

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
1:30 o'clock, Monday, May 6, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 50 students of Grade 6 standing of the Crestview School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Gregory and Mrs. Breckman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all the honourable members, I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions. Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, may I have the permission to make a statement. I haven't copies of the statement that I wish to make to hand to my honourable friends. It's dealing with the situation at the Health Services Centre and if it's okay, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed)

MR. PAULLEY: I'm pleased to announce that I have now received the report of the Industrial Inquiry Commission, which report indicates settlement of the possible dispute between the Health Services Centre and the employees. Mr. Martin and I have been in conversation on numerous occasions and informs me that the agreement reached was accepted unanimously by the Board of the hospital and also the negotiating team for the union. I'm sorry I'm not at liberty at this particular moment, Mr. Speaker, to indicate the precise terms of the settlement, because as is the custom, the membership of the union must ratify the terms of the agreement, although I have been assured, as much as I can be assured, that in every likelihood the employees will ratify. I'm sure that honourable members in the House will be pleased to note that it does appear we are not going to be confronted with a strike of the personnel at the Health Services Centre.

And if I may also make an announcement to the effect, Mr. Speaker, that at long last the strike at Brandon between the employees and Safeway's has been ended, and that agreement has been ratified by the employees at a meeting held yesterday. So we're at least two down over what we were before.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to say that members of the Conservative Party are very pleased that the settlement has been agreed to at the Health Sciences Centre. We saw some very grave situations coming forth if the employees should have gone off, but we're just wondering at the present time, would the government consider taking off the eight percent guideline increase that they have set and allow other hospital boards, if they should be faced with this situation to give them just a little bit more freedom and negotiations with their employees.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. We're going to get into a back and forth debate and that is not proper at this particular time. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'd like to respond to the statement made by the Minister by first of all saying that we're very very pleased that the appointment which he made proved to be a very successful appointment inasmuch as it took the Enquiry Commissioner very little time to act and to bring about this relief that Manitobans I am sure will share with the Minister and with all of the citizens of this province that we have avoided what could have been a very disastrous measure. We would like to express our thanks to the Minister for this appointment and for the rapid results that came about from the appointment.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members again to the gallery where we have 30 more students of Grade 11 standing of the Sisler High School. These students are under the direction of Miss Dawson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and Environmental Management. On behalf of all the members I welcome you here today.

Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable House Leader.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster) in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Finance introduced Bill No. 61, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act Manitoba (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor); and Bill No. 62, An Act to Amend The Financial Administration Act (2). (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 12 students, Grade 11 from the West Kildonan Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Klassen. The students are from the constituency of the Minister of Health and Social Development. On behalf of all members we bid you welcome.

On the Department of Municipal Affairs. The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I have but a few brief comments to make arising from the discussion on Friday. I appreciate the constructive suggestions that were made. I would like to clarify, Mr. Speaker, if I could, a release which was in Saturday's Winnipeg Free Press which might give slightly an incorrect interpretation of some remarks which I had made. The Tribune report is actually--(Interjection)--well a little more accurate, although I have great respect for the Free Press reporter that wrote the article, so I hesitate to even make the comments. But in respect to the pilot project, I did not want to leave the impression that municipalities within the areas affected have indicated a desire - there has been an indication of interest on the part of municipal people in the two areas mentioned, but I would not like to leave an impression, which it appears that I may have through the interview, that there had been an expression of support. I think there's a difference between interest and support.

And, too, I would also like to just comment that insofar as the undertaking there is no particular timetable for the undertaking of a pilot project in respect to regional government; it'll depend again upon that degree of support which one is eventually able to obtain.

So that extent I would like to just remove any incorrect impressions that might have been created in the article in question.

Mr. Chairman, dealing with the subject matter of the debate on Friday, and reference to the Municipal Board, I think that the role of the Municipal Board is one which we should want to examine as to its future relevancy to municipal government in Manitoba. There are certainly powerful arguments that can be presented for the continuation of the Municipal Board in its present role and function to ensure that there is some control on the dangers of reckless or irresponsible financial spending, and also as an appeal mechanism as against zoning and planning changes that should be subject to the scrutiny of an appeal body.

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd)

On the other hand I do accept the argument that is presented that elected representatives representing their municipality ought to have the fullest control and say as to the important matters pertaining to their municipality, pertaining to municipal affairs, with a minimum of checks and controls from non elected personage. To that extent I think that we will have to retain an open mind as to the future involvement of the board and as to whether or not there should be changes in respect to the functions and responsibilities of the board.

I would like to just say to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek that insofar as the Municipal Board and the City of Winnipeg Act is concerned, I think that the Municipal Board had to deal with new problems that are occasioned by the reorganization of the City of Winnipeg. I think that could be anticipated and expected, and thus it's not sufficient to suggest that suddenly there's been a new procedure or development on the part of the board. The board is dealing with the procedures by which the City of Winnipeg Act relates.

Insofar as the comments by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in which he asked about \$400,000 which he was unable to relate to, I would indicate to the honourable member that in the main, well in excess of \$300,000, would be explained by the salary adjustments or increments of civil service within the Department of Municipal Affairs within the past year.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface also raised comment in respect to the Tri-Level Conference. I want to say to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that the province had a meaningful role, in fact I would say a catalyst role, in the development of the Tri-Level Conference process of consultation in 1970. The very first Conference of Municipal Affairs Ministers in which there was discussion of a Tri-Level Conference occurred right here in Winnipeg during our Centennial Year. At that conference representatives of the Canadian Association of Mayors and Municipalities were present and they presented to the municipal people that year their suggestions re the holding the Tri-Level Conference. Manitoba supported that development enthusiastically in 1970, followed later by an organizational meeting involving the provinces and the mayors and Reeves of Canadian municipalities later that same year in 1970 here in Winnipeg. I think that Manitoba can take no small degree of credit for participating in the initial development of that type of conference.

I think I should say to the Honourable Member of St. Boniface that there has been varying degrees of enthusiasm and support by different provinces during the past three years, in fact sometimes it has varied from time to time as to the degree of support for the Tri-Level Conference procedure. I foresee certainly a holding of a Tri-Level Conference at the national level again dealing with matters pertaining to municipalities and provinces. I think it's going to be very important at such a conference though that we deal with concrete specific precise items, agenda items, rather than that we deal too far afield over too broad a scope. For example at this last conference we dealt with the general subject matter of management of growth. Each province, each municipality, that spoke at that meeting tended to interpret this very broad subject from their own perspective. I question whether too much was gained from the debate on a topic of too broad a scope at the conference; better to deal with precise specific matters.

In addition there has been a strong feeling on the part of a number of provinces, and Manitoba, interested in this of developing regional tri-level conferences. For example a tri-level conference of prairie provinces of the municipal and provincial levels of government in order to deal with the problems relating to the three levels of government at the prairie level. I foresee that we may very well be moving in that direction. Ontario has done this and some of the Maritime provinces. I believe the Maritime provinces as a group have held such a regional form of conference. There is some feeling that it may be that more benefit can be realized from a regional conference of that nature than from a national conference in the future. But arrangements are under way involving all three levels of government to organize a further conference at the national level.

I would just like to mention though - I know it's a matter that is more closely pertinent to the Estimates of the Department of Urban Affairs, but reference was made to the lack of involvement in respect to the City of Winnipeg development with public and the people. Reference was made by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in which he related this to hoping that we would not proceed with any other municipal re-organization following the basis of the example that we established at the City of Winnipeg level. I would like to just remind the

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) Honourable Member for St. Boniface that some 14 area meetings were held by my colleagues, my urban colleagues, in the Cabinet in various parts of the City of Winnipeg. I attended one of those myself and at least there was the greatest opportunity given for a full and complete discussion on the part of all those in attendance with the urban members of the Cabinet. So there was an involvement with the public, and I don't think that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is really fair in dismissing that as nothing. In addition there were three days of municipal affairs meetings, three days of hearings dealing with the New City of Winnipeg Act.

So I would like to just place that on the record, because leaving the statement as alleged by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface might leave the impression that there was absolutely no involvement at all, in fact there was substantial attempts to involve the City of Winnipeg and its population in matters pertaining to the development of the new City of Winnipeg Act.

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

MR. MARION: I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Minister a question? The question would be: I realize that this occurred that there were opportunities for people to make representations to the urban members of Cabinet with respect to Bill 36, or the White Paper that became Bill 36, but was this meaningful? Because I think that I did qualify it to the extent that there was not meaningful dialogue entertained. There were some submissions that were made imploring that new roads be investigated with respect to Bill 36, and to my knowledge no concrete recommendations were incorporated in what is now Bill 36, the City of Winnipeg Act.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do think that the meetings did contribute to meaningful discussion and changes.

I should also mention to the honourable member that in addition to the meeting which I referred to there were numerous meetings held by the old Local Government Boundaries Commission with municipal people throughout the City of Winnipeg. The fact that the province did not see fit to accept their recommendations does not mean that there wasn't the fullest effort to consult with the municipal people in the City of Winnipeg. However that is again more dealing with the matters pertaining to urban affairs, and I would not want to belabour that point.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose raised the matter of surveys and, Mr. Chairman, we're going to have increasing problems in Manitoba in the survey field. You know back in the 1880s and 1890s surveying, with all due credit to our survey ancestors, was done in a rather non-scientific or non-technical way, often using the wheel as a means of survey. So that we do find in Manitoba presently many problems relating to our survey, our base lines. And the Union of Manitoba Municipalities for instance have spoken to me about this at our last advisory committee meeting, about the number of complaints which they are receiving from individual municipalities in respect to survey difficulties. You know we have different instances in Manitoba where you have someone who has enjoyed occupancy and ownership of premises for a number of years, a new neighbour moves next door and then the new neighbour raises with the occupant, the owner of that land who has enjoyed it for a number of years, his right to a strip of the land that the fellow thought he owned for a number of years simply because the new survey certificate issued did not conform with the earlier surveys. And unfortunately there is, I acknowledge, increasing tendency for this to be occurring in Manitoba and the municipal people are concerned about this. The Mines Department - and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources could probably make reference to this during his own Estimate review - have I understand commenced a pilot project on resurveying of markers in Manitoba to attempt to ascertain what can be done. It's certainly a problem that with increased construction, purchases, transfers of land, out of existing titles, that there could be increasing difficulties and problems occur in Manitoba, and certainly I will see what I can do in respect to the particular matter that has been raised by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

I believe that's all the items I'd like to deal with at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, I just have a few brief comments I'd like to draw to the attention of the Honourable Minister. Most of these concerns that have been related to me are historical in Manitoba but I think we must again remind the Minister and the government of some of the problems of the rural municipalities that are of great concern to them today and to me as their member.

First of all let me remind the Minister again that the tremendous spending budgets of the

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. MacKENZIE cont'd) Federal Government and the provincial governments are so high today that there's no tax base left for our municipalities. Now where is the municipality today going to pick up some money to look after its welfare problems, its road problems, the hospital problem - they're involved in the construction of certain hospitals - the veterinary clinics that are being built around this province, and all the other programs that are the duties and the responsibilities of our municipalities by legislation. As long as the governments at the provincial level and federal level neglect these municipal people and ship them off in the side, and continue to tax the people the way they're being taxed in this province today, and all across Canada, how can the municipalities possibly operate? Like in Duck Mountain School Division, which is in my constituency, where they're facing a 22 to 25 mill increase for education, how can that municipality possibly go back to its people for more money to look after these other programs when they're nailed with a 22 or 25 mill increase for education. Mr. Chairman, something's got to have to stop some place because otherwise take over the municipalities - and they don't want you to take them over, they want their rights and they want their jurisdictions which is theirs by law, and it's theirs by legislation, but when are the Federal Government and the provincial governments going to allow them some leeway to look after their own programs and give them some tax base that they can collect taxes. I listened to the Minister of Finance the other day who was reprimanding the City of Winnipeg for certain things and certain programs that they could - but migosh as a politician or as a municipal councillor today when can the man, the guy, or the government, the local government, go back and ask the people for more money when they're being overtaxed today to such a terrible extent? So I say this afternoon I hope the Minister will give me some answers that the municipalities of this province cannot be held responsible for the duties and the responsibilities that are theirs by the laws that's in those books, if you're not going to give them a tax base where they can collect some dollars to look after those responsibilities.

So I suggest to the Minister, and maybe he will suggest to us in his estimates where they can get some elbow room to shift around and collect some of these dollars to meet some of these bills. Because if we don't, what's the end result? The end result will likely be legislation coming in, such as we've got here from the Town of Dauphin, where the municipality and the town are both fighting over certain rights by legislation, when they're both short of dollars and maybe the answer would be, and I God forbid me that I raise it, but maybe they should be one council, but that's still not going to solve the problem. Certainly you would eliminate one form of government and you'd have one secretary and less council, but that's still not going to solve their problem, the fact that they haven't got a tax base. I just wonder, and I'm sure the Honourable Minister must know the problem of the R. M. of Mossy River and the problems of the R. M. of Ethelbert, and they've got to face that - you know, their school problems, it's a sub-marginal area where the assessments are not such that they can provide a school system, but there they're nailed with a 22 to 23 mill increase in school for one year. They're in trouble. The Minister knows it and I know it, and where are they going to get the money to look after it. Sure they need hospitals in those areas; they'd like to have hospitals; they'd like to have nursing homes; they'd like to have a veterinary clinic like everybody else has got that's in the higher tax areas, but there's no way that they can have those services unless we can find some way to give them some elbow room to shift around.

Well the other one, Mr. Speaker, and this is one that - and I've had some questions raised to me about some of the people in our northern communities, and it maybe comes under the jurisdiction of Northern Affairs, but they're talking about sewer and water up in certain communities up there, and I find now they haven't got a tax base, to the best of my knowledge. So therefore, like a community such as Ilford, therefore they couldn't form a local development area to provide themselves with sewer and water because they don't have a tax base to - I'm sure they would like to hopefully put up some of their own money to provide themselves with some of the services such as sewer and water, and maybe the Honourable Minister can provide me.

The other one, and maybe the Minister can fill me in on some of the details of the local government districts of our province. I know we're moving ahead and hopefully getting them up to a municipal status but the problems of the LGD's are historical in Manitoba. I get them; I happen to have two LGDs in the constituency that I represent, but the LGD of Mountain and the LGD of Park, and while we're making some progress, but there's cases where you go just on

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. MacKENZIE cont'd) the outside of the RM of Shell River and there's the LGD of Park and here's a farmer that's farming a section and a half of land and he's still got no road that he can go in there and get his grain out in the middle of winter. They don't snowplow the roads onto his farm. He needs about ten bridges because there's the Shell River is flowing past his his farm; there's no bridge over the Shell, there are some planks across, but there's a limit on the bridge, so the limit on the bridge is more than the weight of his truck, so there's no way he can haul his product out that he's producing. So I wonder if the Minister in some way could help - it comes partly under the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - but if the Department of Municipal Affairs could some way help the Department of Mines and Natural Resources to upgrade some of these roads. Because as sure as we face this rail abandonment program that's coming up for next year, we're going to have to spend a tremendous amount of money to allow these people who normally are delivering grain now eight to ten, twelve, fifteen miles to market, some of this grain is going to have to be delivered 40 to 50 to 60 miles to market if we're going to look after the primary producers of our province.

The other problem that I have, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the Minister will give me some ideas, when we revised the Municipal Act some two or three years ago, we pulled out the assessment section and left it off by itself. We said we are going to deal with it. That was my understanding that that will be dealt with by legislation, and we're going to have a new assessment program for this province. I wonder if the Minister would comment when we are going to have it, and if he's got some study papers, or has there been some way that they were going to have some understanding of what type of a program that the people of Manitoba are going to face.

The other one is municipal planning, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the Minister is about as unhappy with his municipal planning program as I've had it in my constituency. They've been planning the development of the Shellmouth Dam - they were supposed to be building cottages on both sides of the Shellmouth Reservoir for the last, well since it was built, six or seven years. The first group of planners that came in I think were from the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, and we had those guys and they came in there and they planned and they drew maps at many meetings, then the thing was scrapped.

Then I understand it went into the Department of Municipal Affairs and they worked it over for a long time. They had many meetings; a bunch of new guys came out and surveyed over the same old maps. Now the thing's been transferred over to Tourism and Recreation. Could you believe it? And still nobody can build a cottage in there with all this enormous planning, and there must be maps that high of the designs and studies that have been done, how can you put a cottage on the bank of the Assiniboine River between the upstream from the Shellmouth Dam? I've been at many of those meetings. I know Parkland Development Corporation has been at it, the municipal people have been at it. As my reeve told me the other day, he said, I must have attended at least 75 meetings over the last several years about giving somebody permission to put a cottage on the shores of the Assiniboine River.

And it still isn't, and now it's been dumped out of that and Rene's got it, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. So we're going to get a whole bunch more planners and designers and they're going to look over those. Why didn't you take the original map when the Shellmouth Dam was built because the plan was there, devised, and there it was, one of the best plans that I've ever seen. It told the people where they could put the cottages, where the roads were supposed to go, and where the whole plan - and it was a beautiful plan. But since then, it's been through three departments and it's no farther off.

So maybe the Honourable Minister will give me some answers to those questions when he replies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to begin by saying that one comment that comes to me first is that in the few short months of being in the House I've learned one thing and that is, that sometimes some of the most important and significant policy statements are sometimes couched in the most innocent and inoffensive and declarative type of language, and I suspect that last Friday when the Minister of Municipal Affairs arose to his feet to present to us the estimates of his department, he included in his opening remarks a series of propositions that if they are to be taken at their immediate face value probably carry with it some of the more important implications for the future direction and growth in this province. I refer specifically to his comments concerning the

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) planning and development in the urban fringe around the City of Winnipeg; and secondly, his comments relating to the development of some system of regional government, or proposed regional government. Therefore, I'd like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, just to take up the Minister on his invitation to make some comments on those two propositions that he introduced, not in the way of a major White Paper or the kind of a dramatic flourishing that we have on budget night, but I think probably in the long run far more significant than any event that we may have seen up to this time in this House, simply because of its long-range significance in terms of what's happening in the province.

I think first of the statement he made in relation to the efforts now undertaken by his department to begin providing some order to the evolution of the fringe around the City of Winnipeg, an area which I suppose we can take for a matter, or for sake of argument, I mean, a 15 to 25 mile radius extending outwards from the city region, because within that area probably about 90 percent of the future growth of Manitoba is going to occur; that if you look at the projected population statistics the Winnipeg urban centre region is going to account for about 90 to 95 percent of the population growth in the province, and almost a similar kind of growth in the industrial and commercial province, and that is going to have to go where the land is, and the land is on the fringe. So what we can expect in that area is perhaps the most dynamic and volatile area of change of anywhere in the Province of Manitoba. Of course I think, as the Minister himself recognized, it is an area which is at this point totally incapable or has an inadequacy of control or management, or even a policy or direction to encompass that change that is going to occur. I think already we're beginning to see very serious signs or evidence that the spill outwards beyond the perimeter of Winnipeg is accelerating at a very high pace in that urban fringe, and that it may be in fact already too late in some respects to provide the kind of control of management that's required. I would point for example to certain indicators such as the fact that in municipalities like St. Andrews and Richot land costs over the past year have doubled in certain areas within that region, which demonstrates that the escalation in land cost, which is such a pressure inside the City of Winnipeg, is now reaching beyond the additional zone into these municipalities.

I think you can also if you go through the assessment rolls look at the increasing frequency of land conversion from what was formerly almost total agriculture use into a variety of uses, many of which are of the gentleman-farmer variety or the ex-urban living variety, and some just purely residential varieties servicing the working population of Winnipeg. And increasingly you're finding the number of farm areas being subdivided into residential lots, either for present development or for future development.

I think we can also look at the increasing traffic patterns on highways like 75 and on the north Main corridor up to Selkirk, and certainly on Highway 1 east and west. With that kind of development comes with it many of the more unfortunate consequences of urban sprawl and that is that you're getting scattered development. You're getting a certain degree of junk areas where there is very limited controls placed upon any environmental considerations, so that there is the growth of septic tanks and the lack of sewage and water treatment. Certainly there is almost a total lack of any effective form of land-use planning going on in that area. As a consequence we're beginning to see in front of our eyes, really growing day by day, the phenomena that is pretty consistent throughout North America of the slurbs of the city where development just occurs in a very scattered haphazard and ad hoc arrangement. The unfortunate part about that, aside from the environmental and aesthetic qualities of simply once more ruining some very valuable and useful countryside, is that it becomes a very expensive form of development; that one of the penalties and prices we pay for that kind of uncontrolled development in our urban fringe is that eventually demands are made to bring the services of those areas up to a standard or a quality comparable to those inside of the City of Winnipeg. So to start extending sewer lines and transportation lines and hydro lines, and all the other kinds of quality services, to scattered areas and to bring them up to par, simply results in very extensive costs to a variety of governments and ultimately to the taxpayer. It is estimated for example that in residential areas that are beyond the control area of Winnipeg in terms of the additional zone, to get anywhere a comparative type of service would cost three to four times that it cost in the City of Winnipeg where the residential area is of a denser variety. Of course that's the key, a factor is the degree of density, because obviously what happens in these outer fringe areas is that kind of sprawl occurs and a very heavy expense goes with it. That expense

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) is certainly one that is being reflected I think in some of the comments that was made by the Member from Birtle-Russell and others, where he pointed out that the rural municipalities are going to have to face the continual upgrading of services which will put an increasing burden on their property tax system. This will bring about higher assessments in agricultural properties which will only once again accelerate the process or the attempt to redevelop and improve.

So I think what we're looking at, Mr. Chairman, in this area is a problem of a very high priority for this province, because we have, I think, still time within this area of a 15 to 20-mile radius to begin applying some more effective form of planning than has been applied in other cities who have faced similar problems. I think that comes back very directly to the role of the provincial government, because I notice that one of the proposals that has been of common currency, and I guess it's almost been elevated to the status of conventional wisdom in most areas, and the attempt by most provincial governments in first coming to grips with this problem, is to develop some form of regional government, or some form of regional council, or some form of regional arrangement of reeves and mayors and councillors in the area. I would caution the Minister very strongly about following that kind of procedure for two reasons:

First, I think we should learn from our experience with the unification of the City of Winnipeg. One thing that was very obvious about the developments that have since occurred with the passage of Bill 36 is that in many cases many of the decisions that are necessary to make that new system work are decisions in the private sector, decisions that have to be made by builders and developers and transportation people, and the rest of it. It is not something that can simply be handled on the level of government consultation or organization. Probably one of the most serious gaps in the transition in the City of Winnipeg from the old to the new was the complete lack of adaptability or transition undertaken in the private sector, particularly in those areas of the private sector which work very closely hand in hand with urban government, so that in this case builders who were having to provide, as they still do, most of the construction in the area were not forewarned, they were not part of the consultative process when one had to anticipate the problems that would be encountered with the new zoning, or land processing arrangements of the City of Winnipeg scheme, and therefore they were simply caught napping, as was the City in many cases because of the administrative problems. I would like to point out to the Minister that in fact if you look at the transition that is undertaken in British local government, they sometimes spend upwards to three to five years undertaking very careful consultation in both the public and private sector for those who are involved in having to come to grips with a new form of government.

I would think that, as I gather the Minister said, he has started conversations with members of the rural municipalities who are going to be affected by the urban fringe and by councillors, I would simply say that's not enough; that if you are looking at the consequences of making a transition into a more sophisticated form of governmental arrangement to handle the planning and development area, then you have to do it in close companionship with the private sectors who are going to be very much involved with the development of that area. I would suggest that that is a very major concern and one that should be taken up very quickly.

But going beyond that I would suggest that I am not so sure that regional government's going to work anyway, because if you begin to look at the experience, particularly in British Columbia and Ontario and New Brunswick with regional government, you find out that basically it really isn't working very well and that eventually the province has to step in in any event. I would point out for example a study which I just read awhile back about the rationale for the regional government system in Ontario. The large part of that rationale was this would be a way by which you could protect or provide a more comprehensive planning for development in areas such as the Niagara Escarpment, which is a very valuable agricultural recreational area in the Niagara Peninsula. Similarly true in the Kitchener-Waterloo area, the rationale was for better development, planning comprehensive land-use. Well what has happened since then? Frankly the province has had to take over in any event. The Government of Ontario went through a very painful tortuous set of rearrangements of local government causing a great deal of consternation on the point of view of the local municipalities, going to a very heavy expense, adding a new tier of government, and what was the end result? Well, I think you could probably add up to a lot of sort of sound and fury signifying nothing, because in fact the regional government system of Ontario does very little in fact to really apply tough strong controls in those areas,

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) and what has happened as we now see, is that the Government of Ontario has now had to step in and establish provincial controls in the Niagara Escarpment because the regional system in Niagara was not capable of doing it. They were simply not able to manage that kind of growth and that kind of development. So in fact what you're beginning to find is that the regional government system may now work.

Now the same thing is true, it is happening in British Columbia, where I think about four years ago, and I could be mistaken in my figures, the Government of British Columbia established the Greater Vancouver Regional District Planning Authority, which again was responsible for trying to establish a form of land-use pattern to control the development and evolution of land patterns in the lower Fraser Valley. What has happened this year? The government of British Columbia has had to bring in a very tough B.C. land commission on a provincial level to do in many cases the thing that the Regional District was set up four or five years ago to do. So in effect what you've got was another tier of government, which I think we need like a hole in the head, without having the real powers to do the job that's required.

So I would like to raise that caution with the Minister, that if he's talking about that kind of regional government, which is simply adding on another tier without either radically or almost eliminating the role for municipalities, which I'm sure that no government in Manitoba would dare do politically without bringing the wrath of sort of the gods upon our heads, then to insert an intermediate tier but not being able to give it the powers to act, would simply mean that five or six years from now, or whenever it's required, the province is going to have to step in in any event.

That's the proposition I might like to raise with the Minister when he looks at this question of first how to manage the problems on the urban fringe of Winnipeg. I can't have anything but full endorsement of his proposals to sit down and consult with the local governments involved, to begin discussing the problem, but I think that that again is simply too little and perhaps even too late, because what is required now is some very serious provincial initiatives at the present moment to provide at least the basic framework for a planning program that will provide controls in this area before the development that occurs simply gets out of hand.

I refer to him for example the proposals that were put forward, and what I think is probably one of the best studies on land-use that's been done in the last while, is the Rockefeller Task Force of land-use that was undertaken in the United States. Let me point that - and they're speaking in this case of course of State governments - that to get away from all the fooling around, the State, or region in this case, the Provincial Government should undertake five basic land control responsibilities for itself right now. First, in those areas where there is critical environmental concern, because the experience has been in almost every municipality that in areas where you have flood plains or low lying areas, areas where the ecological balance may be offset, that the local municipalities just do not act. I think it's fair to say that that is true in this province, and I think the Minister knows of an area in his own municipality where that is happening right now, where in fact a flood plain is being sort of subdivided for development purposes where there's no business, and probably three or four years from now we're going to be asked to put dikes up there so the flooding won't occur.

Secondly, the Provincial Government should establish land responsibility for land planning and control over areas where major facilities or transportation corridors must reside, places like airports, major highway patterns, major industrial parks. Again that's the only kind of control that's required because that does not simply determine its benefits by a regional benefit but by a provincial benefit.

Thirdly, where there is proposed large scale developments, and let me stop here for a moment. We have heard the Premier talk from time to time, Mr. Chairman, about the possibility of new town development on the urban fringe. Well, I think it's about time you stop talking about it and either put his cards on the table and say that this is one pattern of development that we're going to have or we're not going to have it, because it's not good enough simply to throw that up as a balloon; I think if we're going to have a form of satellite new town development in Winnipeg, and personally I believe that that is a feasible alternative attached to one of the existing growth centres within that 15 or 20-mile radius, then you have to begin doing some planning now. You have to begin assembling some land right now; you have to begin developing some planning controls so that when it comes time to develop that satellite centre you don't find that all of a sudden the land costs have escalated, the speculator has moved in, that the choice

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . . . pieces of recreational or land where the topography could be of a peculiar valuable nature is already bought up and being used and you're being held up for robbery. So the question is, if you're going to do it, do it now. Let's stop talking about it, and let's stop having the seminars, and let's start saying, let's lay down for discussion in this House a new town's policy, and let's see how it works, and let's see if it is a feasible alternative for the Winnipeg urban region. Because if you're not going to do that you're simply going to lose in many cases a lot of the controls that are now absolutely essential if you're going to make a new town policy work. And again we can't really tolerate a two, three or four-year consultative period, because by that time the overspill will have overcome you and you'll be too late. So it's got to be done very soon.

The fourth area really is to take responsibility where land use is of a regional benefit, and those areas I would think are primarily recreational areas. I recall that I raised some questions earlier in the House with the Minister of Recreation and Tourism about the Lockport area. Well, let's just speculate that if the population of Winnipeg grows as we expect it to by about one hundred and some odd-thousand in the next ten years, that the requirement for recreation space within close travel distance of the close to 700,000 people in the City of Winnipeg is going to have to be tripled by what it is now. That Lockport area in the St. Andrews municipality has for years, since I've been a child at least, been a major area of recreational use for all kinds of families, especially families that can't afford the cottages, and so on, in the Whiteshell and the lakes, and yet we're doing absolutely nothing, absolutely nothing at this point to really make sure that that area is fully preserved for that kind of recreational use. We have the Lower Fort Garry area, we have the federal land around the docks, but no facilities, no services and no control, and I would think that again if we are trying to anticipate the future demands of the growing population then the province is going to have to step in and provide again some development planning direction in that area.

Finally in terms of the kind of plan that's going on, I would like to see the province declare right now that the additional zone around Winnipeg be extended another 10 miles or 15 miles. Now I'm not so sure I really want the City of Winnipeg operating it, but I would like to see it extended so that we could begin at least developing the mechanisms by which that area of major growth will be within the application of serious control; because again if we simply allow the additional zoning, from a planning point of view it's too shallow a zone right now, and if the purpose of the additional zone was to try to retain some green space or corridor around Winnipeg, it will simply not work under its present prescription, because what will happen, as land costs increase, as housing costs and demand go on, the development will simply jump over that present additional zone. They will land up in rural municipalities where there is virtually no land control or planning or regulation and you will have that scattered development. So you're going to have to provide a zone of planning certainly beyond the fringe of where the present additional zone is. So that is I think another step the Provincial Government should be taking right away.

A final area where I'd like to see the Provincial Government move is in this area of tax assessment, which I think the Member from Birtle-Russell touched upon and other members have touched upon. Unquestionably it is a difficult conundrum to get into because there is no easy answer to that problem of how do you maintain land in its agricultural use while at the same time the assessments are going up, both by pressure of costs and also by pressure of the potential land-use of that area. I would think that this is something that has to be wrestled with in a very direct kind of way because the experience with use-value assessment has been carried out in the United States, and again I would refer the Minister to the Rockefeller Task Force Report and to a paper done by the Ministry of Urban Affairs on land-use urban-fringe on the assessment policy, is that by and large the idea of deferring tax payments doesn't really work; it becomes a highly abused kind of system. Therefore I would sort of caution again the Minister about getting into that kind of practice, that it doesn't really control land into the agricultural pattern at the same time it simply provides for a subterfuge for the speculator to operate in.

I would like to propose to him one proposal that is being circulated in some places in the United States and in Eastern Canada, and that is to establish a system where the property tax of a farmer using his land for agricultural use is considered to be no more than five percent of his farm income; then when the land is sold there's a capital gains applied to it, but that

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) capital gains is scaled downwards over a ten-year period so it may be a fairly tough capital gains system, as the Ontario Government has now introduced, perhaps 40 or 50 percent, but as the land is held over that period it scales downward. And again the value of that is again it preserves the agricultural use and at the same time it does take some of the burden off of the farmer. So I would think that that is a particular proposal that might be looked at and certainly there are others that have to be examined.

But again the question is of some urgency and of some priority that within this urban fringe, as I've said, with the dynamic that is now going into it we simply require a very extensive use of a number and variety of instruments. We need to establish a better system of taxation, a better system of land assessment, a better system of zoning and land planning control, and ultimately we have to decide who is going to be responsible for doing it. What kind of jurisdiction are we going to set up to manage that? And I would suggest that under the present conditions perhaps the only, and perhaps the rightfully responsible body should be the Provincial Government because, you know, we can go right back to the BNA Act if you want, and I think, and this may be a somewhat cruel observation, I think one reason why provincial governments in other provinces have got themselves sort of all involved in this sort of Byzantine game of regional districts and governments, is that it's a dodge. They simply didn't want to face up to the tough problems that had to be faced up to so they figured they could pass it onto some other level of government. But what they have simply found out is that they can't pass it on, it's going to come back to rest on their heads eventually anyway, so better sooner than later we should take that sort of nettle in our fists and begin to sort of tackling the very tough problem of making sure that that land area within the 28 mile radius of the City of Winnipeg, which will be the area of major growth in this province for the next 10 or 15 years, grows according to a proper set of plans and a proper set of instruments exercised in a responsible way in an open form where there can be a direct application.

I'd like to also comment that one of the things I don't like about regional government as it has operated in other areas, is that it becomes irresponsible government, or unaccountable government. That the election is direct; it sits up there; they meet kind of, you know, three or four steps removed from the electorate. I think that one of the things we can do if it is a provincial responsibility, you're here and we're here, and we can maybe keep you honest, or whoever's going to be managing the thing, more effectively than you can through a two or three or four tier system of government.

So for those kinds of propositions, and I apologize somewhat to the Minister that he caught us a little bit unawares on Friday with his propositions about where things might go. So I would only say that this would perhaps be a first glancing touch at this very important subject. I'm pleased that he opened it up for discussion. I would hope that we will have opportunities further on for further discussion, but most importantly I would like to see the Provincial Government in the very short order ascribe a series of steps that they believe should be taken; certainly ask the municipalities in the additional zone in the rural area to respond; certainly hold consultations, but never forget that the responsibility for making those decisions should reside in this Chamber and in this government, and that's I think the direction we should go in, at least at this stage until a better argument comes along.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the last two speeches, and first I would like to comment in respect to the references by the Honourable Member from Roblin and his criticism of the fact that the province was not in his view pumping moneys to the municipalities in order to permit them to carry on their plans and their programs as such. I would like to remind the Honourable Member for Roblin that in fact it has been this government that since 1969 has embarked on many major programs of contributing towards those services that are provided by municipalities for people. I think it is not an exaggeration to say, Mr. Chairman, that in fact Manitoba is leading the way among the provinces in Canada insofar as its contribution is concerned towards insuring that those at the municipal level receive maximum assistance for services to people. I would like to list some of the programs that this government has commenced so that the honourable member will know that what I am saying is not simply idle words.

One is of course the increase in the unconditional grant from \$8.00 to \$10.00 per head, and for the first time, first province in Canada to provide assistance to municipalities based

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) not on a per head formula but to insure that those in the municipalities receive the benefit from growth within the total provincial economy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Would the Minister say that the increase in the unconditional grants is equal to the lack of maintenance on provincial roads?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member knows that we've been dealing with the Estimates of Highways.

MR. WATT: We're talking about money, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I don't believe that that question is in order at this particular time. You had the opportunity to ask the Minister of Highways, and you did ask that question, and the question was answered. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was relating to the criticism which had been launched that we were not putting hands into the - money into the hands of the municipalities. And - that slip of tongue . . .

A MEMBER: More truth than fiction.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . and thus I comment to the Honourable Member for Roblin that we have as a province, and I am proud to be associated with a province that's embarked upon a program of providing to municipalities a share of economic growth of the provincial economy, and thus we have established, established last year for the first time a program of pumping into the hands of municipalities five percent of the total increase in economic growth from income and corporation taxes. And I think it's a novel move; it's one that possibly should be broadened and extended to take in other forms of tax in order to reflect other growth taxes, but certainly it was a move forward on the part of Manitoba to assist municipalities.

Secondly, I think that the province should be commended for the fact that it has embarked upon an extensive property tax credit program which, Mr. Chairman, has provided the people living within municipalities an additional \$50 million. \$50 million by way of property tax credits, and municipalities receive the total amount of this property tax credit early in the year, so these funds are made available to the municipality for its use. And certainly this again has been a major program with a minimum property tax credit being raised from \$100.00 to \$150.00 this year, and of course the maximum being raised and will be realized through the income tax returns that are filed next year. So that in fact this year the minimum has been increased from \$100.00 to \$150.00, so that this year there has been the provision of additional moneys to municipalities and to those residing within municipalities for municipal purposes.

One need only mention other important programs, the Manitoba Emergency and Loan Fund, which has made it possible that loans, in fact 100 percent forgiveness for the work done during the winter period, and 50 percent forgiveness for that done during the summer periods, for municipal projects whether it be the municipally owned curling rink or the municipal hall, or the sidewalks, or the streets, receive this additional assistance through the province to the extent of \$15.00 per head. A new program launched last year. Scores of municipalities have already taken advantage of that program.

The Minister of Tourism and Recreation could mention the grants to a maximum of \$20,000 that are provided for cultural and athletic capital projects within Manitoba, and the list was just made available a short time ago in which many areas received a great deal of assistance through that program within Manitoba. Certainly this again was providing assistance to areas.

The Honourable Member for Arthur is looking at me on this area, and I've mentioned to him for his information that that part of Manitoba which he represents, the WestMan area. I noted that the total amount provided for WestMan was in the area of \$300,000. \$300,000 of the total \$1 million towards athletic capital projects.

Sewer and water was mentioned by the Member for Roblin. Here again Manitoba had a dismal record in respect to the provision of sewer and water. And I don't know why when the Leader of the Opposition was a member of the Executive Council for a number of years prior to '69, and when his colleagues were also members of the Executive Council, they permitted Manitoba to stand alone, to stand alone, as a province that did not provide assistance to municipalities to install sewer and water. The record of Manitoba had been a dismal one, and I can recall representations that were made by municipalities who found it too severe upon their fiscal ability to install sewer and water, but nothing in fact had been done about such a program.

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) We have embarked on a program of sewer and water assistance. In fact we match dollar for dollar the assistance that is provided by a municipality to a sewer and water installation in excess of 20 mills of the utilities debt of that municipality. And numerous towns have already received approval for such a sewer and water program.

One could continue on and on with the examples of where this government I think, Mr. Chairman, in a way in which it has led its sister provinces throughout Canada, has attempted to provide assistance to the ratepayer at the local level by way of municipal programs.

I listened intently to the comments by the Member for Fort Rouge and I would say that his contribution has been a most important one during this session. Because he is right that one of the developing problems that we will have to deal with is certainly the area of planning and control, direction of that area which is going to be pressured by, and his words were 90 percent of the growth in the next few years in the City of Winnipeg. And I accept the fact that we will have to make some very hard decisions as to where we proceed. I would not want to confuse where we proceed in respect to this particular problem with that of regional government, because I think they are two separate matters. And I concur that regional government should not be used as a vehicle necessary to bring about a different planning approach. I think that they are two separate matters and that we ought not on our part to confuse those two important functions.

We have accepted in Manitoba historically and at the present time the importance of the municipality being involved in the development of its own planning. This is also true in our recognition of the role that municipalities have to play in the area surrounding the City of Winnipeg, although within the additional zone the City of Winnipeg has the maximum control so far as planning and development is concerned within the additional zone belt. I think, Mr. Chairman, that that must remain the objective to which we would want to see realized, that the municipalities do exercise this responsible control.

I have enough confidence, Mr. Chairman, that municipalities have the same in their leadership, have the same objectives as those at the provincial level are concerned in the main. I hope I am not wrong but I have been impressed by the progressive attitude that has been expressed to date by the reeves and the councillors and the municipalities surrounding Winnipeg, and their acceptance of the fact that there is a need to work out some technique, some approach to this problem of land use and urban rural pressures in the area surrounding Winnipeg. I think it's safe to say that the municipal people and the municipalities surrounding Winnipeg are more mindful today, 1974, of the problem than they were two years ago or three years ago. I think at the same time, Mr. Chairman, that the province is going to have to ensure that it provides leadership in this direction and the municipal planning branch, and particularly in the person of Mr. Whiting, the Director of Planning, has been in close consultation with the municipal people within this area over the past few months in attempting to work out a program. A number of problems have to be faced.

I think in view of our continuing decrease in the availability to Manitobans of fertile farm land that we would want to ensure that fertile farm land remains in the hands of farmers for agricultural purposes. That fertile farm land should not slip out of that type of use into subdivisions and concrete jungles. I think on the other hand that within the area surrounding the City of Winnipeg that there are areas of less fertile land, poor agricultural land with high gravel substance for instance, or poor soil insofar as productivity is concerned. With a proper development technique it is these areas that should be brought into residential development rather than agricultural use lands. And certainly in that total process however one has to be constantly mindful of infrastructure, transportation corridors, other school public facilities that are to be developed. And I would hope frankly, Mr. Chairman, that we can move together towards the development of a plan by which the province and the municipalities and the city can work within in order to ensure this orderly development within the municipalities surrounding Winnipeg.

I think that there must still be the option for those who prefer to not live within the City of Winnipeg, and prefer not to live within a town, but to have a small acreage, that we ought to be able to find some means of providing that type of option and certain the complete freeze on any further residential development within any of the municipalities about the City of Winnipeg would eliminate that type of option, and I think we want to attempt to provide that type of option for individuals.

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd)

I'm a little reluctant at the idea that at this point developers can be brought into this type of discussion. I think that it's the elected representatives at the provincial and the municipal levels that must first determine where they wish to go, what type of community they wish; do they wish it to be an urban community and then cultural community, and if it is to be an urban community, will it interfere with the province insofar as the pressures upon the province to provide social and economic contributions that may in fact be contrary to provincial interests. The developer's interest is often a different one so I think the elected people will first have to make up their minds as to where they are going in this important area. Then I think the developer should be brought into the picture for discussion at that point insofar as that part of the total area that they will play and can play a useful part in; but I think first the elected people will have to assume the responsibility of providing leadership in this direction, removed as much as possible from other interests that might be more persuaded by economic purposes and reasons rather than the social thinking of ratepayers and residents within the area that is affected.

I would say to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that the Planning Boards in British Columbia possibly have been ineffective under the vehicle, under the operation that they have operated in British Columbia because the Provincial Government emasculated those planning boards by their behaviour and by their approach to those planning boards in British Columbia. I think that there is no need for us, nor should we want to follow that type of precedent in Manitoba. I think we can provide a different type of leadership in this respect, and I think there is still time to do so and to retain as much control as possible through the local planning boards.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge emphasized quite correctly though the areas within the radius about the City of Winnipeg where the provincial interest has to be paramount. He mentioned the Lockport area, the Red River area, and certainly this is a part of Manitoba with historic significance that is, I think - I hope I'm not biased because it happens to be my own constituency - but it's certainly an area which has historic significance away beyond possibly any other part of Manitoba. Honourable members may not be aware but the house that was lived in by the First Speaker of the Manitoba Legislature, by the First Leader of the Opposition in the Manitoba Legislature, is located along that Red River. There are still within the area of the Red River many Indian burial mounds, and one can go on and on with the important historical significance of that area. Yet the Member for Fort Rouge is correct when he states that there has been a great deal of urban development within that Lockport Red River area; urban development that if it continues at the same rate that it has been proceeding with, may in fact destroy the very character and historic significance of the Lockport Red River area. I share with him the concern that that area is protected before it is too late because if we do not, certainly our children and our children's children will not forgive us for betraying this very important historic area in Manitoba.

Certainly when the honourable member refers to the transportation corridors, this is another area of grave concern. The number of ingresses and egresses off some of our major transportation corridors in the City of Winnipeg have been one of the major contributing factors to rising accident rates in the area surrounding the City of Winnipeg; the resultant injuries and deaths occurring because often of this type of unplanned type of arrangement.

Flood plain, the R. M. of Richot is really the example of flood plain area in which subdivisions, I gather, were either in the process of approval, or have been approved, but yet this latest flood we saw waters which covered large parts of that area which is to be in the process of completion as to subdivision.

I mention all these points to indicate that I share with the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge the importance of us being not fearful of proceeding in as strong a direction as possible to protect those areas from some of the social factors which, if they remain unchecked or uncontrolled, may bring us a great deal of cost and embarrassment in the future.

The question thus remains, can we come together with the people living within that area within the leaders within that area, to develop a plan that we can all work within? That I think is the best type of arrangement if the three partners, the city, the province and the municipal people within the area can come together with a joint realization and understanding. This is what I place my trust and hope in and I've been inspired by the response of the municipal people to this possibility within the area surrounding Winnipeg.

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd)

I suppose that the only other alternative would be for either city control or provincial control; certainly the idea of individual municipal control would be out of question, but I do think that plans can be best developed and effected if people themselves feel that they are participating in the development of those plans and have a hand in the final implementation and policy decisions relating to those plans. I trust that we will be able to develop an approach in the area that you made reference to with joint participation by all interested parties. I trust that I will not be proved wrong in the future in my trust that we can arrive at that approach.

Those are all the comments I would like to make at this point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to direct a, really a short question to the Minister related to his final statements related to the direction he sees this development occurring in terms of acquiring a better system of planning and management of this area. I gather you say that you place, as I think you have to, on the confidence of the ability of the individual municipalities to come together to form some way of dealing with the problem. Well let me raise this question, and I think you would concede that none of the municipalities, including the City of Winnipeg, have the geographical range to provide for a form of regional comprehensive planning, nor do they have the range of powers that are required in terms of the full range of things in terms of transportation and everything else, therefore the conclusion would be that you need some new kind of jurisdiction, and that jurisdiction either has to be some form of regional district, or some form of land development corporation, with the different members participating in it as equal partners in it, or I suppose the most meagre would be a kind of informal planning council, such as they have in the Minneapolis St. Paul area, where there is a kind of metropolitan regional council where members are on it, which has limited powers, but it is a discussion forum if nothing else. I was wondering how the Minister sees this occurring. Does he have, or has the provincial government anticipated as yet the kind of jurisdiction that would be required? Or can I raise the other, the final question, does he see the Provincial Government taking responsibility for specific areas, such as the ones we have agreed upon, where there is need for direct planning such as in recreational areas and in flood plain areas, transportation corridors, and then leaving the spaces in-between to be managed by the municipalities, so that the agricultural land and residential land in between those major sort of development corridors or development areas, would be still under the purview of the local municipality government as it now stands?

So what I'm saying, there is a series of options that are available by which this jurisdiction can be set up to manage this thing, and I'm wondering if at this stage, you know what kind you're aiming towards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the question is a very, very valid one and I foresee that from the meetings which are presently taking place, that we'll be able to develop together a vehicle or an approach by which we work towards the objectives. Now I am concerned that if the vehicle is to be effective, it has to be more than simply a discussion vehicle, I think it is going to have to have certain powers and responsibilities which would be laid down by way of legislation. I might mention here that I think that our planning act is in need of updating, and I would see that as one of the priorities that we should be working towards for the next year's sitting of the Legislature, an updating of our present planning Act. But certainly legislation would be required. Now as to the exact nature of that legislation, I have my own developing views as to what that legislation should be. I do not want to predetermine for the municipal people within the area; my own views may alter as a result of the interchange that will take place in discussing this matter with the municipal people over the course of the next few months, but it's certainly going to have to be an effective vehicle. It will have to have legislative responsibility, and I would trust would have the maximum municipal representation from the area affected on such a vehicle.

Insofar as the areas of direct concern to the province, the transportation corridors, the recreational planning areas, and what not, I do not foresee problems here because I think that the province once it has set its sights as to a particular program of action, such as the Lockport Red River site, I think it would receive municipal endorsement, and I would think that within that vehicle we would be able to deal with those problems without the province exercising the

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) heavy hand insofar as that shall be done along the Red River despite what the municipality says. I don't expect that we would run into the danger of that direct confrontation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've listened with interest to the dialogue that has been going on between the Minister and the Member for Fort Rouge. While I concur mainly with what they have both been saying, I want to at this time just issue a little word of caution and a little word of warning to the Minister when he starts talking about planning. Because, Mr. Chairman, if planners are turned loose without any restriction on their operation, I see more problems created than problems solved, because planners are a group of people that have a tremendous enthusiasm but the problem that so often occurs is the enthusiasm is allowed to run away with itself and the practicality becomes secondary to the enthusiasm of the planner.

While I'm speaking about planning, Mr. Chairman, I also want to ask the Minister if there are any plans by government to sort of control the various planning authorities that are presently in existence, that are so often working at variance with one another. I know the member from Roblin raised the question, and I don't believe the Minister answered it, where we have seen not one or not even two, but three different planning jurisdictions all dealing with the same project, and the result is that when one planning jurisdiction gets finished with the project another one takes over and they scrap everything that has occurred beforehand, and you get one delay after another, and four and five years can go past and there is still no final decisions being made, and here I'm referring in particular to the development of the Shellmouth Dam Reservoir and the Park that is part and parcel of that project.

But I just ask the Minister again to address himself to the problems that exist there, and I would like to know which planning authority does have the final say. I think there has to be one that is the all important, over-all body. Now it doesn't bother me whether it be the Department of Tourism and Recreation or the Municipal Planning Authority. It doesn't bother me that much but one of them has to be the master and the others must come before it and submit their proposals. This diffusion of planning I think is causing far more problems than it ever answers. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to get back again to the comments I made earlier regarding the free hand that planners can be given and the results that can occur, and I want to refer in particular to the Leaf Rapids development where we saw the province setting up a model for future generations to look at and use as an example. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that the model that has been set up has been a veritable Cadillac, and whether or not the people of that area can effectively support the community that has been planned and designed for their own use, only time will tell in the future. I suspect that before very long that same community is going to be calling on the Provincial Government for a form of subsidy, because the planners have designed a relative Goliath that the people of that area will not be able to support. So I would like the Minister, when he is commenting again, to consider putting restrictions--and I would like to know what type of restrictions and restraints are placed on planning authorities so that they can be held responsible so that whatever plans they do devise will be practical and be acceptable to those that must use them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. In accordance with the revised sittings, agreed upon by committee, I am leaving the Chair to return upon the call of the House. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, has directed me to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can indicate at the present time what the level of Lake Winnipeg is and how that would compare to previous years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that it's somewhere in the neighbourhood of 716; I believe it would be higher than last year. In order to give a comparison of previous years on a long term basis I'd have to take the question as notice.

I could advise the honourable member that the Lake Winnipeg Management Board was told to look into the present levels and the contingencies that would result, or the hydro activities which should be dealt with, relative to what appears to be high waters on Lake Winnipeg this year.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister's in a position to indicate what likely will occur in the early part of the fall with respect to the levels in terms of the shore line and what damage is likely to occur.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will look into it, but I would indicate that the levels this year, although high, are not different than they have been in several years - in the last ten years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can inform the House what precautions were taken to protect property in the Whiteshell in the recent high level of waters on the lake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that there were any special precautions in that area, but the area is under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Tourism with regard to the parks themselves. I certainly can look into the honourable member's question.

MR. PATRICK: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it not a fact that no attempt was made . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is going to be argumentative.

MR. PATRICK: Well, let me rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker. Was any attempt made to reduce the level of the water on Falcon Lake during this spring?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any specific matters having been done of any specific matters having not been done, and I will look into the honourable members's question. I believe that it is something which would ordinarily be under the Department of Tourism and Recreation, given the fact it is a provincial park.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary Mr. Speaker. Were the control dams open on Falcon Lake to keep the levels of water lower than the high level now, and will several hundreds of thousands of dollars' damage done to private property, will that be included in the flood compensation?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there has never been a flood compensation program that I'm aware of relative to cottages in the Whiteshell, of which I have one. I am not aware that there was anything left undone or anything specifically done relative to cottage owners in the Whiteshell.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Management. I wonder if the Minister can confirm that chemicals approved for the mosquito abatement program for the City of Winnipeg will be available for use this year, and can the Minister also confirm that

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MINAKER cont'd). . . . the City of Winnipeg is experiencing difficulty in getting delivery of these chemicals which have been approved for the abatement program ?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that some official of the City of Winnipeg indicated that due to a late order they are having some difficulty, a late decision-making by the Provincial Government, that they are having difficulties obtaining such chemicals. Mr. Speaker, I know that there are many people down at the City of Winnipeg who hope that they will be able to blame every mosquito bite on the Provincial Government. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the chemical that they are talking about - that is the larvicide chemicals - there was never any doubt with regard to that type of larviciding program, nor was I at any time advised that they questioned whether they were going to buy this larviciding material. If they are having difficulty obtaining that material, Mr. Speaker, it is one of the many things that they would like to lay at the foot of the Provincial Government because apparently they are unprepared to accept political responsibility for their own actions.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the same minister. In view of the fact that the mosquito abatement program was in limbo during the latter few months, and in view of the lateness of the decision of the Minister on what would be acceptable by his department, could the Minister advise what assistance the province will provide the City of Winnipeg in view of the delivery problems they are presently having?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, since we are in no way responsible for those problems, not one cent.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, clarification of my question to the Minister. It was not necessarily monetary assistance we were inquiring about, but also possibly expediting or assisting the City in obtaining these chemicals.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, all the good will in the world, any assistance which our department can offer, will be at their disposal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister provide this House with further information in regard to the statement he made over the weekend that the White Paper Working Group would be integrated into the Manitoba Health Services Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Seven Oaks): Well, Mr. Speaker, this was in comments I made at the annual conference of the Manitoba Medical Association, and it is planned that the Health Paper, the White Paper Working Group, will be incorporated into the total departmental function which includes the Health Services Commission.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same Minister. Is the Minister going to investigate recent allegations by a member of the health profession that doctors are reluctant to make house calls because of low remuneration that they receive?

MR. MILLER: No, the Minister is not going to investigate it. I'll let the consciences of the doctors investigate themselves.

MR. BROWN: Another question to the same Minister. Why are patients still being removed from the Health Sciences Centre if indeed there has been a settlement of the labour dispute?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, that's an assumption that the honourable member's making which I cannot corroborate. Now that the threat of a strike has been ended, I suspect that any plans made to thin out the number of patients in the hospitals, now they're reversed and they're probably back in full swing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question's for the Attorney-General. Can he report any progress on the study that's being conducted by the Manitoba Law Reform Commission on the feasibility of introducing a Home Owner's Warranty into the Manitoba law for home purchasing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the proposal by the Law Reform Commission was issued for public response. They have received considerable response. There have been meetings held at the federal level as well, with the honourable Mr. Basford, the Minister responsible

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . . . for Housing at the federal level, dealing with a possibility of the development of a federal warranty program. It's my understanding that representatives from the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Chairman of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission, Mr. Muldoon, attended such a meeting recently. That was my understanding, that they were going to attend such a meeting, make representations and bring back a report. I have not received a report whether or not the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has received that report; so, to sum up, they are still proceeding with the program at the provincial level but in consultation with possible developments at the federal level.

MR. ASPER: To the same minister, Mr. Speaker. Taking into account the possible short life of the federal parliament and the inability of it to act for the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the question is, will the government of Manitoba move unilaterally at this session of the Legislature to introduce a homeowner protection plan for Manitoba - for this season?

MR. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker. There are so many ramifications which are involved, and certainly if there is intention to proceed on a federal basis we would prefer to move with the other provinces with the federal people, as long as the proposals that are made at the federal level are effective, so the answer to this session would be "no". And what would happen in '75 would depend upon the recommendations and reports that we would be receiving from our own Law Reform Commission and from the federal level as to the advance that they might be taking in this regard for next year.

MR. ASPER: Thank you Mr. Speaker. A final supplementary. Does the government have, or does the Minister have any studies indicating the cost to the consumer of a homeowner warranty, a guaranteed -- I guess workmanship and quality of construction and so on guarantee? Do you have studies indicating what the cost of that would be, and also any studies indicating how that cost could be alleviated? Has the Law Reform Commission done any of the economic studies?

MR. PAWLEY: There have been no economic studies, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge. I believe that there have been studies done at the federal level and by the housing urban committee, which has been dealing on a steady basis with the federal Minister responsible for Housing. I couldn't detail for the honourable member what the indications are from those economic studies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and he may take this question as notice. I wonder if he could give us any further report on the negotiations in regard to the Garrison Dam, to the diversion of the water from the Garrison Dam into, again I say the bilingual river, the Mouse and the Souris. If I may, Sir, according to United States TV, they are going ahead full swing. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. WATT: Well, the question: Is it correct that they are going ahead without any further negotiations on the diversion of the Garrison Dam into the Souris?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are no negotiations between the government relative to proceeding with the Garrison Diversion. The present status of the matter is that the Canadian officials, which includes input by the Manitoba government, are taking such steps as are necessary to get the United States government to comply with its own undertaking that there will be no violation of the Boundary Waters Treaty. Any procedures that are taking place now, to my knowledge are not part of that phase of the Garrison Diversion program which would put waters into the Souris River. That phase of the program is not scheduled, by the Americans' own account, until late 1970 or early 1980.

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. What steps are being considered by the Minister to bring about this closer rapport he spoke about to the Manitoba Medical Association between that association and the government or the Department of Health?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing new about it. The Manitoba Health

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MILLER cont'd). . . . Services Commission and the MMA have a consultative committee which has now met a number of times. The Manitoba Medical Association can and has been in touch with me when they so desired. On the other hand, when I wanted to meet with them I called their executive and had meetings with them.

MR. MARION: A further question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise if participation of MMA in any new programs or the realignment of existing programs is obtained when these plans are being formulated?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it depends entirely on the subject matter. You know, consultation is one thing. That doesn't mean that the government has to go to every professional group before it does anything. Consultation does not mean concurrence. One can exchange views and in the final analysis it's the government's responsibility to do what it has to do. The consultation at the present time is to explore with the Medical Association and, for instance, the Manitoba Health Services Commission, problems which both are concerned about and which both have to address themselves to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Can he tell us whether he plans to introduce legislation at this session to reform the Manitoba law on property rights of women in marriage, as advocated by the Manitoba Law Reform Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the entire area of family law, including the Act that the honourable member has referred to, was referred to the Manitoba Law Reform Commission some time in the latter part of 1972. The Law Reform Commission is presently working on the entire ambit of family law and has also, in the process, been receiving assistance and reports completed by the Ontario Law Reform Commission, and I believe also at the federal Law Reform Commission. They expect to have the completion of their recommendations in respect to family law by October of this year, which should give us ample opportunity for discussion and response to the recommendations at that time. The answer is "no" to this session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Did the Minister receive a proposed program approved by the dairy farmers of Manitoba, the Manitoba Fluid Milk Producers Association, and the Manitoba Industrial Milk Producers Association, for the establishment of a Milk Marketing Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wish the honourable member would clarify. He seems to imply that there was a recent proposal. Is he talking about something recently or something in the past?

MR. BANMAN: March 15th of this year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, we have had very numerous discussions and indeed letters, respecting policy on this whole question, and we have had, we have had policy proposals and we've also had agreement on policy, which is now in effect.

MR. BANMAN: Did the department consult with the Manitoba Fluid Milk Producers before implementing the new policies?

MR. USKIW: Again I should like to restate, Mr. Speaker, that all of the changes that have been brought about very recently were pursuant to discussions and agreement on the future policy, dairy policy in this province, as between the Government of Manitoba, the Fluid Milk Producers Association and the Industrial Milk Producers Association.

MR. BANMAN: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Now that milk quotas have basically no value and have become worthless . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BANMAN: My question, Mr. Speaker, is, will the Minister be advising farmers not to pay for quotas they have purchased and financed through the Farm Credit Corporation and through MACC?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for La Verendrye seems to tie in the question of quota values to the new dairy policy which was brought into effect on the 1st of May this year.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd) There's no relevance, no connection whatever. The quota values that existed before May 1st can exist after May 1st if people feel they should pay for quotas . . .

A MEMBER: Oh, come on.

MR. USKIW: . . . but in the last few years, Mr. Speaker, the Milk Control Board has been issuing free quotas. That policy was changed two years ago, not on May 1st of this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

A MEMBER: He just told him that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I wonder if he can advise the House what is being done now to keep the level of water down on Falcon Lake, from melting ice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, obviously I've been receiving conflicting advice from officials of my department pertaining to the problem, the apparent problem in the Whiteshell. I've again been in touch with my officials and indicated to them, like in the past, the resources available to the Department of Mines and Natural Resources out there. Other measures can be made available and whatever effort needs to be taken should be considered. The honourable member, before the question period, indicated to me that he was out in the area over the weekend and the problem is more real than apparent.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Minister responsible for Autopac takes this question very lightly and thinks it's a joke.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATRICK: He's not aware there's been thousands of dollars of damage.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Again I remind the honourable members this is a question period. If the honourable member has a particular issue he wants to raise at some other time, he's entitled to it, but not during the question period.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. In view of a statement by the Parks Board last fall that the water was high on Falcon Lake, what precautionary measures were taken by the department to protect property on Falcon Lake?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, again, when the question was posed of me last week and having been in the area myself last week, the problem wasn't as real as apparent then, but I'm informed by the Member for Assiniboia that it is now. I can recall back in 1966, and so can the honourable member, where measures were taken to assure that the water flow be increased, actually preventing cottage owners to receive damages to their property, and obviously that same measure would be suggested now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture and he may wish to take it as notice. I wonder if he could inform the House when the licenses for the A.I. technicians in the province will be renewed in order that they may operate within the law by having a licence for their facility.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing holding up the renewal of any licence to my knowledge. I am not aware of any single one application that has not been renewed.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

CORRECTION - PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMITTEE

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a correction in the Hansard report in the Public Utilities Committee sitting on April 30th. It's indicated that the committee met at 10:00 o'clock. That is incorrect. The committee had to wait until 11:05, until the members in opposition arrived to form a quorum. There was only one member present at 10:00 o'clock and that was the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. The other opposition members on the committee were not present until 11:05 and the members had to wait until that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I certainly don't think that the remarks of the Member for Radisson are pertinent at all to the situation. The committee certainly did

CORRECTION - PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMITTEE

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) meet. If there weren't enough members there to form a quorum at that particular hour at 10:00 a.m., I don't think that matters at all. I certainly was there and I'm a member of that committee, and I think the remarks of the member are uncalled for.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I suggest that the chairman of the committee should withdraw his remarks; otherwise he will invite us, as members in the opposition, to recall the number of times which we have sat in that room waiting for the government members to return. I suggest that rather than enter into that kind of an exchange, it would be wise for the member to withdraw it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, can we proceed now with the adjourned debates on second reading, starting with Bill No. 46 and then Bill Nos. 43, 44 and 52?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, may I have this matter stand? However, I would like to make way for any other members who would like to speak to this bill.

BILL NO. 43

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 43. The proposed motion of the Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this - amendments to the Farm Machinery and Equipment Act, and express my concern, both as a member of the Legislature and as a farmer; one who has always felt that the government shouldn't protect everybody from every situation that might arise, but governments should be there to give leadership, and I don't think this bill is going to do very much for the farmers in Manitoba.

We've heard the Minister express, on second reading, the different changes, the amendments that are going to take place, and I would like to say that after the debate that took place about two years ago here on this very important bill, that the expressions of the farmers and the machine companies at that time I think made it fairly clear to the Cabinet and to the government of the day that they want an option. They want an option when it comes to dealing with warranties. They don't want to be tied to any one given set of formulas here such as three years, as in this present bill, and 15 hours, 1,500 hours on tractors, and three-year warranty on combines and 300 hours, and all other machinery for one year. I think they want an option, and why do they want an option? Because of the extra cost that's going to be involved to the farmers in Manitoba. Most of the costs, I think, ran a lot of the time around four percent if you're going to put a compulsory three-year warranty here, 1,500 hours, that it will be at least four percent or higher for that type of service that has to be provided by the dealers and also by the vendors, machine companies in the province of Manitoba, because they in turn will have to foot a lot of the warranty that's going to be involved.

Now, I don't know who asked the Minister to put these amendments in. I would like to ask the Minister what organizations asked him to have these amendments included in the bill. I would safely say, right now, that there's only one farm organization in the province of Manitoba, that being the Farmers Union, that might have asked. I'm sure the Farm Bureau have never asked them to have these amendments included. I'm sure that the machinery dealers in Manitoba have never asked them to have these included, and I'd be safe to say that other farm organizations, or any other organizations in Manitoba have never requested these amendments. So why is the Minister doing it? Why is he doing it? Is he thinking he's protecting the farmers? Is he protecting the machine dealers? Who's he protecting? I'd like to know.

Well, I'm going to tell the Minister what's going to happen. I'm going to tell him what's going to happen if these amendments are passed. I'm going to tell him there's going to be a lot of farmers that'll never be able to purchase machinery, new machinery. Now, why won't they be able to purchase new machinery? Simply because a dealer, a reliable dealer will not

BILL 43

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) sell machinery on a three-year warranty to some farmers, because he would be out at that particular farm day after day and year after year for the full length of that three years. That's why they wouldn't sell him. So that will mean that many farmers are going to be in trouble, and they're in trouble partly because of their own reasons; that they neglect machinery; they don't service it and don't grease it properly. I realize that over 50 miles, if your machine dealer sells machinery over 50 miles away from his dealership, that the extra cost will be involved. I don't know who's going to pay these costs, but anyway I see there's a maximum distance of 50 miles there from the dealer's place of business or repair shop.

What I'm getting at, Mr. Speaker, is that I say to the Minister, give the option to the dealers and to the farmers. And one of the reasons why I say that, at the present time where there's an option where you can have the maximum warranty or a minimum warranty, a one-year warranty, or better, that 95 percent of the farmers are taking the one-year warranty, the dealers tell me. That is the reason why I say there should be still an option, still an option in there for the purchase of farm machinery.

Now I see where you're going to have tires, batteries, belts, hydraulic performance, electrical parts and diesel pumps, that all these warranties are going to be set by regulation, set by the Cabinet. This kind of disturbs me because I always thought when I bought a tractor or I bought another piece of machinery, that the tires were part of the tractor, the battery was a part of the tractor, the belts, all hydraulic and electrical diesel pump were all a part of the tractor. Now I find out that at least a third or a half of my tractor, the value of my tractor, is not subject to the ordinary warranty and subject to the warranty set out by regulation. Now I think it would be far better if you set out the warranty of these particular things under the standard tractor, because I think you'd have a lot less problems when you're dealing with a warranty on a tire that's maybe only used for three months and then had to be replaced.

Now I know what's going to happen on sharing the cost of late deliveries, and I think mention was made by the Member from Virden the other day in his speech, what will happen from now on, that no company will take an order for a given farm machine unless that machine is in his yard, the dealer's yard. This is the way they'll get around it. In the past, you've been able to order a machine and take delivery six months or a year later, but this no longer will be the fact. The dealers and the machine manufacturers cannot take that risk any longer because the penalties are too great, so they always find a way of getting around this, a way of getting around the amendments to the Act, and they do that by not taking orders in advance for any farm machine.

Mr. Speaker, there's one other thing that bothers me in this particular Act. It's the setting up of a \$300,000 fund; \$300,000 for what? I would like to ask the Minister, for what? We passed an act two years ago that requires each machine dealer to have a \$10,000 bond in order that they may do business with the farmers in Manitoba; in order that they might sell any parts or service tractors or sell new machines. It's a broad requirement and it's set out in 35.1 subsection (3). If that bond is as good as we were told it was, why are you establishing another \$300,000 slush fund? It was established originally out of the Consolidated Revenue, and in turn each year, as the fund is deleted, the dealers of the province of Manitoba have to replace that fund. Now I'm asking, who's going to pay for that? I know who's going to pay. It's the farmers from Arthur, and the farmers from Souris-Killarney, and the farmers from Gladstone and a few other farmers in the background here that's going to have to put up that \$300,000 - and the Minister of Agriculture will have to pay a portion of that.

Now why do we need that 300,000? We don't need it, I say right now. I know what a bond means. I know what a bond means - city businessmen, not only your machine dealers. I know that if he loses that bond that he's out of business, and for the life of me, no machine dealer in his right mind is going to do anything that will hurt establish his position as a dealer in the province of Manitoba, because I know this board here, the Farm Machinery Board, which is established under the Act, can put him out of business; or anything that falls contrary to the Act, he can be disfranchised from his dealership. So why do we need a 300,000-dollar fund? The Minister has never told us yet why we need it, and I think that's one good reason why we should vote against that bill, because it's going to put an extra tax on the farmers of Manitoba, I'm sure.

Now the Minister might come along and say, well, there's some dealers that won't do the

BILL 43

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) farmers justice in most every deal, but let's be honest. This country was never built on government law, it was built on good common sense, and common sense still prevails, I am sure, between machine dealers and farmers, and the day that common sense doesn't prevail, I tell you we're in trouble, we're in trouble in the province of Manitoba. So let's not put everything into penalties and try to legislate everything. We have to use common sense in most every deal that we make, as individuals and as farmers, and I hope this always remains that way.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's anything much else I have to say other than to say that I think that we've legislated about enough here for the farmers to try to protect - try to protect; and in every case you try to protect, it's just that many more dollars out of his own pocket. And the farmers are good enough businessmen yet, I think, to look after most of his own problems. He's looked after them up till now and I think we'd be better off rather than to legislate everything, everything, as you say, for his protection, but in most cases it just costs him more dollars and cents. And we're living in a day and age, I tell you, where the farmer, even though he's taking in a lot more money today, he's finding out, he's finding out at the end of the year after he pays his taxes to the Minister of Finance, that he hasn't got any more dollars left in his pocket, and I think it's about high time that we not put another tax on him like it's going to be put on here. But the three year warranty, another four percent, replacing the 300,000 which is eventually going to have to come out of the farmers -- and I'm not saying all the 300,000 will be paid out every year. A small portion will be, likely, but that's got to come out of the farmers, and I tell you, let the farmers have the option.

So I'll close by saying that. Let the farmers have the option of warranty. That's all they're asking; that's all the machine dealers are asking for. And I'm sure that 95 percent or better will take the one year warranty, as presently is in effect on most of the deals made in the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 44

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 44. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do wish to, at this time, make my contribution on Bill 44 and to commend the Minister for bringing the legislation in. I know I've had several scrapes with him during the past four or five years, and I thought for many years that Workmen's Compensation legislation, as it is at the present time, had the most glaring injustice as far as many of the people that were receiving compensation in the province of Manitoba. So I commend the Minister for taking a step forward in bringing this legislation, and I know that some features are most welcome, and perhaps one - and I will say the Minister will be remembered by many people in Manitoba some day and perhaps the area that he'll be remembered most for is one feature of this bill - and it is the pension, Mr. Speaker, to the widows, the ones that had a husband killed in an industrial accident. Because it was not their fault that their husband died in an industrial accident and they were relegated to receiving a pension that was meaningless and worthless, Mr. Speaker. They were getting \$125.00 or \$100.00 and subsequently it was raised to \$150.00. And this is something that I have not once, but on every occasion that I had an opportunity, on every labour estimates that was before this House since I came into this House, I have made that same remark. And I'm sure the Minister remembers that. I used to receive letters, not only from my constituency, but I can perhaps find some from the constituency even of the Honourable Minister of Labour, that I received from people from his constituency as well, because this was an issue that I used to bring to the attention of the members in the House and, as a result of some publicity, it used to get into the paper.

My argument used to be with the legislation as it stands at the present time, that when a husband was alive, Mr. Speaker, he was able to be on a pension of, say, six or seven hundred dollars, and if he died as a result of that accident the pension to the widow then would be reduced to \$150.00. Now she still had the same payments on the house, the same heating bills, the same cost of living bills to the family, to the children, the food bill, and the pension to that widow went down to what her husband was receiving by something like 75 percent. And it

BILL 44

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) was most unreal, Mr. Speaker, that we continue to have this kind of legislation continue in the province of Manitoba.

I again will say that this is one area that perhaps the Minister has taken a large step, a giant step, in that one specific area, because for years now, for years, I have said that if even the husband was incapacitated, had to stay at home, he could have probably looked after the children, baby-sat, and the widow, or his wife could have gone to the store, done shopping, or even could have worked part-time and they had the income which was then the husband's income, full compensation, whatever it was. But when he died, that was reduced by something like 75 percent and she had hardly no income. And this is the type of legislation that we had in this province.

But, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with that in a minute. I wish to deal with the bill. The bill deals in three specific areas and one is with the change of name, the second is the extension of compensation to additional workers, and of course the big one is provisions for increases in benefits and levels of pension, and some small administrative changes.

One, the first one that I would like to point out, is that I know it's a very good feature and I think it's good, that now we will be able to include or we'll have a chance to include such people as students or the firemen, what we call as volunteer fire people, which were not necessarily included before, particularly we had concern on part-time employees and student, because I know I had one case before me, that this particular person has written to MPs in Ottawa - and I believe the Minister's probably familiar. He took a part-time job during the summer and decided to stay on as a full-time employee and not go back to school. He was injured, and because he wasn't a full-time employee at that time was not allowed for compensation because of an accident, industrial accident. And what the Minister's doing in this legislation is bringing, expanding the coverage to include the people that employment programs and work programs that have students in them, also the features, one of the features in the bill is the employment of volunteer fire brigades, which I think it's a good extension and we certainly accept that.

The other feature, Mr. Speaker, is the change of name, and I certainly accept that because I had the resolution before the House and I know we're not breaking any new ground because the province of Alberta had already changed the Act, I believe, prior to this year, and I don't know how many other provinces call it Workers' Compensation Board because, Mr. Speaker, over 40 percent of the women at the present time do form - in Manitoba at least - form the labour force, and really the title of the Act in my opinion was discriminatory. I think that doing what the Minister did now is really bringing true sex equality and an end to sex discrimination under this Bill, and I think that until all our institutions are examined for discriminatory clauses and practices, perhaps discrimination will continue, and I believe there's other legislation has to be checked. I know that the family today is becoming more and more an economic unit. The CMHC just recently had already changed the Act to allow full amount of a woman's salary to be added to her husband's when applying for a mortgage on a loan, and in the last few months I believe that several mortgages have been issued on those bases. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel this is the right approach by the Minister, but again I say that there must be other legislation that we have to look at.

Mr. Chairman, the other point that I wish to talk on now is the compensation that is increased to the employees, and one point that I would like to bring to the Minister that I'm not completely satisfied. I know that he has increased the ceiling from \$8,000 to \$10,000 on compensation, and I am questioning the Minister if this is really necessary to have a ceiling because the compensation is based on 75 percent of salaries or wages earned, and in some areas, I'm particularly thinking of the line people on, say, Telephone or Hydro, who do hard work and perhaps their salary may reach somewhat higher than some of the others, and should they be penalised, should the ceiling then be based or should the ceiling be \$10,000.00? So I want to question the Minister in that respect. I know that he increased the ceiling to ten.

The other point, a 75 percent wage ceiling again is 75 percent, and has the Minister given any consideration or has he been requested to increase that, say, to 85 percent? I know I have some recommendations and some people come to see me, and I wonder if the Minister has given any consideration.

I know one area that I hope the Minister will have another look at, and that's the burial expenses, which is still at \$350.00, and I know that we talked about this some time ago and I

BILL 44

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) would like to see that increased to \$500.00, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, I feel there should be again some better compensation for disfigurement caused by claims and accidents, and at the present time I understand it isn't sufficient. I know it's a serious thing when there is that kind of a claim, that kind of an accident, and there isn't sufficient claim for people to take proper measures to cure.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, there must be some requirement on the employers to employ workmen who have recovered from injury. I know there is no perhaps definite requirement, but I feel that there must be some obligation on the employer to provide some readjustment, maybe to another type of work with a program of retraining to be available where desirable, and perhaps the retraining should be the responsibility of the Workmen's Compensation Board, but I think there should be some obligation on the employer to see if this person that was injured can be fitted into the same industry and could get another job.

And I think that vocational training must also be available where workmen's earning capacity is affected as a result of an injury. We have serious problems as far as hearing protection and noise control is concerned, because today we have noise levels in many industries or engines or class motors which exceed what's modern acceptable standards and I think the Department of Labour should provide some kind of inspection and testing equipment to see what is the levels of noise that is safe. I know today it's not only motors, high frequency motors, and noise that is causing serious problems, but what is the safe level? For instance, even I understand certain type of lighting in our factories and industrial plants are damaging to the eyesight. So this is an area that I would hope that the Minister would undertake to do some research work.

I know that increases in the minimum pension payable for permanent total disability will not be less than \$250.00, but even, I would say, the Red Tories in the province of Alberta have a much better minimum requirement, which I believe the present government of Peter Lougheed in Alberta has the minimum compensation of \$275.00, which is closer to in line to what the minimum wage is, and I don't believe that the minimum pension should be less than the minimum wage, because if you take, on the basis of our present minimum wage, the minimum that's in Alberta is much closer in line to what the Minister has here. And I'm not critical of the Minister because he has taken a pretty giant step in respect to pensions which will be starting on the 1st of January for the widows.

The other good feature, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister has indicated when he introduced the bill that there will be an advisory committee set up to review disability pensions and report back to the Minister, and I would hope that he would have some wives, or at least one on that committee, who has the experience of what it is to have lived on a pension of \$150.00 which she had before, and I think it would be of great asset to the Minister.

I also feel that Claims Advisory Service, I don't know to what extent it is operational in the Minister's Department, but it would be a means of personal communications with workers and perhaps employers as well, which would provide information, advice on claim problems, and perhaps explain the board decisions. I think if further information, for instance, comes to light, new medical evidence or evidence of further disability, then this should be a complete medical review and this should be taken into consideration. I think that when an injured worker is not satisfied with a claim, that there should be easy review procedures and easy appeal procedures, Mr. Speaker.

So these were just a few of the points that I want to bring to the Minister's attention. I certainly accept the upgrading of the disability pensions. I know that it's a large step to \$250.00 but I just point out to the Minister it's somewhat below the minimum wage level and it is below the province of Alberta. I would hope he can tell us what some of the other provinces are. What is their minimum pension in this respect? I also feel that there should be a greater onus put on the employer to rehire injured workmen after they have completely recovered, and if it is at the expense of Workmen's Compensation to give these people retraining for, say, a different type of a job, I think this should be done, this must be done.

The point that I'm somewhat concerned, Mr. Speaker, is the appeal procedures at the present time, and the Minister may say that they are satisfactory, you know, but I have talked to not only several in the last while, but for the last few years there seems to be some concern as far as appeal procedures are concerned. I know that the employee can ask for a medical review and this is fine but I would like to recommend to the Minister if there is not a provision

BILL 44

(MR. PATRICK cont'd). . . . that the employee can ask for his own doctor's report to be submitted. I think this should be made available to the employee, that he can present his own doctor's report to the Medical Review Board. I think this may be of some help.

The other concern that has been registered by many workers is about pre-existing conditions and I know there's no change in respect to pre-existing conditions made in the bill so I would hope that the Minister can give us some indication what is happening in that area.

The other feature, Mr. Speaker, is the compensation for a widow when she marries. I know that she has an option of a lump sum settlement and compensation for the children will continue. I think this is only right and fair.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the points that I wish to bring to the Minister's attention on this bill. I have no intention to delay the debate on this or to be long on it. As I mentioned I just wanted to raise a few points. I hope that there will be people in Committee and particularly those that are affected mostly to bring any other representations, but in general I accept the bill and feel it's a good bill with the exceptions of the points that I raise to the Minister, particularly the appeal procedures, the medical review, pre-existing conditions and the minimum pension, that the Minister can give us a reply what's happening in the other provinces.

In other areas I accept it, I think it's a good bill. The Minister has gone a long way in respect to widow's pensions where now, I think after January 1st, they'll be able to receive the full pension of what her husband would have received if he would have been totally disabled on full compensation. She will receive that same pension. I think this is probably the best feature in the bill. In fact I think it may be the best in Canada. I may be wrong. I think this is the area where I said that the Minister of Labour will be remembered by the people that his legislation affects. Those who will probably remember him the most and will certainly appreciate is the widows that will be receiving the minimum pension and the ones that will be affected because of the unfortunate accidents to their husbands that will be receiving a pension that they would have received when they would have been on full compensation. So these are the few points that I wish to bring to the Minister's attention, Mr. Speaker, and I commend the bill to Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to say a few words on Bill 44. It's a bill that concerns my particular interest to some degree, and I just might say that my feelings on the bill run very parallel to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, much more so than what the Honourable Member for Fort Garry had stated last day in the House.

I just want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Honourable Minister of Labour for the fine bill that he has drafted and brought before the House. In speaking with my colleagues in the labour movement in general we are very satisfied with the bill and he is to be commended for coming forward with such a progressive piece of legislation. And I would just say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that possibly he has reassured his election in the future for so long as he wants to run, that there's that type of feeling from the people, so I would think that he might not be looking for an early retirement at the present time because he's doing rather well.

It's certainly a giant step forward for a little Labour Minister, the stature that he is, he's taken a real big step forward and I know that the people in the labour movement are appreciative of that.

The name of the Compensation Board being changed wasn't of a primary concern of ours but we welcome the change and we know that it will certainly coincide with the wishes of the female members of the labour force and we're certainly coming along in our endeavours to make things more integrated in the labour force.

I would just say, Mr. Speaker, in relationship to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, he made mention that the Compensation Act is not welfare and I certainly agree with that statement and that principle, but in his deliberations he didn't leave me with the feeling that he really meant what he said because later on in his discourse he intimated that some of the funds to finance the progressive nature of Bill 44 should be coming from the public treasury, and I certainly don't agree with that. I would think that the financing of the provisions provided in Bill 44 should come from industry, industry is responsible for the work force in the

BILL 44

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd). . . . province in that sense and if the workers are injured on the job then it should be wholly and totally the responsibility of industry and not the public in general; and I wouldn't agree with the Honourable Member for Fort Garry in that regard. It isn't fair that the taxpayers should have to subsidize some of the unsafe working conditions that do from time to time prevail in industry and sometimes the industrial people put operational speed-up ahead of safety and we certainly can't agree with that.

The ceiling has been a concern of ours over the past number of years. Elevating it up to 10,000 is certainly a welcome step but we are fairly reasonably assured that the Minister is aware of the concern in this area and he is taking a look at something that will be a benefactor to the work people making more than that particular ceiling. I would think that he is well aware of the provisions in the Saskatchewan Compensation Act in the interpretation section which set up a formula and that would be a welcome innovation into the Manitoba regulations. I'm sure that he's cognizant of that and will be taking a serious look at it in light of what's happening with the rising salaries that workers are earning nowadays.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia certainly hit the thing on the head when he said that the provisions upgrading pensions for widows and children is a welcome step and there's no doubt about that, because in this day and age when the cost of living is escalating at the pace it is it's been a miracle that the widows and children could continue to exist on the pensions that were in effect before Bill 44.

I would also like to express some concern in regard to pre-existing conditions. I am well aware that the Honourable Minister certainly is on to this and we're looking for some relief in that area and that is the pre-existing conditions that were in effect prior to 1972. We are still having some problems in that area and we certainly look for some relief there.

I would just comment, Mr. Speaker, that the Accident and Prevention Branch of the Workman's Compensation Board is doing rather well but we find that there are many weaknesses in this particular area. I know the Minister is aware of it and I'm positive that he will do something to upgrade this particular piece of regulation, because when you take a look at what Saskatchewan have done in this area they are considerably ahead of us and we certainly don't want to be followers in legislation affecting the work force of Manitoba. I would just urge the Minister to take a good look at this particular section of the Workman's Compensation Board and hopefully bring it up to if not surpass what Saskatchewan have already done in that area. And as I was speaking previously on the Estimates it is an area that requires a lot of research and this is where I was putting emphasis on the department in the research area and certainly this is where we need the research in order to get the type of legislation that we're looking for in Manitoba and I'm certainly hopeful that it will come in the not too distant future.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly urge the bill along to Committee and certainly let the Minister know that the labour movement in general is well satisfied with Bill 44.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I at the offset say how much I appreciate most of the remarks that have been made in respect of Bill 44. I think that it would only be fair for me to express some apology to both the management and the labour groups in that unlike the previous changes that were made in 1972 to the Workman's Compensation Act the changes in this particular bill were not made with prior consultation either by labour or by management. We felt in the Department that having read over numerous task force reports from other jurisdictions, having reviewed some of the matters that had been drawn to our attention in this House in previous years, that it would be advisable for us to proceed with changes in Workman's Compensation before consultation and we rest our laurels, if indeed they are laurels, on the bill itself and await in keen anticipation representations that will be made by both labour and management and also organizations such as the Injured Workers Association when the bill goes into Committee.

In listening to contributions made by members of the House, Mr. Speaker, it seems as though there is general agreement that we are progressing in the right direction in respect of Workman's Compensation. There were three who made a contribution to the debate, namely the Member for Crescentwood, who has just spoken, the Member for Assiniboia and the Member for Fort Garry. Each of them touched on the question of pre-existing conditions and expressed

BILL 44

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) regret that it appeared that this matter was being overlooked because there wasn't any precise legislative changes proposed in Bill 44. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm informed that the proof of the pudding really is in the eating thereof and that I'm also informed that the general approach of the Workman's Compensation Board in respect of pre-existing conditions is considered among the foremost approaches in the whole of the Dominion. True, not precisely set out in legislation but by practice and by comparisons more consideration is given here in Manitoba to pre-existing conditions and pensions as a result of a pre-existing condition than exists anywhere in the Dominion.

I do not mean, Mr. Chairman, by saying this that anything is letter perfect but the instructions after consultation with the Board is this is a matter that is given prime consideration in respect of injuries previously existing as far as employees are concerned. I do realize that there are some areas of complaint, particularly in the field of neurosis which comes as a result of an accident, but even in these particular cases where the neurosis is accompanied with another accident, pre-existing conditions are taken into account for the benefit of the worker.

The Honourable Member for Crescentwood mentioned the accident and preventative functions of the board insofar as industrial accidents are concerned. I want to indicate to my honourable friend that this is an area of grave concern to the Minister and to the board as well. A task force was set up a few years ago to consider this very important matter and we find that there is a bifurcation of jurisdiction going on at the present time between one department of government and another. For instance, the Department of Labour have jurisdictions over the spray-booth equipment. The Department of Health have jurisdiction over the possible toxic effects of paint. And also of course in the field of mines and natural resource development there is another organization or unit set up dealing with mine safety and the application of safety insofar as underground is concerned. And then of course the Compensation Board enters into the picture on the above surface equipment in the mining industry. What we are endeavouring to do at the present time is to consider ways and means under which all of these matters pertaining to accidents in preventative injury factors should be under one umbrella so that we will have an understanding of the requirements of safety for workers and safe working conditions throughout the province.

The Member for Crescentwood mentioned the new occupational safety legislation that was introduced into Saskatchewan recently. I want to indicate that at a Labour Ministers' Conference held not too long ago in Calgary, the subject matter was given very intensified investigation and consideration by all of the ministers of labour in Western Canada, and while we do not view that the legislation in itself is perfect I agree with my honourable friend from Crescentwood that that legislation is a step in the right direction.

Now the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and also the Honourable Member for Fort Garry in their discourses made reference to the question of availability of medical reports of doctors to the workmen. I think that it is a general accepted position that doctors' medical reports should not be given out for the protection of the doctor and to some degree for the protection of the individual themselves lest there be a misinterpretation placed on the doctor's report. That is the basic reason for this. And I don't know about my honourable friend from Assiniboia but I know that if my doctor gave me a full medical diagnosis of what my complaints are, that I wouldn't understand them; maybe my friend from Assiniboia would if the doctor's report pertaining to me was made available to him, but this is one of the areas that we have difficulty in and I can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, some concern in this particular area.

A simple solution has not been worked out as I understand it anywhere in Canada insofar as the availability of these types of reports because there is the possibility of rendering the doctor who made the report, particularly if the reports are really from two or three doctors, there may be conflict in opinion - and I'm thinking right now of medical boards that are established to consider cases - there could be conflicting reports which could conceivably be harmful to what we call the proper conduct of medical reports. That is the basic reason.

My honourable friend from Assiniboia raised the question of particularly dealing with appeal procedures. Now I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that this is of concern to all. Here again, other than an appeal from a stated case in law, no one that we are aware of, or no compensation organization anywhere on the North American Continent have been able to set up appeal boards that deal with the matter of an appeal for compensation. Now there's lots of arguments

BILL 44

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) that someone should have the right of appeal as to the adequacy or otherwise of the amount of compensation. Now I would suggest that if we were to set up an appeal body beyond the compensation board insofar as adjudication of degree of injury and the cost of the provision for pensions, we would really abdicate from the basic principle of compensation and for the reasons of setting up the whole area of compensation back in 1915 or so in that the matters then would be going back into the courts by litigation and that the main compensation benefactors would be the lawyers of the province of Manitoba, the jurisdiction that adopted such an appeal.

So far as the appeal in stated cases of law, that provision is there and I'm hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that in the provision of the Bill to establish an advisory committee to the Minister, that we will be able to go into greater depth in this particular area and that the committee - as yet unnamed of course, because we haven't the authority to set up such a committee until the legislation is passed - will give further consideration to that problem or to that matter.

My honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia mentioned one or two matters pertaining to our legislation, pertaining to benefits that will be lesser than it will be in some other jurisdictions. Now when I introduced the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I thought that I took pains to point out that while our proposed legislation was not the best in every instance by comparison to other provinces, that I felt that it was going a long way to being among the best taking in totality Workmen's Compensation right across Canada.

My honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia made mention of the matters of burial cost increases in other jurisdictions. It's interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that for instance in the province of Saskatchewan there have been increases recently that it is now proposed to pay funeral expenses up to \$400 as compared to ours of \$300. It is proposed that their burial plot will be \$50, same as ours at the present time. And then when we look at the additional death benefit, Mr. Speaker, it is proposed in Saskatchewan to raise their additional death benefit to \$500 whereas ours is \$650. At the present time the total in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, in respect of funeral expenses in total is \$1,000 and it's suggested that they may be coming up toward us in Saskatchewan by \$950. I do want to say that the total award in respect of an unfortunate death in industry in Manitoba of \$1,000 is the highest in Canada with the exception - or among the highest; only one province in Canada has one that is higher at the present time and that is in the province of Quebec in respect of a Roman Catholic funeral which is \$1,100 as I understand, otherwise their general total amount is the same as we have here in Manitoba of \$1,000. So I don't think we're very far out if you take the whole figure and not try to separate it.

I might state quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, requests were made of me from time to time in presentations from the likes of the Manitoba Federation of Labour and others; the Railway Brotherhoods, too, made a request of me to increase the amount to be awarded to an undertaker. Well my own attitude is that that's fine, if we designate some amount of money to an undertaker, well he'll certainly charge that amount plus possibly a little bit extra, so if we keep it at a comparatively reasonable figure the undertaker may take a closer look at what he is charging for the actual funeral expenses directly. At least I'm hopeful that they will.

Now my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia mentioned disfigurement benefits without giving me any example. However, I'm sure my honourable friend is aware of the fact that under present legislation disfigurement benefits only apply to visual disfigurement. Under the proposed changes in the Act they will cover all disfigurement whether normally they are covered by clothing or otherwise. And that, I believe, will be if not the first, among the first changes in legislation right across Canada.

In regard to the matter of the increase in the ceilings, my friend from Crescentwood raised the matter of the legislation in Saskatchewan. The Member for Assiniboia suggested that there should be no ceiling and I'm quite prepared to adopt a formula for increasing beyond the 10,000 which they have done in Saskatchewan, they've done in British Columbia, and have under consideration in some of the other jurisdictions, but by going to the suggested 10,000 in our legislation it will be on par with practically all of the compensation acts right across Canada.

My honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia, too, - and I don't fault him for it - did point out that some of the minimum payables for permanent total disability pensions, that ours with an increase from \$175 to \$250 will be below Alberta, will be below Saskatchewan.

BILL 44

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) I accept that. I accept that. But if my honourable friend would take a look at the proposals contained within the legislation to upgrade past pensions by amounts running from eight percent to 25 percent, which is not being done in other jurisdictions, and if these increases in respect of past pensions proposed in this act, if the increases that were added in 1972, we will see that we've gone further here in Manitoba than they have in most other jurisdictions. And I expect, I expect that there will be some comments from certain quarters, Mr. Speaker, when we go into committee insofar as the upgrading of the pensions happen to be concerned.

I believe it was also the Member for Assiniboia that made reference to the matter if a widow or widower remarries a cash settlement for them on the change of their marital status. I'm informed that by the changes suggested here in Manitoba that we will be the highest in this particular area in Canada.

The Member for Fort Garry, I must refer to him. He mentioned the Injured Workers Association and wondered whether they ever talked to me or I to them. I want to say that I have met with representatives of this organization on a number of occasions and only met the other day with one of their spokesmen. I had received a brief away back in January in connection with the problems that the Injured Workers Association may be having, and I want to say to the committee I do not discard lightly some of the complaints that they have to make. The Member for Fort Garry also referred to a list of responses to the Injured Workers Association's brief which was given to me also in March and I've taken a good close look at some of the comments from some of the people who made comments on the workers' brief and in assessing some of them I'm positive that the parties who signed the comments have practically speaking, no knowledgeability of Workmen's Compensation in Manitoba, neither do they have any competence in my opinion to make assessment of the Act.

A MEMBER: Pretty strong statement . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, it's a strong statement, but sometimes strong statements have to be met by just as strong or even stronger statements --(Interjection)-- well I guess I'm not either; which reminds me of a comment that I had in mind to make. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia suggested that I would be long remembered after I'm dead and buried and gone, which I appreciate may not be too damn long in coming, sometimes I wish it would come quicker than it appears to be; on the other hand however, my colleague from Crescentwood says I'll be around for a long time. Now maybe somewhere between the two we'll be able to become reconciled to the two different viewpoints. But anyway, I did think, Mr. Chairman, that it was competent for me, indeed necessary for me to make some reference to the paper that the honourable the Member from Fort Garry referred to because it appeared to me that that honourable gentleman got a big kick out of reading from that document, and I say I'm positive that some of them are not too knowledgeable of the Workmen's Compensation Act, or if they are knowledgeable of it they haven't drawn what in their opinion are deficiencies in the Act to the attention of the Minister responsible for the operation of Workmen's Compensation.

My honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry did make a suggestion of the possibility of a contributory Workmen's Compensation insurance bill. I do say that I have done a considerable amount of reading in this area, that in New Zealand they started such a scheme this year. I hope to be able to make an assessment of that before long and that various task force reports have made suggestions that it seems ludicrous that an employee who is inside of the shop gate having been injured is eligible to receive Workmen's Compensation, if he steps outside of the gate on his way home he is not eligible. This is an area of great concern and an area that we're going to have to give consideration to the possibility of an all-embracing compensation insurance for injuries, be they in the shop, outside of the shop or indeed in our homes, and this will eventually, I'm sure, materialize.

The other matter that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry took great umbrage and took a long time, Mr. Speaker, to discuss was the matter of the contribution from the public treasury, the Consolidated Revenue, insofar as the cost of the upgrading of the pensions. He referred to statements that I made back in 1972 when I was able to announce, and did announce, that from the Consolidated Revenue of the province a contribution of a million dollars for the upgrading of benefits at that particular time. And he's correct, I did make those statements; there's no question about it. But I do say, Mr. Speaker, I've taken a look since then at the

BILL 44

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) increasing total amount through which assessments are being paid in respect of injuries in total. I find that the total income, or total payrolls in the province are ever escalating. I did make an announcement that I didn't think that it would be too great a burden taken over a seven-year period, and that industry as a whole, in my opinion, at this particular time can absorb the full amount.

Now having said all of this, Mr. Speaker, I close by saying I am pleased with the general reception that the bill has been given. I want to indicate once again to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that many of the sections in the amending bill have been referred to him over the years and I appreciate, as Minister, having had his contributions over that time. I think, in all fairness, that he would also agree that while I was sitting over on that side of the House I had made many suggestions in respect to Workmen's Compensation that didn't materialize. Maybe I can be faulted that it's taken me as Minister of Labour from 1969 to 1974 to satisfy my honourable friend the Member for Assiniboia or to satisfy the member who used to sit over on that side as the Member for Transcona. Rome wasn't built in a day. I trust and hope that as a result of the amendments being suggested, that the injured workers in Manitoba will be better off than they ever were before.

. . . . continued on next page

BILL NO. 52

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 52. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've had an opportunity to peruse the bill and the amendments thereto over the weekend, and we see no reason to hold up the passage of this particular amendment to committee. It just facilitates one more function of the Credit Union movement. This was referred to by the Minister when he introduced the bill to do with the trust funds of lawyers and, as I say, it's just one more amendment to the Act to allow them to carry out their function in a manner that's maybe a little fuller than was possible in the past, so we see no reason to hold up passage of the bill into committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to say several words on this bill. I realize that there's no sweeping changes but, again, it is of concern to me because in my riding I do have some fairly large credit unions. The Steinbach Credit Union, which is the largest credit union in Manitoba and is also the most efficiently run in Canada. It's one of the few places you can borrow money for eight percent and they pay you eight and a half percent back on your savings. So I think it's pretty hard to beat the efficiency of something like that. We also have a fairly large and fast-growing credit union in Niverville. Both these credit unions are doing very well. The Steinbach Credit Union jumped from \$23,600,000 assets last year to \$30,068,000 assets this year, and the Niverville Credit Union also increased its assets by \$1.3 million over the previous year. The credit union people that I have spoken with welcome this bill. It will enable them to receive trust accounts from legal firms. I think it's another step forward to ensuring that the credit unions gain the respect and confidence of the people in the community.

I think that the credit unions I've just mentioned are an example of what good management can do, and possibly the government in their co-op development up north and that, could take some example from these credit unions. When the big hand of the government leaves people alone so that they can manage their own affairs properly, and you get some people that can manage their affairs properly, the result is fairly substantial and I think fairly beneficial to the community.

So with those words I also would recommend this bill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 25

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 25. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 25, an Act to validate an agreement made between The Provincial Exhibition of Manitoba, the City of Brandon, and the Government of Manitoba, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that members opposite have fairly full knowledge as to the intent of this bill. They are aware that the Province of Manitoba entered into an agreement with the City of Brandon and the Provincial Exhibition -- well, dating back to December of 1971, which does in fact obligate the three parties, and in particular the City of Brandon and the Province of Manitoba, into some financial arrangements which members opposite will appreciate have been in dispute to some degree in recent days.

We have had a request from the solicitor, I believe the City Solicitor, for some two years now, wanting us to validate this agreement. We were not sure that there was any need for an act to validate, and there's been some difference of opinion on the part of legal counsel. However, it was felt that we should proceed with it to satisfy the legal opinion that feel that it is necessary, and in particular to satisfy the legal opinion as represented by the City of Brandon, who have made those representations to us in the last two years.

I want to simply point out that this particular agreement has a great deal of significance for the western part of Manitoba in particular, Mr. Speaker, in that it does offer an opportunity to that part of Manitoba that would not be possible without the kind of financial inputs that have been made by the three groups in question, but in particular the City of Brandon and the Province of Manitoba.

I should recall for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Exhibition in Brandon did own some 84 acres of property with a lot of facilities which they donated to the new

BILL 25

(MR. USKIW Cont'd) agricultural recreational complex known as the Keystone Centre, and that the City of Brandon did indeed contribute some \$1.4 million towards this project, and the Province contributed something in the order of 2.1 million. We feel that it is indeed a real asset to that part of Manitoba, a real attraction, and that not only the City of Brandon but all of that part of Manitoba will benefit from that facility for many many years to come, and that indeed it enhances the opportunity for the City of Brandon to become much more significant as a second major city in Manitoba. I think it will contribute much towards Brandon's desire to grow with the rest of Manitoba, and in particular to compete as a growing city with other large urban communities.

So with that, I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that there's no need for greater elaboration. Members opposite, I am sure, will want to enshrine that particular historic event in this particular piece of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite aware as to the proper procedure . . .

MR. SPEAKER: We have done all the bills on the Order Paper.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: We have completed all the bills on the Order Paper.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes. The point, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not aware, as to whether or not it is necessary to propose another motion to go into Committee of Supply, this being the first -- some more speakers over there, are there? Well maybe I don't have to ask you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I can get guidance from across the way of those who are less knowledgeable than you are. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite certain whether a formal motion should be presented to go into Committee of Supply or whether it's automatic, the motion having been passed this morning -- a motion having been passed this morning to go into Supply, whether a second one is necessary. I seek your guidance, Sir.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may. Members will lose their right to speak on a grievance motion if the suggestion by the Honourable Minister of Labour is carried out. --(Interjection)-- Well, the House Leader requested members on this side not to use the grievance motion on the first hour to go into Supply, so that if we do not have a motion to go into Supply, then members automatically lose their rights from speaking on a grievance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I just want to confirm what the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie said, as I think my leader met informally with the House Leader previous this afternoon, or just at the start of this afternoon's session, and this was what was agreed on. A new motion would be moved after three o'clock and then if we had agreement on the motion we could move at that time. Otherwise, if you don't have a motion to go into Supply, we can't bring in a motion of agreement at that time. It's only to protect the opposition that we're concerned about, because you fellows don't have any grievances over there. At least we don't think you have any grievances over there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I will accept the motion to go into Supply; that'll make it easy.

MR. PAULLEY: Then, however, I wasn't aware of the agreement referred to by the Member for Souris-Killarney. All I did was read Hansard as to what Hansard says, and what goes backwards and forwards between House Leaders or any other members of the House I'm not aware of. However, I'm sure that one of these days, Mr. Speaker, just on the point, someone who desired to speak on the first motion to go into Supply, by way of agreement will do so because that will be their right. However, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- It will be their right.

A MEMBER: No.

MR. PAULLEY: Because it's not contained -- Mr. Speaker, if I may, it's not contained, it is not contained in the instructions that were arrived at and announced through Hansard last

BILL 25

(MR. PAULLEY Cont'd) Friday. --(Interjection)-- Agreed upon by yapping across the table, eh? Okay. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think that an honourable agreement that has been reached in this House should be recognized as being such.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell was -- no, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would like to say on behalf of my constituency, I welcome the announcement by the Attorney-General's Department to locate the Assessment Branch in Steinbach. I think it's a step in the right direction and there are possibly other government agencies that could take a step like that, could decentralize, put different governmental agencies in smaller towns and villages throughout Manitoba and make that their base of operations.

Another thing that interests me and I think interests the councillors and reeves and mayors in my area, is the concept of regional government. Having some municipal background myself, I would first of all like to caution the government and I would hope that they do take this into serious consideration and consult with the council members and the reeves and the mayors of the different areas before they embark on this path. I think we're learning quite a lesson in bureaucracy from the present Unicity structure, and I feel that possibly the municipal governments which are now in touch with local problems and local conditions -- and I might add that most of the councillors are doing a very good job -- I think the people can come to these people; if you do have a small problem like a pothole in the road or something like that, you can still go to your councillor that represents that particular ward and get some fairly fast action on it. Moving into a large regional concept, I think would once again, as I said before, add to the bureaucracy of the thing and I would have to be really convinced by people who are proponents of this particular plan before I would tend to agree with it.

Another problem facing, I think, facing a lot of smaller municipalities, it's somewhat of a diversification problem in that many people are buying small plots of land, building their homes and getting out of the cities. This is a particular problem, of course, in the close proximity of Winnipeg. It's causing problems for the municipalities and again it comes under the planning section, but many of the municipalities closer surrounding Winnipeg at present don't even have any planning in effect at all. I refer to two specific areas in my locality and these are rural municipalities who are not involved with municipal planning at all. I know they are having a serious look at it and I hope that the government will help these people in going ahead and devising a proper plan of attack and a proper planning system.

The other problem, of course, facing municipalities -- and this has come up in the last little while -- is the cost squeeze. As we all know, and it's been reiterated in this House fairly often, that the municipalities -- the only way they can raise taxes is through property tax levies. We heard the premier announce the other day that the tax rebate had been increased to \$50.00, but I would just like to point out to the Minister that the municipalities are still receiving a fairly large amount of money from both farm properties and from small businesses, and a rebate such as this is really not helping these people at all. The business tax and the tax on farm properties is becoming quite high and is starting to make it quite difficult for the smaller businesses and farmers to operate.

The other, final point that I would just like to make is that in the smaller towns, and in Steinbach particularly, we are having problems as far as the availability of serviced lots. The town has now undertaken and signed an agreement with the Provincial Government. I think it's a good agreement. This will allow them to make more lots available and I hope, through that, possibly drop the price of the lots, and service these lots properly the way they

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. BANMAN Cont'd) should be. So with those words, I'll sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to comment briefly and, in doing so, try to avoid as much repetition as I can in respect to the two main areas. They are, as I understood them, problems of the urban sprawl, particularly as it relates to the Winnipeg area - those fringe problems that are developing constantly as a larger urban center grows and experiences the problems of growth. And the other area, of course, is the one in which the Minister indicated his concern and his active promotion of the concept of regional government. Now perhaps the word "promotion" isn't the one I should use, but the Minister did indicate that the department was actively considering this concept in respect to the municipal governments that now exist in the province of Manitoba.

With respect to the problem of the urban fringe, I know that it is an inter-departmental policy in respect to the City of Winnipeg, because we do have a Department of Urban Affairs and we have a Department of Municipal Affairs, and what is happening here is happening, I think, in almost all of the same respects and perhaps on a smaller scale around the City of Brandon, but in this area of course there is no interdepartmental problem, it's a problem which comes completely under the control of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

I would like to take the Minister back a few years to, I believe the year 1970, when we were discussing and debating in this House a bill called the Brandon Boundaries Act, or some such title - I've forgotten exactly what the title was. During that debate, it was suggested by members on this side that one of the problems that was inevitably going to reappear, even though the Boundaries Commission had dealt with the current problems of growth just outside the City of Brandon, and by enlarging the city in one Act they were able to deal with those problems of loss of assessment for the city and of industry in which the city felt that it was providing many of the services but getting little of the benefit in the way of tax. So the Commission did recommend a greatly enlarged city of Brandon and they also, I recall, recommended that at the same time as the Act was implemented there should be a zoning council, a community planning council, a regional planning council, set up in order that the same problems which they were then dealing with by a revision of the boundaries would not again reappear.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to represent myself as an expert in hindsight, but it seemed to me at that time that that was one of the points that we attempted to bring to the attention of the Minister, and to indicate to him that there was a real danger that if the bill went through without any provision for regional planning, that exactly the same things that had happened would again happen. Mr. Chairman, I think that has, in the past four years, been the experience and we find on examining the development around Brandon that there is a game being played where people simply jump one or two miles beyond the new city boundaries and re-establish and are actively developing what may be again essentially the problem we dealt with by a boundaries revision in 1970.

I don't think it would be any attempt on my part to claim any vision or foresight in this matter, because the recommendations for such a commission was contained in the Report of the Boundaries Commission at that time of the government, so Mr. Chairman, I feel that there was a great opportunity to have pursued this matter to do then what we are now thinking is going to happen in areas or communities where there is a community of interest, where there are common problems, and to somehow establish a form of regional planning which will anticipate and prevent those specific growths which occur just on the edge of the boundaries of urban areas and which occur there, really, for the main purpose of avoiding higher assessments which apply in the urban centers, and they apply really because the urban centers are faced with extremely expensive costs of services to the serviced lots that they are providing for the city dwellers.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is part of the general discussion which the Minister is now having with the municipalities on the subject of regional government, but I think it's not necessarily, nor does it need to await any change in the concept of municipal government in order to implement a form of community counselling which would be at least helpful, if not the whole answer to the problems. I recognize the comments and the validity of the comments of the Member for Fort Rouge, when he says that while you may establish regional councils, their authority does not necessarily involve all of the areas in which they are asked to make

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. MCGILL Cont'd) recommendations, so that while they are advisory in a sense, they lack across the board the kind of authority that they would need in order to make it completely effective in preventing the anomalies that do occur in industry and residential areas just outside large urban centers.

Let me just briefly again support the views, I think, of most of the members in opposition, that we should not proceed in any great rush to provide another level of government, which we might call regional government. I presume that the Minister does not conceive of this as a third level, or a second level, perhaps, between municipal and a middle level between municipal and provincial. Perhaps it is to replace all of the municipal governments that we are now considering a regional government. If that were to happen, we would lose I'm sure, as many members have pointed out, the kind of grass roots input into the decision-making process in municipalities that we are all constantly talking of, promoting and recognizing as basic to good government - some way in which people at the grassroots level can participate in the decision-making; some way in which those elected officials have a working knowledge, a direct working knowledge of the problems in the area which they represent, and I think if there ever has been a grassroots government in our province, it has to be at the municipal level where the councillors are able to deal at council meetings with specific problems that are familiar to them, presented by people who know them personally, and they are able to represent in an understanding and informed way the problems of their ward or their constituency.

To lose this, I think, Mr. Chairman, would be the concern of the Minister. I'm sure he's concerned about that. He recognizes some of the values of regional government, as there are of course many, but they do not in my view in any way replace those which would be lost if we did eliminate the present system of municipal councillors and reeves.

I don't think, however, that it's necessary to give up on the idea of community zoning or planning or land use being handled in a regional way. I think that's possible even without a regional government, and retaining the municipal governments of the present time. I think it should be possible for those councils to work, to advise, and to come to agreements on the way in which land will be used, the way in which land will be zoned, in areas which have a community of interest, and I think that can be done with the restrictions as outlined by the Member for Fort Rouge, that not always will full authority be given to that council to act to the ultimate decision-making; but certainly to advise the Provincial Government, this council, in my view, would be of very great importance, and I regret again that the Minister did not see fit, that his department did not see fit at the time that the boundaries in Brandon were enlarged, to establish that concurrently with the boundary enlargement and to have had the benefit of that advice in preventing a recurrence of the problems which we undertook to eliminate by a boundary revision.

I understand too, Mr. Chairman, that the municipalities in the area of Brandon are already, and I think perhaps mostly on their own initiative, proceeding to - and I may be wrong in that, there may be some encouragement from the Department - but I understand that they are proceeding to meet in a community council in an attempt to come to some decisions that would be helpful in solving their common land use problems, in coming to decisions about arteries for transportation to the main urban centers and in the fields that were mentioned by the Minister, one of which of course is the field of sewage; how these urban and suburban areas are being serviced with septic fields, and so on.

So, Mr. Chairman, these are the thoughts which I have. They have been phrased perhaps in a better and more descriptive way by others members who have already spoken, but I would feel - and it's an oversimplification on my part to simply say regional government no, but regional zoning and planning, regional councils for that purpose, certainly yes. I think that the basic input again can best come from a council which has its basis in a regional part of the country where the various municipal governments involved have common interests and common problems. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, there are a few comments which I should make. The Honourable Member for Roblin, I see he's not in his seat, but I would like to just make reference to the point that he raised re the Shellmouth Dam. The point I would like to make is that the Crown land, the responsibility for Crown land was transferred from the Department of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Management, to Tourism and Recreation,

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. PAWLEY Cont'd) and it's for that reason that the Department of Tourism and Recreation is actively involved insofar as the planning process is concerned in the area that's referred to by the Member for Roblin. Just one more point I would like to make, of course, is that -- and this is in response to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell too, who made reference to planners and sometimes planners getting out of control etc., words I understand to that extent -- I'd just like to emphasize that the planners working for the Planning Branch of the Department are performing an advisory role. They are providing planning advice to the municipalities and the responsibility still for municipal planning rests with the municipality. So the planners, though they may make suggestions, recommendations and advice before that advice is ever implemented into policy, it must receive the endorsement of the local municipal council for it to take effect.

Insofar as the park area referred to by the Member from Roblin, it's true, it was an area where the Department of Tourism and Recreation took over that responsibility from Mines and Natural Resources, who was responsible for the planning there.

I found the comments by the Honourable Member for Brandon West quite interesting. I think that his suggestion that we should be thinking in terms of more regional planning, zoning, etc., are correct comments, and without any question I think that is the direction we ought to proceed so that people think in terms of the larger area rather than their own particular area. We have had discussions with the RMs surrounding Brandon, Cornwallis and Elton, and I think that really the development around Brandon of moving towards joint planning has really developed or germinated with the thinking of both the government and the local municipalities. The reason that this did not take place with the passage of the Brandon-Cornwallis Act of a couple of years ago, was at that time the municipalities did not express a willingness to proceed in that direction, and I suppose if we are subject to any criticism here it might be to the effect that we've been too sensitive to the inclinations of the municipalities. It was only for that reason that we did not move in a joint planning area at that time, because we recalled the report, the Dalmage Report. One of the recommendations in that report was the joint planning scheme around the City of Brandon. At that time it did not receive support from the municipalities in that area, but it may be possible now that because it was not implemented without their support two years ago and now may be proceeding with their support, that we'll have a better plan with municipal support than we might have two years ago. So from that point of view there may be a distinct advantage in the way that it has worked out.

I believe that's all the comments I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a few words about the Minister's salary in Municipal Affairs. It's because of the fact that we have a Minister of Urban Affairs and he only applies to the City of Winnipeg, I understand. That's all the First Minister -- your Department actually does cover urban affairs in a sense, with the exception of the City of Winnipeg, I understand that. Well, one of the problems I was going to bring up is one of the same problems that the Member for Brandon just mentioned, the sprawl that's taking place in the City of Brandon going beyond now the boundaries of the -- even the extended boundaries of Brandon, and actually reaching out into my constituency into the municipality of Oakland. And many of these small little settlements are taking place now just northeast of the Log Cabin there, and if you go back about a mile north and a mile east all the way down those roads, they're just little settlements, you know, opening up all over the place, about four or five acres settled, you know, about four or five acres for each housing project, and this is becoming a problem and I don't think our municipality is equipped well enough because they're more just a new rural municipality. And I can see that developments such as these, some of them are trailers put on a four acre lot, some of them are homes that are put, you know, with a foundation, but there's really no organized effort to more co-ordinate these developments and each farmer sells his parcel of land as he goes along and I can see the problems that in the future are going to develop.

Now I realize that once you extend boundaries that this is a fact of life, and unless you really have a system of planning, it not only entails one municipality, it entails a number of municipalities in that particular area. Now I don't know whether municipalities of all that WestMan area are ready for planning at the present time or not, but I would safely say that

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. McKELLAR Cont'd) within ten years that something of that nature will have to come about, otherwise we're going to run into problems.

Now one of the reasons why they moved out into the Cornwallis area farther out into Oakland, was the cheap taxes compared to Brandon. And I'm talking about cheap. Our mill rate last year was 37 mills, both municipal and school, compared to Brandon's about 95 to 100 mills. But our mill rate's going up 17 mills this year, 7 mills on municipal and 10 mills on school, so we're gradually catching up, I guess, if there is -- and it's only a matter of time, I suppose, before we'll be, not near Brandon, anywhere near Brandon, but up quite a lot anyway because we'll be about 54 or 55 mills this year. Now what's this going to mean? And I want to talk on the property tax credit. On a \$20,000 assessment on a section of land in my municipality, and going up at the rate of 17 mills, that's a \$340.00 increase in taxes in this one year. What's the government doing about it? I don't think there's very much little help directly through the municipalities, but they've increased the property tax credit from \$200.00 to \$250.00 which is a maximum of \$50.00 this coming year. Now, as I mentioned, a section of land is about average, I guess, in our municipality and the tax is going up \$340.00. We're going to be relieved to the extent of \$50.00 over and above what we got a year ago. So that means that \$190.00 - no, \$290.00 has got to come out of the pockets of the individual farmer to pay for increased services, I guess, at school levels and municipal level.

One of the reasons for the increased costs to the municipalities this winter has been the cost of snow plowing and also the increased cost of wages which they must pay to their employees, their Secretary-Treasurer and all their cat operators and municipal operators. But this is a large increase, I would say, for a municipality such as ours, and I'm hoping that the municipalities can get some direct help, more than what they've got, from the government of the Province of Manitoba, because I think they need it and they need it now.

Regarding the school mill rate, this is a large mill rate, 10 mill increase, but I'm sure that the Minister of Education has taken this to heart and when his Estimates are debated he'll have an answer for this problem too for the coming years.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak about the Municipal Board and I'd like to know how a man can serve in a dual purpose - the Chairman of the Municipal Board, Mr. Leon Mitchell - can serve in a dual purpose as a Commissioner on the CFI. Does he draw wages from both? How could he serve both of these government -- one being a board, another one as -- I know his lifetime, he must be getting near the end of the road for the CFI, as a CFI Commissioner, but I think he's been on that as a Commissioner for three years. I don't know how he's paid on that, whether he's paid on a daily basis or a yearly basis, but I would imagine his salary as Chairman of the Municipal Board is up in the over \$20,000 a year, and I want to know if this man is a full-time employee of both, a part-time employee of both, or where does he fit it on both these jobs? I understand he was a former partner of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in his law firm so I take it that he's a government supporter in the best interests of the New Democratic Party.

I'd like to speak too on the problems involving many of their communities that I served and the mill rate besides, and I've talked earlier, first about the rural municipalities, but the towns in the constituency in which I serve, like Killarney and Souris, Wawanesa, and another town, Glenboro, are having a difficult problem of financing and keeping your mill rates under 100 mills. And some of them are over 100 mills at the present time. I don't know what help the government have in mind for these communities, but I would say that they'd better look at this problem, look at it seriously, and so something about it. Do something about it, because the property tax credit isn't doing one little thing for these towns. It isn't doing one little bit of good at all, and I tell you, if you want to help the municipal men, give them the money and let them spend it. And I want to say, why should a person like my mother in the nursing home in Brandon, who is subsidized by your government now, she wasn't up to last July, why should she get the maximum amount of property tax credit? She's not paying any property taxes. She's being -- the cost of her being in a nursing home has been contributed by your Department of Health and Social Development, everything over four dollars and a half, and yet you send somebody into that nursing home to fill out the forms to tell her how much money she's going to get, and she got the check within a month after the forms were filled out. That's not helping property taxes, relieving property taxes. She's not paying any

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. McKELLAR Cont'd) property taxes. I say the way to help property taxes . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hold it please. I do not see the relevance of the Member's comments under the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. McKELLAR: I'm talking about taxes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe there'll be the Department of Finance that the Estimates will be coming up. Proceed.

MR. McKELLAR: I realize that. You see, I want to debate it twice. I'm not going to debate it under the Ministry of Finance because we'll never get to his department, I know that.

The thing that I'm trying to relate, Mr. Chairman, is that I'm trying to tell the government, and I tell them for very good reasons, that we did that when we were the government and we found out it was no good. It was no good. You don't get at the problem by trying to get it through property tax credits. Now I know he'll say, well Ontario's doing it, and Alberta's doing it. But it still isn't the right answer, and this is what I'm trying to tell the government. If you're going to help people, give it to the municipal men and I tell you, they'll spend a dollar where a dollar will go. They'll give you 99 cents on the dollar or better and I tell you this is the way to do it. But you're not going to accomplish it by saying, "Well, we'll give you 200 this year; we'll give you 250 next year." My God, what's going to end up with the next election? We're going to have the greatest give-away that you ever had, and you're not getting at the people that are paying property taxes. The man that needs it is not getting.

You know, the man that's trying to do something in this world for the province of Manitoba is the man that's getting less, is the man that's getting less. Because I have two jobs and want to work 24 hours a day and seven days a week and 365 days a year, I'm penalized. If I want to get work and do the least I could for the province of Manitoba, I would get more property tax credit. My God, this is not the way the province was built. The province was built on the man who wanted to do a little more for his province and more for his community, but property tax credit works that the less you do the more you get, which is not the way it should be, in my way of thinking. If you're going to level out incomes that's one thing. You'll do it like the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources does. He says, "Take it all away from them and we'll give you a little bit back." That's what he says. But the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Finance do it a little different.

I'll just say one thing here in closing, that we tried it when we were the government, we were condemned for it, we cancelled it out, and we tried -- and I'm only saying that it's time that you brought out a different system of finance for the municipality; for a dedicated man who can do the job better than any one of us in this Legislature, could do it, because they have the experience in knowing how to expend money within their municipalities. And what we're doing when we're giving property tax back in this method is contrary to my viewpoint and to the viewpoint, I'm sure, of many people in the province of Manitoba if you questioned them on it, because they'd say the municipal men, who have had the experience along with their Secretary-Treasurers, can allocate this money better to the people in their municipalities who are paying the taxes. And my God, the taxes are going to be high this year, and they're going to be a lot higher next year, and the property tax credit isn't the answer to the problems of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, just several brief comments in respect to the matter dealing with Leaf Rapids Development Corporation. I believe that that is a matter which is more fittingly dealt with under the estimates of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. I believe that the Development Corporation assumed responsibility for the planning operation as well. I just want to comment, though, from my own observations. I make no apology for the planning of Leaf Rapids. I think that that community is among the best planned communities that I have seen in the Province of Manitoba, bar none, but specific . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thank the Honourable Minister for drawing my attention. It is a fact that the matter is before Committee and the committee has not reported, Committee on Economic Development.

MR. PAWLEY: Insofar as the question involving the Chairman of the Municipal Board is concerned, Mr. Mitchell, there is of course no double salary, no payment of two different sets of remuneration. I believe this was dealt with several years ago in the House when the same question was asked. But the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney need

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. PAWLEY Cont'd) have no concerns that way. He is receiving just the one salary in his position, in the two roles that he is performing.

I just want to say to the Member for Souris-Killarney, and I don't want to provoke a lengthy philosophic exchange, but I for one make absolutely no apology or regrets for a program such as this one, dealing with income credit plan, which is aimed at providing assistance to those in need of assistance, those on low and fixed incomes. And compared to those that are not in a position of requiring assistance, and if the honourable member is referring to those paying large real property tax bills in respect to farm lands during a period of low income, cash farm flow, then of course the person in that position receives complete return in periods of higher farm cash flow, then of course there is a reduction in the maximum that is provided. But surely that is part of the total project or operation of the plan, that the return is based upon one's means, one's ability, one's need, and I think that is a worthy concept that is being pursued by all governments now in Canada generally, regardless of political stripe, and I'm proud of the moves that we have undertaken in that respect in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I spoke earlier on the need for sound municipal planning and the Minister, in his remarks on the Leaf Rapids Development Corporation, again I think emphasized the point that I made about municipal planning when he said that the planning for the Leaf Rapids was done by the Corporation and not the Municipal Planning Board. And again I ask the Minister, what planning authority in this province is going to have the over-all . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It was drawn to my attention, the fact is that the Leaf Rapids Corporation is reporting to the Committee on Economic Development, the matter is before Committee, and my understanding of the rule is that matters unreported from committee are not debatable in the House.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, quite obviously you weren't listening to what I was saying. I was talking about planning and I wasn't talking about the Leaf Rapids Development at all. I was talking about the planning that went into the program for Leaf Rapids. And I would ask the Minister again, what planning authority has the over-all jurisdiction in this province? Is it the Municipal Planning Board or does each planning authority just go off in their own direction without some over-all authority which is really in control? My Number One concern is that we're going to have planners coming out of our ears, out of every agency in every department, and unless we have some system, some over-all guiding authority, such as the Municipal Planning Board - that's just a suggestion. Maybe the Municipal Planning Board should not be the over-riding authority, but I would suggest that maybe this is a role that it could assume that would lend a comprehension to a systemized planning for the Province of Manitoba and a coordination of efforts that would be beneficial to all and we would start to maximize the benefits of the dollars spent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, in the case of Leaf Rapids, the planning authority, under the provisions of the Act, would be the Leaf Rapids Local Government District of Leaf Rapids, and of course the arrangement that they made for planning services is part of the operations of the Local Government District of Leaf Rapids and the advisory committee are responsible for that district. The Municipal Board's only responsibility is that of an appeal, an appeal function, appealing from objections either on the part of the earlier applicant or the municipality, with no expertise provided by the Board. The only expertise would be forthcoming through the planning branch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 90. (a) -- passed. 1(b) -- passed; 1(c) -- passed; 1(d) -- passed. Resolution 90 passed. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Chairman, could the Minister just give us a rundown on what the honorariums and the consultant fees were?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Included under that heading, Mr. Chairman, a large amount, would include the fees which were paid to consultants dealing with some studies that were done in respect to the Winnipeg Regions study. For example, analysis was done as to the location of gravel pits, gravel areas in and about the City of Winnipeg, and other things such as that, the type of soil, what not, for assistance in the Winnipeg Region study. In addition, there are

SUPPLY - MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

(MR. PAWLEY Cont'd) grants paid from that sum to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and to the Manitoba Urban Association, as well as, for instance, moneys that were expended in respect to the annual dinner of the Association. In the main, those would be -- yes, \$20,000 would be straight consultant. There is also the Secretary-Treasurers Association that would be included in that amount that receive assistance.

MR. BLAKE: . . . consider it honorariums, the Secretary Association, is that what you would consider an honorarium? My interpretation of an honorarium is something a little different than that.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, I don't know whether -- . . . such a problem defining honorarium, but it's grants to the organizations I've mentioned. ICOR is another, which is a national input organization which all the provinces contribute to the Department of Municipal Affairs for planning, research and advice. Another study I should mention is the study which is presently underway and in the process of being completed, dealing with the pension plan of secretary-treasurers by Mercer & Company that I was referring to the other day. That's the type of of consultant studies that are included within these figures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 90. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I just wonder, would there be any amount included in the consultant fees for consultations on the concept of regional government?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, there's none identified for that purpose, but I would not want to suggest to the honourable member that during the course of the year we might not want to spend some of those funds for that purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 90 passed. Resolution No. 91, (a) -- pass?
The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: If you would like to call it 5:30, Mr. Chairman, maybe we could proceed . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon?

MR. MCGILL: If you care to call it 5:30 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 7:30.