if those elements that have been questioned which have been called new ideas, which have been called experimentation, if they don't work, Mr. Speaker, we will end up with something much better than what we have today. But if they do work and if people make an effort to really develop a sense of community and a sense of participation at the smallest neighbourhood level, then indeed, I think all members should agree that if they do make the effort, if it does work, then we're far far ahead of any other city I know of on this continent. So it's up to us as a group, as citizens of Winnipeg and as citizens of Manitoba to make that effort that the expectations, many of which are doubted by members opposite, make sure that those expectations are worked at, developed and hopefully realized.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the fact that the government has set up a number of task forces, task forces dealing with a variety of aspects of relationships of the municipal governments amongst themselves, of restructuring the new City of Winnipeg and of relating the provincial input to the City of Winnipeg input, of seeing to it that they could work together; and now I have a right, I believe, to call upon the administrative people in the municipal areas who have shown a tremendous, positive response to our request up to now; and to the municipal people now in Greater Winnipeg who to a large extent have shown a positive response, that they will work with our task forces starting yesterday, because many started months ago, and starting tomorrow and continuing to work during the balance of 1971 with the task forces in an effort to arrange for an orderly transfer. I believe that now the government having taken full responsibility for the bill; taken full responsibility for the plan; having carried it through to the final vote, that now it becomes a law of the Province of Manitoba; and from here on in I believe that we have a right to demand that the people of Greater Winnipeg participate with us.

Now I see there are some members who are becoming impatient, and I don't wonder, I don't wonder, those that are impatient, it's been a long day, it's been a long couple of months. I, of course, am pleased that we are able to progress another step forward, one which I think we should begin, I think we should all do in concert. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I end on the note that with all the acrimony that has gone on, with all the violence that has gone on in debate -- (Interjection) -- yes, there has been violent debate gone on, and the member who is insisting that there wasn't any was party to it as were others, that we now settle down and say

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) "we have something to work for, let's make it worthwhile."

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

A MEMBER: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order, please. The question before the House is Bill 36, Third Reading.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Cherniack, Desjardins, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Turnbull, Uskiw and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Bilton, Craik, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Graham, Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Henderson, McGill, Moug, Patrick, Spivak, Watt and Weir.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 22; Nays 14.

MR. SPEAKER: Yeas have it; I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Monday morning.