

**THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA**  
**Tuesday, May 10, 1977**

---

**TIME: 2:30 p.m.**

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker**

**MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan):** Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to my gallery where we have as our guests Mr. Robert W. Duemling, First Minister to the Embassy of the United States in Ottawa; and Mr. Tom Hutson, Consul General, United States Consulate in Winnipeg. On behalf of the honourable members we welcome you here.

We also have 20 students of the St. Norbert School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Ray Fissette. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

We have 70 students of Grade 11 standing of the Sisler High School. under the direction of Messrs. Brown and Shaw. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

And 60 students, Grade 6 standing, of the George Fittan School under the direction of Mr. Harvey Laluk. This school is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East, the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

On behalf of the members we welcome you as well.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a Ministerial Statement dealing with the unemployment figures for the Province of Manitoba which I received this morning. Copies are available.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom since becoming Minister of Labour that while we are in Session and that we receive the statistical reports dealing with employment and unemployment, that I table these reports at the appropriate time on our agenda and make brief reference to the same' and of course, Mr. Speaker, I am now so doing.

I draw to your attention, Sir, and to honourable members the fact that though we are having increases in unemployment rates, that the rate of actual unemployment in the Province of Manitoba decreased from the last report I made, from 7.2 percent to 6.8 percent. This represents a decrease, as I say, Mr. Speaker, from a month ago. But at the same time I must, in order to be factual, indicate to the House that that is an increase over the 4.6 percent of a year ago. Manitoba still records the third lowest unemployment rate in Canada after Alberta and Saskatchewan. On the seasonally adjusted basis the unemployment rate increased to 6.7 percent from 5.7 percent in March, and this represents an increase over what the rate was a year ago of 4.5 percent for Manitoba.

In terms of actual numbers of unemployed in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, I take a little satisfaction — and I emphasize "little" — in that the total number of unemployed in Manitoba decreased by 1,000 April over March. At the same time, Sir, as we recorded a decrease of 1,000 in the total number of unemployed, Manitoba's labour force increased in April over March by the whopping number of 9,000 people in our labour force, and this is 14,000 greater, Mr. Speaker, than it was a year ago, which to me is an indication that the economy of Manitoba is in good hands with this administration. In total numbers of employment, we increased by 11,000 from March to April of this year, to a figure of 423,800, which also represents an increase over the year, Mr. Speaker, of 4,000 from the 419,000 employed a year ago.

I do indicate, Mr. Speaker, to honourable members of the legislature that I, as the Minister of Labour, do not suggest that we should be complacent on receipt of these reduced numbers of unemployed, and the increase in the labour force. But I do want to point out to the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, a change in attitude as it appears to be taking place, insofar as the federal administration is concerned, particularly as a result of the summit meetings recently held in London, where the Prime Minister of Canada at long last recognized that unemployment was the prime concern of he and his government, particularly insofar as unemployment is concerned with students, and the younger people.

I also note, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in the federal administration, Bud Cullen, has acknowledged that problem in Canada, insofar as unemployment is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, members of this Assembly, and I'm sure the citizens of Manitoba, will recognize through the announcements made by my Premier and the Minister of Finance, that we recognize the severe problem that we have in unemployment, notwithstanding the fact that our relative position has remained comparable, and if you want to extend the word comparable to include favorably

considered, with the rest of Canada, that we are not satisfied, we are hopeful, and I say that advisably, Sir, that we are hopeful that the involvement of provincial funds into the area of unemployment, and the provisions in jobs in Manitoba, will assist us to further reduce, and I say "further reduce" advisably, the total number of unemployed that we have in the Province of Manitoba.

I respectfully, Sir, suggest that there is no provincial jurisdiction in Canada that is attempting to resolve the problems of unemployment, as indeed is the government headed by the gentleman on my left, and this process will continue.

I am prepared, and ready to accept criticisms that we have not done enough, and I guess that is fair game, Mr. Speaker, but I think that I am justified, as Minister of Labour, in making this announcement here today, in saying it could have been a helluva lot worse under a different administration.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, no juxtaposition of figures by the Minister of Labour, no growing awareness or change in attitude on the part of the Federal Government of the type alluded to by the Minister, can change the basic facts, Sir, that in terms of unemployment' Manitoba is now reaching a near crisis situation. It can be sliced and dissected and analyzed and presented to this Chamber, in any form that the Minister wishes. The fact of the matter is that we are at a near crisis situation and we've got tens of thousands of students from universities, community colleges and high schools coming into the labour force at this very moment and for the Minister to suggest that he and his colleagues are not satisfied is not, Sir, anywhere near good enough. He should be far more than dissatisfied. He should be absolutely outraged, absolutely upset, he should be absolutely furious about the situation, not simply in a state of dissatisfaction.

Sir, I have the Statistics Canada figures in front of me that I am sure the Minister has himself. The facts of the matter debunk the position taken by the First Minister in this province in recent days when he has told Manitobans that he needs time before he can call the next election to correct some of the misconceptions that are being disseminated around the province. Mr. Speaker, he hasn't got time, he hasn't got time. Our situation, in terms of employment and unemployment, has been growing progressively worse so the First Minister has not got time to correct the kinds of difficulties and the kinds of problems that he suggests are at hand. The facts of the matter today, Sir, are that the labour force in Manitoba has grown less in the past thirty days and in the past year than in any other province; that Manitoba has the lowest net gain in employment; that Manitoba continues to have the poorest job creation record for any Western province and that the record is also worse than that for Canada as a whole.

Sir, we are looking at a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate of 6.7 percent — a full percentage point higher than a month ago — and more than 2 percentage points, 2.2 percentage points, I believe, higher than a year ago. From 6.7 percent now compared to 4.5 percent in April of 1976. Alongside our seasonally adjusted unemployment rate of 6.7 percent for the month of April, Saskatchewan's is 5.5 percent, Sir, representing a slight worsening of their situation and Alberta's is 4.3 percent, representing a fractional improvement in their situation. If you look at the figures for job creation, persons coming into the job market and jobs available, Sir, we trail the Western provinces and the nation as a whole dismally.

One of the most difficult areas and one of the prime ones is the area of construction. Of 28,000 tradesmen in the province — and those are the figures of the Department of Labour, Mr. Speaker — there are today 7,700 of them out of work for an unemployment rate of 26 to 27 percent. Most of those are in rural Manitoba. Of that 7,700 out of work, 5,005 are in rural Manitoba and there has been nothing done by this government, Sir, in the past year to tackle the employment problem in the province at large notwithstanding the difficulties in the City of Winnipeg. There has been nothing done in either of those areas.

So, Sir, I suggest that the Minister and his colleagues burn the midnight oil rather than congratulate themselves and tackle this problem for the critical problem that it is. It is more urgent than ever, Sir, that the Minister heed our words of a few days ago that the Federal Minister of Manpower, the Honourable Bud Cullen, be discouraged in the extreme from bringing in an Unemployment Insurance qualification program that would be structured on regional unemployment levels. That is not good enough. It is not good enough to structure it on out-dated levels to begin with but on any levels of that kind, it is not good enough. It should be structured on employment opportunities, job creation, and if that's the case, then Manitoba would be getting the best break under the program because we have very few job opportunities, very little job creation in respect to other provinces. That's our problem, Sir.

The challenge is that of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industry and Commerce, as I have said before, as well as the Minister of Labour to go back to introducing methods that will stimulate the private sector. That's the only thing that is going to save us. They seem to be deaf to that message but that, Sir, is what Manitoba needs.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Any other Tabling of Reports or Ministerial Statements; Notices of Motion;

ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. STERLING R. LYON (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, a question for the First Minister. At the beginning of the session, in the Throne Speech it was announced that some plan or piece of legislation with respect to accident insurance would be brought before the House during the current session. I was wondering if the First Minister is now in a position, as we reach what might be considered the tail end of the session, to advise the House as to whether or not we may be seeing a White Paper legislation, or what form, if any, that will appear in.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the order of three weeks ago, a question was asked to much the same effect and I indicated at that time that there would be a White Paper, a Green Paper, which would be tabled and hopefully by mid-May. We are still looking to that as the target, so that means in approximately a week.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It relates to Polar Gas and the request by the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood to be involved with and in the decisions with respect to the pipeline and the social economic effects of the pipeline in Manitoba. First, I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to confirm Polar Gas' policy that they will consult with individual groups and advise the provinces, but not deal with the provinces and the groups within the provinces.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not had that told me directly by senior people of Polar Gas. I think that one observation that is relevant here, is that the proposed route of the pipeline, with one exception, does not come within a 100 miles of any human settlement. The one exception being Shamattawa, in which the distance is approximately in the order of 25 or 30 miles. But even that route, Sir, is tentative.

We have already agreed that at the time of the filing of any application, if and when that happens that there is an application, that we will want to have a watching brief and in all probability an intervention to ascertain whether the costs, the comparative costs, might not favour or be equally served by some alternative route.

**MR. SPIVAK:** I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to indicate whether information has been supplied by Polar Gas of a meeting with native groups for May 31st of this year and whether the province has been advised of this and advised and asked to attend.

**MR. SCHREYER:** A communication of that specific kind, if made, would be, I would think, to the office of the Minister of Industry and Commerce and in his absence I will have to check.

**MR. SPIVAK:** I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to indicate whether the government will be prepared to meet with the native groups prior to their meeting with Polar Gas at the end of this month.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that goes without saying. Meetings take place from time to time at which any relevant subject matter of interest is open for discussion and it can be brought forward.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights, a final question.

**MR. SPIVAK:** I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the government has any research on the analysis and prediction of the social economic effects of the pipeline in Manitoba.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Berger Commission having just reported after three years, I suppose that one could now order a similar commission of inquiry with respect to Polar Gas. There are some differences which probably predicate the holding of a commission of inquiry really *de novo*.

I have already said that the route that traverses Manitoba is, in itself, not yet settled on, so there is some question as to what area we would be studying social environmental impact on, unless my honourable friend wants to see two studies.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. HARRY ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Yesterday he indicated in response to the Berger Commission report, the suggestion that no single group or individuals should be in a position of unduly delaying necessary public works, whether it involved land, claims, etc. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is, does the situation, the drawn-out proceedings at Nelson House, now approaching four years, do they fall into this classification as the Minister described shouldn't be allowed to happen?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Mines.

**HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it abundantly clear, both in the House and in writing, that that is exactly the position that we take vis-a-vis the native population in the province of Manitoba and the Churchill River Diversion.

**Tuesday, May 10, 1977**

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister, a supplementary question to the Minister, persists, the fact of the matter is that today, at a time we need it, we still do not have . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question please.

**MR. ENNS:** . . . utilization of the Churchill River Diversion to its fullest extent. Can the Minister indicate when the litigation procedures at Nelson House will be concluded so that that valuable water can be used in the public good?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I can advise my honourable friend that in any discussions we are having we are taking the position that this group, nor any other group, is able to veto the Churchill River Diversion; that the program is one which we believe we have the lawful right to proceed with as a result of a grievance between the representatives of the Indian community, namely the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba in 1966. Discussions are an attempt to resolve the problems but we have taken the position from the outset and continue to take the position that we are legally entitled and that no group has a veto power over that process.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. ENNS:** A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate to us in dollar figures the cost to the public of not being able to use CRD to its fullest extent either on a day by day basis, week by week basis, or year by year basis.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I can't give my honourable friend any figures but what I can tell him is that it's the position of the Province of Manitoba that despite discussing these matters with a mediator there is no legal impediment to the province proceeding and if the Federal Government wants to sue us in that respect they can go ahead and do so.

**MR. ENNS:** Can the Minister then just confirm THAT as of this moment, this second, 20,000 cubic feet of water is flowing over the Missi structure unutilized by Hydro.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to my honourable friend that that may or may not be the case — I can't confirm it — but that the Province of Manitoba does not take the position that they are precluded by any group from making use of the Churchill River Diversion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BOB BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the First Minister and would ask him if he has been in contact with the Federal Minister of Transport, Otto Lang, re the sale of Transair?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes.

**MR. BANMAN:** I wonder if the First Minister could inform the House whether he has expressed concern with regard to the possible loss to Manitoba of the Maintenance and Overhaul Base based here in Winnipeg.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have expressed concern. We have received assurance from the Minister of Transport that he has received assurance from Pacific Western that the level of activity and complement of personnel at Transair's Winnipeg operation would be maintained. We have asked for more definition and specification to that kind of undertaking and it is my distinct understanding that that will be forthcoming, either directly from PWA or from the Minister of Transport office, within the matter of a very few days. The undertaking in writing is being requested so that there can later be no misunderstanding as to what was meant and what the qualifiers or caveats on that were.

**MR. BANMAN:** In light of problems of previous assurances from the same Federal Minister, I wonder if the First Minister has accepted these assurances as being *bona fide*?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I do not see that it is advisable or acceptable to proceed on a premise that in advance someone's word is not acceptable. Frankly, Sir, my problem is one of reconciling the Minister's position with that of the stated intent and spirit of Bill C46, which if enacted proposes to disallow precisely the same kind of action that is now being presumably allowed, indeed encouraged, by the self-same Minister. That is a problem. It is one of logic and the Minister of Transport, I understand, has some explanation which would square what seems to be rather difficult to reconcile. So we're waiting for his statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

**MR. STEVE PATRICK:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister on the same topic. During the Western Premiers Conference in Brandon, did the First Minister have any communication with respect to Transair and PWA in respect to approval? Did he have any commitment from the Premier of Alberta that the location of the hangars and the personnel would not be moved out of Winnipeg if approval was given to PWA to take over Transair?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, there was that kind of discussion. There was that kind of indication or undertaking in broad principle. Since then there has been a more specific undertaking and that is, as of this morning. It is, however, verbal and as indicated we expect to be in receipt of a written definition of the undertaking within a matter of a very few days.

**MR. PATRICK:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did the Premier of Alberta agree that the Cabinet of Alberta would not approve the takeover if Manitoba objected?

**MR. SCHREYER:** That is my understanding.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me. I have a question to the First Minister. In view of the concern that the Leader of the Official Opposition has expressed with regard to when the government is going to be introducing a White Paper dealing with the universal accident benefits, can the Minister indicate whether he has yet received an apology from the Leader of the Official Opposition with regard to his charges that Manitoba Hydro wasted some \$605 million of taxpayers' money.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN:** I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I may ask the First Minister a question, and I ask him if he may want to take a lead from the Attorney-General and provide the answer to the Member for Radisson as soon as he receives it, so to prevent him, or obviate the necessity of him rising in his place every day?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought I had in effect done just that. I have invited the honourable member to peruse, line by line, the transcript of the committee hearings of Public Utilities in which the Chairman and Chief Engineer of Manitoba Hydro have in effect answered that question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable First Minister for advising me how I should proceed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question, please.

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** However, I have a question to the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. Can the Minister indicate what would have been the effect on the communities around the Churchill River Diversion . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Question.

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** . . . if the government had proceeded . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Order, please. The question is hypothetical. Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, you allowed the Member for Lakeside to ask the Minister of Mines questions along a similar line. I would like to ask the Minister if he can indicate what would have been the effect on the communities along the Churchill River should the government have proceeded with the 869 foot level on the South Indian Lake, as was proposed by the former government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Mines.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's fairly common knowledge that approximately 900,000 square miles of land would have been flooded as against approximately 300,000, that the community of South Indian Lake would have had to be totally moved because that location would have been inundated, and that there would be far more ecological changes than are occurring under the existing program. That is why, Mr. Speaker, following Mr. Cass-Beggs' recommendations that the Underwood-McLellan firm recommended a reduction as a result of receiving the good advice of Mr. Cass-Beggs, they made recommendations which followed Mr. Cass-Beggs' advice and came in with a reduced program which has now been endorsed by the Conservative Party.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Minister indicate, to the Minister of Mines, could he indicate what would have been the cost to the people of Manitoba and at the same time we wish to indicate, as the First Minister advised me that he would advise the Leader of the Official Opposition, that he, too should learn to read . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. SHAFRANSKY:** . . . some of the reports that have been . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he is in a position to indicate to the House whether his government agrees in principle with the position that Transair finds itself in now or that we in Manitoba find ourselves in now, whereby the decision on the purchase of the regional carrier is really subject to a decision of a Cabinet of a Provincial Government. In principle, does he believe that this should arise in Canada?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not a good circumstance, I agree with the honourable member. However, he is obviously ignoring two other considerations, that the transaction is predicated not only on the attitude of the government of the Province of Manitoba but also on a finding of the Canadian Transportation Commission's Air Transport Committee which is a quasi-judicial function and it is predicated on the transfer of certain somewhat more profitable Air Canada

routes to PWA. And frankly, Sir, that really does put the whole matter on to a basis of being subject to certain hearings and certain decisions still to be made. So that it is not really only one factor, there are several factors.

**MR. SPIVAK:** I appreciate the answer that the First Minister has given the House but I wonder if he can indicate whether, in his discussions with the Federal officials, he has raised an objection to the fact that a provincial government finds itself in a position where a Cabinet of another provincial government is in fact making a decision of a major economic importance to the province?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, now that I understand my honourable friend's question, I say to him that I do not regard that as a major factor of concern. The major factor of concern is whether or not there will be a realistic commitment made with respect to the retention of a given level of activity with respect to the Transair base in Winnipeg. That's factor No. 1.

Factor No. 2 has to do with whether or not the proceedings of the Air Transport Committee of the Canadian Transportation Commission will somehow be prejudiced by these kind of transactions that are publicized in advance and made subject to certain decisions being made by them.

My honourable friend, finally I say to him, it is far less our concern that a decision be made by the duly-elected government of another province, a sister province in Canada. I find that no more disturbing, in fact less disturbing than if that decision were being made in some polished table board room.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Yes. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether there has been any realistic commitment given about future expansion of the regional carrier to meet the needs of the province?

**MR. SCHREYER:** This is why I've indicated that the discussions which have taken place so far are to be followed, for it to be useful, by a written indication of intent. It is my distinct understanding that the intention is to operate to provide the level of service, the level of activity with respect to overhaul and maintenance that obtained under Transair management in recent years.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs. In light of the discussion that is taking place in the City of Winnipeg concerning the proposed arena development in the CNR east yards, can the Minister indicate whether the province has been party to those discussions and has received any request for assistance for the development of the CNR east yards and has the province taken any position at this stage as to what commitment for capital expenditures is it prepared to take in that development area?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs.

**HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks):** Mr. Speaker' I can tell the honourable member that the provincial government has not been involved in the discussions between the city and other agencies, whether it be CNR or someone else, that it has not been brought forward to our level certainly. This is something the city itself will have to determine and whoever they deal with, they will be dealing with directly.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. In view of the serious problem of job creation in the province and in the city, particularly in the construction field, has the province made any overtures to the city to see if there can be any further capital expenditure for housing or for recreational facilities in that central part of the city either in the CNR east yards site or in other areas in the city?

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, under the Special Municipal Loan Fund the City of Winnipeg can and would qualify for labour forgiveness loans and they could certainly take advantage of those funds if they wanted to launch some special construction programs or special types of programs, and could draw down on that particular fund as they did for the Sargent Park Pool, as they did for the Library and other projects.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister on the same subject. In view of the fact that any question related to the CNR east yards requires agreement by the three levels of government in terms of rail relocation, can you indicate whether there is a continuing tri-level committee meeting on this particular subject. Have they come up with any proposals or guidelines as to what that relocation may be and would this have a bearing on the immediate or imminent development in the CNR east yards, particularly for housing purposes?

**MR. MILLER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the first and foremost hurdle that has to be overcome is the views of the City of Winnipeg with regard to the proposal to redevelop the east yards. That is something that the city is first going to have to determine whether it wants to do. It's only then, after that, that the question of what lines are going to be moved and where, if any, only at that time will the matter move to another level. But in the initial instance, I can't see any need for moving it to another level if, in fact, the primary decision has not yet been made.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Wolseley asked me a question in regard to misleading advertising. The subject matter was referred by the Department of Consumer Affairs to the Federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for

**Tuesday, May 10, 1977**

investigation falling under their jurisdiction. And the reason that the problem in question did fall under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government is mainly in regard to the subject matter or the company not being licensed under the provincial Consumers' Bureau. It is licensed under the City of Winnipeg and they conduct 80 percent of their business on the on-site, permanent site and about 20 percent of their volume is covered by direct sales from outside of the premise. So the question could be pursued by the honourable member with the Federal Department.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **SECOND READINGS - GOVERNMENT BILLS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed with the introduction on Second Reading of Bill No. 62.

#### **BILL (NO. 62) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CITY OF WINNIPEG ACT**

**MR. MILLER** presented Bill (No. 62) An Act to Amend the City of Winnipeg Act for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. MILLER:** I thought perhaps it wouldn't be necessary because, as members know, when the Bill was distributed in the House explanatory notes were distributed at the same time to help members fully understand the amendments, and I thought those explanatory notes were so clear and precise that no explanation would be needed. However, having been asked to give an explanation — (Interjection)— I'll try to give a few. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. MILLER:** All right. Well, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 62 provides for the refinement and the improvement of the legislative framework within which the City of Winnipeg operates. It has been now more than five years since the province provided for the unification of local governments in the Greater Winnipeg area. Previously the citizens of Winnipeg — Metropolitan Winnipeg — had suffered from fragmented authority and equitable sharing of the municipal tax base and inequitable concentration of urban costs. Now we accepted our constitutional responsibility for providing a legal framework for local government which would allow Greater Winnipeg to live up to its fullest potential as an urban community.

Through the City of Winnipeg Act of 1971, or was it 1972 — 1971, proclaimed in 1972 I think it was — we proceeded to unify the civic government and its administrative structure, to create a uniform tax base, to provide for the integration and the rationalization of municipal services. At the same time we created a system of community committees which would encourage greater citizen accessibility to influence city decision-making procedures. We knew that such a dramatic change in local government would be very difficult to carry out. It was inevitable. So we provided a variety of transitional measures to ease the process of unification and we determined to undertake a comprehensive review of the Act within five years.

So in accordance with the Act, Mr. Speaker, we appointed a Committee of Review that was chaired by Judge Peter Taraska, and its members were Mr. Earl Levin and Allan O'Brien. The committee and its able staff proceeded systematically to canvass public opinion, carry out research, to draw upon their own considerable knowledge and experience in producing an evaluation of the City of Winnipeg Act and the activities of the city's management and its implications.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly would want to not let this time pass to acknowledge and thank Judge Peter Taraska and Mr. Levin and Mr. O'Brien and their staff for the manner in which they carried out their review, the time spent on it, and the seriousness with which they addressed the matter. It was not easy to do. I know in other jurisdictions some commissions have been appointed and it is over two years now that they are still studying the matter. So I want to commend them for, as I say, the seriousness with which they took up the task, of the thoroughness of their review and the fact that they completed it in what I feel is a very reasonable length of time.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the message we received from the Review Committee and from the submissions to the committee and from our own soundings is that the unification of Greater Winnipeg was the right thing to do. It has provided for much more equitable sharing in both the costs and the benefits of municipal services, that is throughout the Metropolitan area, and it has made possible the utilization of city-wide resources to deal with city-wide urban problems.

I know that there has been considerable criticism periodically in the newspapers, in the media about the Mayor and the Councillors, about the City Council, and, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Mayor and the Council and the administrative staff of the city because it is through their efforts that the challenge of unification was made into a reality during the past five years.

They had to start from a totally different system into a unified system, had to move from that one day, on January 1st move it to something else. It was not easy to do. The fact that it was done at all and

as smoothly as it was done is a credit to these people, the fact that they try to work within the Act and the requirements of the Act.

So, of course, there have been problems, that's inevitable. There remains a great deal to be done and I may add an of course, I suspect there always will be problems as there is in every government, in every structure. It simply reflects the changing times, the dynamics of a city, which is a living organism, and one must change constantly in order to reflect the needs of a growing society, a growing city.

Nevertheless we feel very strongly, I feel this certainly, that the citizens of Winnipeg are satisfied that the transition from the thirteen jurisdictions which existed prior to 1972, that transition from thirteen jurisdictions into one has been made successfully and irreversibly. We are now prepared to take the next major step in the evolution of Winnipeg Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, we propose through Bill 62 to further consolidate and approve the political processes in a manner comprehensive to the needs of the citizens of the City of Winnipeg and the means of serving them; to encourage the adoption by individual councillors of a broader policy perspective while they still remain sensitive in response to the concerns of citizens; and to encourage the greater degree of accountability by City Council for its actions. We propose to give the City Council much greater freedom to determine its own administrative structures and its own procedures.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, I will try to give the highlights of the proposed changes. I cannot refer to particular clauses, so some of the things I mention will probably cover a number of clauses throughout the bill.

There will be the continued election of the Mayor at large, and, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the citizens of Winnipeg do desire this kind of election of Mayor. We recognized this prior to 1972 and we recognize it again. I think that it makes sense that if this is how people feel that we should not therefore move to the proposal that the Mayor should be elected by Council, but rather he should be continued to be elected at large. That is the method that we propose to continue.

However, because he is elected at large he is in a different position than anyone else on that Council, Mr. Speaker. For that matter he should be because his constituency is the entire City of Winnipeg. Therefore, by virtue of being elected by the population at large he should be automatically on all civic committees as a matter of right, by an automatic appointment. He should not be dependent upon the election by Council to this committee or that committee, but rather as Mayor he will serve through Statute as a member of every committee of Council whether it be EPC, Standing Committee or what have you.

We are introducing something new and I will certainly be interested in the views expressed by members with regard to a person who desires to run for the Mayoralty. We are suggesting that a person may run for election as a Mayor at large and as a Councillor in a ward. Now I am pragmatic enough and I am realistic enough to recognize that this is not a matter that has much meaning today, but I am thinking in the future. Some day when the present Mayor of the City of Winnipeg may decide to retire . . .

**SOME MEMBERS:** Never.

**MR. MILLER:** Well, with all due respect that day may come as it will come to all of us. And when that day comes, Mr. Speaker, I am putting forward the suggestion that when that day comes, people who have served well, served ably are now in the position where they have to decide they are going to run for Mayor; if they do so that's the end of the line. If they make it they're still in. If not then they are out of the picture completely. It seems that there is merit in considering that we should not make it necessary for people to be lost in the public service, people who have done well, who are respected, who have much to contribute and have contributed, that they should suddenly be lost to the community simply because it is an all or nothing situation. So we are suggesting that the concept of the Mayor running at large as well as a Councillor within a ward, should be entertained, and should be considered.

As well, Mr. Speaker, we are reducing the size of council to 28 from 50, and we are consolidating the twelve communities into six communities, and they will conform with the administrative districts by and large. This should encourage councillors to adopt a broader policy perspective because of the community being larger, covering more area. At the same time, by retaining the single member wards, it will retain the responsiveness of councillors to concerns of their electors. So we are still maintaining that sort of accountability and access by the individual.

Mr. Speaker, in the initial years of the unified city, it was important that there be substantial administrative detail in the City of Winnipeg Act, to avoid confusion in the day to day operation of the city from its inception. Now the proposed amendments will loosen the statutory reins on the city, to allow it far greater flexibility and autonomy over its own administrative methods and procedures.

To bring about this administrative autonomy, there are changes being suggested in the Act. Council will be given the power to establish by by-law, the number of standing committees and the composition of each. Council will also be given the power to delegate by by-law, its powers and

duties, to the Executive Policy Committee, as well as to the standing committees — there will be a number of them. However, Council will not be able to delegate to committees, the powers and duties which the city's required to enact by by-laws, such as planning and zoning by-laws, or the capital budget, or the current budget, the power to appoint the commissioners, the chief commissioner, the department heads, that, Council cannot delegate away. Council will be given the power to establish by by-law, the departments and the administrative divisions of the city and to designate their responsibilities and functions — something that the Act is very precise on — now the Council will be able to do this. Council will also have the power to vary or to change the powers and the duties of the Board of Commissioners. So, Mr. Speaker, there is a considerable loosening of the reins, to use that phrase, and far greater onus on the City of Winnipeg to determine for itself how it would like to see the city administration function.

The different levels of city planning, Mr. Speaker, are also more clearly defined. Council will be given greater authority to deal with what are known as action area plans — the plans of subdivisions, zoning by-laws, variances, etc. At the same time, the individual citizen's rights to notice and opportunity to be heard will continue to be protected. We are removing the present requirement of referral to the Minister, and that is being removed, so, in those areas that I've just mentioned, there will no reference to the Minister, and therefore, from the Minister beyond him to the Municipal Board.

However, regarding the Greater Winnipeg development plan, and the community plan — these are the two major plans. The development plan for example, is the statement of the policies and the principles, to guide and direct the development of the city and they are very broad principles. In that kind of planning, there is the community plan, which is a plan for the entire community, the large area, these will still go to the Minister before third reading, and this is simply to assure that the larger provincial concerns are being taken into account, because these plans, by their magnitude, will impinge beyond the City of Winnipeg boundaries. They will have broad implications beyond the city itself.

As well, because the development plan, and the community plans are so important to future growth of Winnipeg, the Act provides that Council shall prepare those plans. In the unlikely event, and I say it's very unlikely, that they do not, the Minister, after consultation with the city, the Minister of Urban Affairs would be empowered to do all the things necessary to see to it that such plans are indeed prepared and adopted.

The authority and powers of the City of Winnipeg Council, by the Municipal Board, has long been a matter of contention, and disagreement. A strong case was made to the committee review, and the committee review did have comment on it. You know it's felt that the politically responsible people are those elected to office — those that have to stand for office and be accountable every three years, or whenever they stand for office, and it should not be an appointed board, who really are responsible to no one, because once they are appointed' their responsibility is really to themselves, or to their colleagues on the board, and their interpretation of how they think things should be done. So the role of the Municipal Board with powers to amend or to veto are discontinued. The matters may still be referred to them, to the board for consideration, for advice, but whereas today their advice, it's not advice, their ruling is binding — they even have more power than the Minister. That is now being discontinued, and the matters can still be referred to them, as I say, for consideration and advice, but not veto or amendments.

As well, the role of the Municipal Board as the approval authority for the city's capital borrowing, will also be discontinued. That too has been a matter of serious discussion, and it has been a contentious issue. It's been a matter of disagreement between the city, by the city feeling that the Municipal Board again, is a non-elective body, and really they shouldn't have the final veto over the capital budget of the city. So that authority is being discontinued, however, it's not simply being left wide open. The city will still have to get approval from the Provincial Government, and I believe this is important because in the final analysis, the province has a responsibility to ensure that Winnipeg does remain financially solvent. You know we want to avoid what has happened in some other cities across the line, and so there's a need for the province to have an input in, and to have a say in, to the extent to which Winnipeg borrows on the capital markets, and incurs a debt. It can be done by a formula. We haven't given it any great thought yet, but I think a formula perhaps relating the debt service charges to the gross current expenditures — something of that nature could be done, and if they met that, then of course approval would be automatic.

Mr. Speaker, the Executive Policy Committee, which is one of the committees of Council, would consist of a minimum of seven members, and as I indicated earlier, the mayor is automatically a member. He does not have to be elected, he serves on that committee by virtue of being the Head of Council. The other committee members will consist of the chairman of each of the standing committees by virtue of being chairman of a standing committee; every member of a standing committee will be on the Executive Policy Committee. As well, a chairman of the committee will be elected annually by Council. Now in order to, because we feel that there shouldn't be less than seven, because less than seven makes a very small number, we are suggesting because we don't know how

many standing committees there are going to be, it's up to Council to determine that, we are suggesting that if there are less than seven, because there aren't enough standing committees, that the additional members would be appointed by Council, to achieve this minimum number of seven. On the other hand, if Council decides that there is, let's say five or six standing committees, then of course they won't have to do that, because the chairman of each committee, will be on the EPC, and because the mayor automatically would be on as the Head of Council. Now each councillor, we suggest, should be appointed to a standing committee. This would eliminate some of the problems that have existed — the feeling by some that they are being by-passed, the feeling that they cannot participate fully, and what I think is the jockeying that takes place. I do expect there will be more than three standing committees, and therefore, with a smaller Council and more committees, I can see no problem in assuring that every member of Council is on some committee.

Mr. Speaker, the community committees will retain the responsibility for preparing and submitting the annual capital budget, and the current estimates of the cost of operating the community committee, which will include the expenditures for libraries, parks, recreation, the recreation commissions where they exist, or community centres, as well as the supervision of the services. The community committees will also retain their responsibility to ensure that the residents of a community, have the opportunity to make their views on policies, programs, budgets, and services — make their views known to their councillors, so that those views may be communicated to Council or to the administration, or to an appropriate committee. It is a community committee's responsibility to receive representation from the residents of a community, on any matters, and to carry those that it considers appropriate back to Council, or some other appropriate body. So, that flow of information, and exchange of information, will be continued.

As well, the residents advisory groups will continue, and they will hopefully be more involved in the preparation of amendments to the development plan, to the draft community plans, to the zoning matters, plans of subdivisions within their communities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one change that I know is going to create some discussion. Mr. Speaker, that is one that I can simply say, put it this way: that in the interests of public good and welfare, the Provincial Government or an agency of government or certain entities designated by government — it could be a non-profit organization that carries out a function, funded by government through a grant or *per diem* — specifically designated by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, they will now be bound by the city's zoning decisions. The intention is not that the province should ignore the city, or to ignore its procedures, but rather that in the final analysis, provincial programs and policies should not be rendered ineffective by municipal action or inaction, because it is essential that certain programs continue on, whether the programs be in Health and Social Development for example, with regard to community residences, other health and social services; that they not be frustrated in delivering the programs because of a particular zoning restriction that the City of Winnipeg, on the advice of the Community Committee perhaps, might even bring forward.

So that power is being vested in the Crown and, of course, it parallels what is traditionally known as the royal prerogative, it still exists throughout Canada as a matter of fact and it exists insofar as the federal government and every other jurisdiction, that we have no power over the federal government, nor has the city any power over the federal government. The royal prerogative gives the federal government the right, the legal right, to build where it wishes, although I know that they do, of course, consult because it would be senseless not to have consultation and not to try to meet the needs of the city.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this, in the few months I've been on this, designing government structures is not easy; trying to get a consensus is not easy; trying to get unanimity is impossible; at least it is for me, some people may have a better ability in that regard than I.

So, in closing I only want to make it clear that I will welcome constructive suggestions, not just from members opposite but from members on both sides of the House, and I am sure I will hear them from both sides of the House. You know, suggestions which might further improve the legislative framework of the City of Winnipeg, to enable its citizens to develop an urban community which will yield the maximum benefit, not just for Winnipeggers but for all people of Manitoba, because, Winnipeg being the major city in Manitoba, it is necessary that the City of Winnipeg be a healthy City of Winnipeg and to that extent it will help to make for a healthier Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I don't think I have covered every point in there. If I haven't, I may have inadvertently left out something of importance, that somebody feels is important. On the other hand, I am looking forward to the debate which will follow and hear what members have to say, both in the House and after second reading, if there is going to be approval in second reading, then in Law Amendments or Municipal Affairs Committee, whichever one it goes to, to hear at that time what the public and other people might have to say. So if there can be improvements in the bill, I will certainly welcome them and I look forward to hearing the comments from both sides of the House. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of honourable members to

the loge on my left, where we have a previous member of this House, His Worship Mayor Stephen Juba. On behalf of the honourable members, we welcome you.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Brandon West, that debate be adjourned. **MOTION presented and carried.**

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, would you call readings on Adjourned Debates on Second Reading.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Very well, thank you very much.

Bill No. 5. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

**MR. HARRY GRAHAM:** Stand please, Mr. Sieaker.

### **BILL (NO. 13) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE MUNICIPAL ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 13. The Honourable member for Pembina.

**MR. GEORGE HENDERSON:** Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Member for Gladstone.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill 13 is more or less a housekeeping bill, An Act to Amend the Municipal Act. There are, however, a few clauses that we would like to have further explanation on and consequently we would ask the Minister to reply in his closing debate or sometime along the way.

The bill allows jailers, sheriffs, bailiffs, clerks of county court and referees to hold office on municipal councils. I feel that county court clerks and referees should be disqualified from holding because of the judicial nature of their jobs.

Another clause of the bill allows for the removal of councillors for non-attendance at meetings. Three meetings, under the old bill, were mandatory, that you had to resign or were removed. Under the proposed addition to the Act, it would appear to give the Minister some flexibility as to whether or not the seat is to be forfeited and we would like some further explanation on this particular clause.

Another portion of the bill is to do with the Municipal Pension Plan. We wonder why the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council has decided that December 31st is to be the day determined by them for the Board to consider all pensions.

The bill removes the necessity of a municipality obtaining the consent of another municipality where the former intends to expropriate or acquire land in another municipality. We would like an explanation as to what the reasons would be, that they would be wanting to expropriate land and why they would be going over the head of the other municipality.

It also prohibits councillors from buying land at tax sales because they may be in a favourable position on inside information. Any offenders under the new bill could not be convicted because the bill has failed to make the offenders liable because the bill has not been amended to include them as being subject to the fine.

These are basically the few clauses that we have shown a little bit of, not alarm or anything, Mr. Speaker, but just the fact that we would require further explanation. With that, that would be all I have to say on this bill. Thank you.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **BILL (NO. 39) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE PLANNING ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 39. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MR. FERGUSON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Here we have an amendment to a bill which was introduced in 1975, Bill No. 44. The original bill contained 58 pages and had 97 clauses. Bill No. 39, the present bill, has 14 pages and 45 clauses. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that under this legislation we go to some of the major things that are governing our lives. The Lord's Prayer contains 56 words; the Ten Commandments contain 297 words; the American Declaration of Independence has 300 words; and the European Common Market directive on the export of duck eggs contains 26,999 words. So here again we have the fact that when we go to the bureaucrats and we start drafting legislation, we seem to find ourselves in a position that there is so much included in a bill that it is more or less beyond the grasp of the average layman to understand it.

The bill is mostly housekeeping with the exception of the new portion and this is to do with the section concerning the north. This was covered the other day by the Member for Fort Rouge and I don't think we will go into that matter again. It does place the handling of the complete north in the hands of the Minister of Northern Affairs, all the planning, and we feel that it is a little bit too much power in an individual's hands. It is going to remove the power from the people who are going to be involved and consequently, I cannot, as the Member for Fort Rouge said, I cannot understand the members from the north letting this bill slip through. Possibly they still will make some comment on

it.

The bill is not working at the municipal level as well as it might. Here again, Mr. Speaker, I have to point out I feel that it is because of the cumbersome method of involvement. If a person considers what really is involved now in any transaction, basically you have to go through the Planning Board, then you are through the zoning, then possibly you have to pass the Clean Environment Commission. It is becoming almost prohibitive to start a deal, you have to have lead time of possibly a year or a year and a half to accomplish anything. Hopefully, the thing will be streamlined. We certainly recognize the fact that there has to be planning because of the fact that there is quite a large group of the urban people settling out in the rural and they just can't be brought in helter-skelter. We all know that there are building codes that have to be honoured and sewage, etc.

But here again we would hope that this bill, rather than being added to, that the government in power would take a long hard look at it and possibly try to streamline it so that it does get down to a point where it could be more readily understood. We are aware of what the Income Tax Branch are always telling us, that they have come out with a very simplified form but it seems that then you have to take it to a lawyer or two or three accountants to figure it out after it comes out. Basically, this is something that I think we are facing here.

I feel that there is a great danger in this Planning Act that, again, the bureaucratic load may become so heavy that the government in power could possibly be attempting to sneak regional government through the back door, to the degree that the municipalities are going to find this workload too heavy and they are going to say, we'll pass it on to someone else.

There is one other thing that I would like to bring up and have the Minister answer it, and that is the apparent discrepancy between the establishment of cottages and trailer parks. This would be in the recreational areas around the lakes. My understanding is that a cottage development in a resort area is under municipal planning; it must have 14,500 square feet if it is within 1,000 feet of the lake and if it is more than 1,000 feet from the lake, it must contain two acres. Added to this is the 10 percent factor for service lanes, beach access, etc. Whereas a trailer park, unless a lease is registered against the title and has been in effect for one year, only is required to have 1,500 square feet per site and no provision has to be made for drainage, access of public beach, etc.

I do feel that, if my information is correct, there is a discrepancy here that should be straightened up. I feel it is a little unfair that a cottage owner has to add a 10 percent and have the footage involved, where a trailer is not required to do so.

I think with those few words, Mr. Speaker, that that is all I have to say on that bill. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, before the Minister replies — I know that he wasn't here to hear all of the suggestions that were made by the Member for Gladstone — but before he closes debate I have just a few comments that I want to make. I don't want to cover the same ground that the member has covered, I perhaps want to deal with the bill more in a philosophical way than I do with its particular provisions.

When the Planning Act was first introduced into this Chamber, I expressed some concern at that time. I thought it was a device to impose regional government over the municipalities. My suspicions have not been allayed by the application of the bill within the past two years. Indeed, Sir, I go so far as to suggest that they have been confirmed. I find very little activity on the part of the people that are responsible for the administration of the Planning Act, very little activity dealing with land use planning but a great deal of activity in usurping the authority of the municipal councils, to the extent, Sir, that one of the municipal councillors in the Municipality of Morris was moved to make some statements that, again, further the suspicions that I have.

The amendments that are now being proposed are, in my view, designed to further consolidate that hold over the municipalities and particularly as it applies to northern residents.

I would like to place on the record, Sir, a news release that appeared in the Carman paper, The Valley Leader, on May 4th, 1977, in which one of the rural councillors in the Municipality of Morris had some comments to make about what his suspicions and his fears were and they are pretty much along the lines that I had suggested in 1975. Although I have had no particular communication with this councillor, he is expressing what I believe to be the fears and the thoughts of most rural councillors in the Province of Manitoba. The headline of the story says, "Planning increases load on Morris R.M. Council." This, incidentally, Sir, appeared on May 4th, 1977. "Earlier this year, the Rural Municipality of Morris Council changed its meeting schedule from once a month to two meetings each month. Change in the Council meetings scheduled reflects the work load. Councillor Gilbert Cretton told the leader that when he first sat on the R.M. Council, most of his time as councillor was spent in dealing with drainage and road projects. Today, the major item of the Council is planning. The R.M. of Morris has been involved in planning since 1968. The time needed to deal with planning problems has increased. Councillor Cretton says that this is due, in part, to Provincial Government regulations and legislation which have made planning more complicated for the local council. He says that planning is becoming a burden for the rural councillor and feels that the Provincial Government is making it so hoping we will throw up our hands."

**Tuesday, May 10, 1977**

That's a rather surprising and I think a startling admission for a rural councillor to make. I don't think Mr. Cretton or any of the other rural councillors who have expressed some concerns about the application of the Planning Act, are doing so unfairly or not out of a sense of some feeling for their own responsibilities. The Minister, when he introduced amendments to the Planning Act, had this to say. He said, "There may be some changes required that may not conform to the provincial land use policies."

In 1975 when the bill was first introduced in this Chamber, I urged the government to indicate what their land use policies would be. I had some support for the legislation in 1975 as a measure that would do something about land use planning. I think that's necessary. The rural councillors believe that is necessary and, for reasons I need not explain to this Chamber because I think most members of this Chamber understand the reasons why, there is a necessity for some kind of planning in order to ensure the most effective and the proper use of our land resources.

But I have seen or heard nothing from either the administrators of the Planning Act, the Minister, or any of his officials, that would indicate to me that they do have, in fact, a plan for land use. Indeed — I don't want to encroach on another piece of legislation that is being introduced in this Chamber — but indeed, Sir, the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture when he introduced the Farm Lands Protection Act, would indicate to me that there is no land use policy. I think that if municipal councillors or the people entrusted with the responsibility of the administration of this Planning Act are to make their objectives known to the people of this province, then the first thing they must do is to outline to the councillors and outline to the people of this province — and I would think that the first place they would do that is in this Chamber — a land use policy that can be understood. Not just a setting up of a level of bureaucracy for the sake of having another level of bureaucracy. We all know how that happens.

We all know how it is so easy to start to give power and authority to a group of people and they just continue to build upon that power. The measure of success in the Civil Service is to a large extent the number of people that they can add to their staff and the amounts of money that they can spend, whether they are achieving anything or not a monster that begins to feed upon itself and continues to grow like Topsy without any particular purpose in mind. I think this is what's happening here but it's an administration, it's a body that has grown all out of proportion to the time that it has been in existence.

Now we all are concerned about land use planning. We're all concerned that the proper use be made of our land resources in this province but I doubt very seriously whether this administration, or whether the particular branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs that the Planning Act comes under, is doing the kind of job that I would have liked to see it do and the hopes that we all had for it. I get concerned when the Director of the Planning Act, in speaking to municipal councillors, tells them that one of the great problems they face is that the government doesn't own all the land. It would be so much easier for them to implement their policies and their philosophy and their ideas. That kind of a statement concerns a great deal of people and a large number of the people who have been elected on the municipal councils and perhaps that kind of a statement is something that compels municipal levels of government from withdrawing and being very careful about embarking wholeheartedly and embracing the planning district concept that is inherent in this legislation.

What we want to see is some direction in land use planning. Directions that can be understood, not only by the rural councillors, but that can be understood by the people of this province. We are not getting that direction. I suggested at the time that the bill was introduced that one of the first things that needed to be done was to outline a clear policy of land use that could be understood by everyone. To my knowledge, that has not been done yet and perhaps it is one of the reasons why there is so much reluctance on the part of the people of this province to accept the concept that is envisaged in the Planning Act.

Aside from that, Sir, there was an inherent suspicion of the imposition of another level of bureaucracy over the municipal councils and between the municipal councils and the Provincial Government. I don't think that that suspicion was misplaced. I feel that a great deal of that is happening and I don't think that it is necessary. I don't care what the bureaucrats say. I don't care how much they want to build an organization that they can call their own and that they can continue to add to. I say it's wrong; it's not going to serve the people of this province as it should be serving the people of this province. Indeed, Sir, we will find the same situation developing in the rural areas as we are finding here in the City of Winnipeg. We've got wholesale amendments now being brought to the City of Winnipeg Act. One can only conclude the reasons that those amendments are necessary is because the Act is not working.

Certainly the problem, as far as I am concerned, in the Planning Act is that the Provincial Government has not accepted the initial responsibility that should have been theirs when the Act was introduced and that is the outlining of a clear land use policy other than the one that has been stated from time to time in buying up all the farmland. That, to me, is not the kind of a land use policy that I would like to see. Land use policy that is necessary is one that clearly states what lands will be

reserved for agricultural purposes and what lands will be reserved for other purposes, whether it be residential, commercial or recreational. Surely that should not be all that difficult.

Now everyone knows that there's going to be exceptions to that. Everyone knows that in the growth of a particular community, if there is a desire for the expansion of that community either as a residential area or an industrial area — a factory wants to move in — some land is going to be taken out of production, but to the largest extent possible, the smallest amount of land will be used for that purpose and the largest amount possible will be left for agricultural purposes or for whatever it has been designated for.

That, Sir, in my opinion, implies not that you have a level of bureaucrats sitting here in the Legislative Building or in an office, in some of their office towers, making that decision, because, in my view, those decisions are the ones that should properly be made by the elected representatives, not the non-appointed bodies who are not responsible to anyone but themselves. Those decisions should be made by people who have to answer to the public sooner or later. If that sort of thing happens, you have the essence of democracy.

But what I fear — and I am sure it is coming to pass — is that decisions that are going to be made on a level that are not going to be held responsible to the people of this province and when that happens, then we will be confronted with far more problems than we set out to solve in the first place.

Confederation in this country, Sir, was a success — in my view it was a success for a good many years — and the reason it was a success is because of the decisions that were made by the elected representatives, whether they be on the municipal, provincial or federal level, were made by people who were elected and were responsible to the people in their respective jurisdictions. The moment you start to concentrate powers of decision in the hands of non-elected people and people who do not have any particular responsibility to anybody, then democracy will lose its way. I am fearful that the kind of bureaucracy that is being built up under this Planning Act is one that is going to be making decisions and taking actions that are contrary to the real wishes and the desires of the people that live in those communities. I place a great deal more confidence in the elected representatives of the municipal council than I do in the appointed representatives or the appointed bureaucrats of any government, whether it be Liberal, Conservative or NDP, and as long as that authority and that power to make those decisions remains in the hands of the elected representative, I think that we will come out with a policy that can be acceptable. But I do believe that the Provincial Government does have a responsibility of outlining what that land use policy is so that they have some direction and some guidance. Now, there are going to be variations. There are going to be changes from time to time but let those take place, but if we start out knowing what the objective is, there is a far better chance that we are going to stay on the right track and not get side-tracked by bureaucrats who want to impose their decisions on the people of this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few brief comments to make with regard to planning also. One of the things that I think is concerning most of the people, and I think a lot of the points were raised by the Member for Morris, but one of the problems that we are faced with, and again referring to the near proximity of Winnipeg, is the problem of escalating costs with regard to parcels of land that are being sold for the development or the building of residential homes.

The area of particular concern in my particular riding is that we're starting to have difficulty selling homesteads. When somebody, for instance, has a 160 acre parcel of land and they want to take five acres out of that and either retire and stay on it, or the son wants to buy the farm and he just wants to buy the buildings and the house that were on that five acre piece and doesn't want to continue to farm — he wants to work in the city or something like that — we seem to be having quite a bit of red tape dividing that. And that is causing problems in my area.

Another problem of concern is, I had a case the other day where somebody was selling a five acre parcel where there had been a homesite on there a number of years ago. There is a well on there. The services have been brought right up, including telephone and hydro, and are right on the parcel of land. It belongs, at present, to about a 120 acre parcel. Now they want to sell five acres off of there and they have been working with it for over a year and they are having all kinds of problems with it. And the people just don't understand what's happening. Now here is a parcel of land that could be developed for housing and we are having problems bringing it onto the market.

Now what is happening out in rural Manitoba is that when somebody does get a subdivision, when he does get a piece of land broken down into five acre lots, or whatever, they sort of have a gold mine on their hands. We've got marginal land that up until five years ago wasn't worth \$100 an acre, now suddenly if you have a five acre title for that particular piece of property, it's worth something like \$15,000 or \$20,000 and that is really driving up the price of land in Manitoba. It almost seems that when somebody finishes the hassles and goes through the bureaucratic build-up that we have built up, you've almost got a gold mine when you get a subdivision passed. I think that a lot of people that — and this is the problem that I have — would like to split-up some land and have maybe the proper land for it in marginally farmable areas, just don't have the expertise and the red tape bogs them down

and they just leave it.

I think the Minister during the Estimates pointed out now that the subdivision form is much simplified and I have spoken to some people and it has helped. There is no question about it, because they have reduced it from eight pages, I believe, to four size and that has definitely helped. But there is still a problem. For instance, there is a subdivision out in the Mitchell area, which is about four miles from Steinbach. We have been working on that one now for three years. We're looking at maybe an acre and a half lots. I understand the Minister says it's passed now but I think they are still waiting for some final approval on it.

I have got another subdivision in Kleefeld, which is a smaller town too, and, as I mentioned to the Minister, after somebody has gone through this process you have almost got a gold mine on your hands because it is so hard to get any others passed. And that in fact is what's happening. And if you are looking at supply and demand, somebody that has got a subdivision passed realizes all the problems and amount of red tape. And it's not only with the planning people, you've got to go through the whole step. You've got to make sure that Highways has been looked after. We're going through the whole thing. You have to get approval from all the different departments and if one department drags its feet a little bit, if Highways doesn't send in their report for two or three months, that means the whole thing is held up. The Minister realizes that. And I've got one right now which exactly that happened on.

So, when a subdivision is passed, you've got a commodity which you know is of a pretty rare nature because it's going to take somebody else another three years to make sure to bring another one on stream. And that's what is happening. I have no question in believing that this is substantially driving up the price of lots, no question about it. I think that in some of the areas possibly we could use a little more common sense.

One thing that I agree with is that in areas where the soil conditions are such that you have to have an acre and a half or two acres to support a proper disposal field, there is no question that we have to enforce that particular Act because we don't want to contaminate or pollute the underground waters at all. But if you set down a few criteria like that and then you develop a policy, very much as the Member for Morris said, where you designate this marginal land, and in my area, just south of Steinbach, we've got all kinds of marginal land which is not worth anything for grazing, it's a bunch of stoney land. —(Interjection)— The Minister says it's close to the feed lot. The other day I was at a meeting and they introduced somebody as being the Head of a non-profitable organization and it turned out he was a cattleman, but, Mr. Speaker, there are not that many feed lots out there.

I realize that the solution to this particular problem is not an easy one but I tell him that the problems of red tape, the problems of trying to get a subdivision through, for the average person, or for any person for that matter, is a lengthy process with a lot of red tape and there is no question about it that in rural Manitoba that is definitely driving up the price of land at present. There is no reason why somebody with a small two acre parcel of marginal land should be able to get \$10,000 for that piece of land but for the fact that it's a limited amount of land that is going to come on the market, they can definitely ask for it and they're getting it. They're getting it because people want to build a house out in rural Manitoba.

The other thing I'd like to ask the Minister is, have we done any studies when it comes to planning with regard to what the states such as Nebraska have done? Now in Nebraska it's pretty easy to get a subdivision. You'll see subdivisions close to town. I appreciate that causes certain problems but they have been able to maintain a fairly low price per lot in that area because they're not limiting it to just a certain restricted area or a certain number of people that can do it. —(Interjection)— Well, I'll tell the Honourable Attorney-General that there is a lot of land out just east of Richer and around the Richer area, all the way through Vivian, all the way back in through the Pansy area, which is the Member for Emerson's riding, which is marginal farm land. But we're looking at developing lots. I understand that there's going to be lots on sale from MHRC in that 65 acre Selkirk Development and I think, if I read the Ad right, these lots were 35 by 80. I mean who wants to buy a lot 35 by 80? You know, and I think those lots were selling for more than \$7,000.00. Now that's a pretty high price for 35 by 80. I don't know what you can build on 35 by 80 but, I mean, you're putting them down like match boxes.

In this province where we've got a lot of land, we've got a lot of marginal land, there is no question that — and I don't think anybody can argue — the red tape is causing a certain amount of problems. It is driving up the price of land in the province. And I'd like to see that changed to a certain extent. I think we can overplan. A certain amount of planning is good but when we're going to overplan what we're going to do is we're going to make it almost impossible for the average citizen to own his or her own home. I think that some studies as far as the United States system is concerned . . . I think they're ahead of us in certain areas with regard to developing these areas. I appreciate that their servicing costs are lower sometimes because they don't have to dig as deep to put their pipes and sewers in but I think that we have something to learn from them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs will be closing debate.

**HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of

Tourism, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 50. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. THOMAS BARROW:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 51. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Stand, please, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 56. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. LYON:** Stand, please.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 59. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. JAMES H. BILTON:** Stand, please.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 61. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 64. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 68. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, 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 Logan in the Chair.

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

### ESTIMATES - TOURISM, RECREATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan):** I would refer honourable members to Page 60 of their Estimates Book. Resolution 108 Cultural and Recreational Services Division (a)(1) Salaries \$47,000.00. The Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

**HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows):** Yes, Mr. Chairman, as I had indicated several days ago in introducing the Estimates of my department that, in my opening remarks, I intended to deal only with general administration followed by tourism and the park resources division, which is the second resolution. So I'd like to make a few comments, at this point in time, by way of introduction of this particular resolution, namely Cultural and Recreational Services Division.

I suppose, in a sense, this somewhat ties in or is related to the general theme of Heritage resources. The provincial archiVes is just completing its second year of operations in its new home, that is the Manitoba Archives Building. The new facilities, as well as the Hudson's Bay Company Archives now deposited in the custody of the provincial archives, continue to attract researchers from every part of Manitoba, as well as from almost every province in Canada, and many places in the United States and the United Kingdom.

In 1975, 3,788 research visits were recorded in the Archives Research Room. In 1976, the number increased by roughly 30 percent to 4,991 visits, an increase of 1,203, and a similar increase occurred in the use of the picture collection. In 1975 the general public, book publishers, movie makers, and television producers ordered prints of 6,413 photographs. In 1976, an increase of about 10 percent, to 7,161 such requests.

The archives staff has also been busy outside Winnipeg advising people, organizations and institutions about the proper collection and preservation of archival materials.

The holdings of the archives have been enriched through co-operation with organizations such as the Rapid City Museum, the Western Canada Aviation Museum, the Railway Historical Society, the Jewish Historical Society, and the Polish-Canadian Pioneer Society.

It has been said that people get the governments they deserve. It could also be said that provinces get the archives they deserve. The extent and importance of the present holdings of the provincial archives are a permanent testimony to the wisdom and public spiritedness of Manitobans, past and present, whether they still live in the province or now reside elsewhere. Important donations have been received during the past year from places as far distant as England, Florida, California and British Columbia, as well as from people living in every corner of the province. They rightly should receive the gratitude of present as well as future generations.

The provincial archives have been and are being expanded and enriched as much by Manitobans themselves as by the professional staff who care for the materials deposited in the Manitoba Archives Building.

The legislative library has similarly completed its second year in the new quarters and, as in past years, has continued research services to members of the Legislature, departments of government,

and the general public. It enjoys an enviable reputation by reason of the variety and continuity of its valuable collections, the extensive use of these resources, and the quality of service it offers. The legislative library has been, from its beginning, a depository for the publications not only of our own Provincial Government but of Canadian, Federal and other Provincial Governments, and those of the United States, Great Britain, and of the United Nations.

From a standpoint of the members, the entire history of lawmaking and legislation in Manitoba is contained in the legislative library in the form of statutes, regulations, journals, debates, reports and sessional papers. These parliamentary documents chronicle the growth of political and economic institutions, the development of natural resources, the foundation and extension of educational policies, the expansion of the means of transportation and communication, and the enlargement of the sphere of social responsibility in health and welfare. Much of this material is of vital importance to all levels of government in planning and policy making and to the public seeking access to the wide variety of information provided by government.

From the beginning the library acquired, and still maintains to date, a complete file of the books, periodicals, newspapers, etc., published in Manitoba. The library has undoubtedly the most complete holding of newspapers published in the province. The majority of the titles have been microfilmed to 1976. It is these unrivaled resources which provide the material for the political, economic and social history of our cities, towns, villages and municipalities.

During the past year new acquisitions totally totalling 65,52 items in the form of books, government publications, newspapers and periodicals, and microfilms were added to the collections. A selected accessions list is issued monthly and distributed to honourable members of the House and government personnel to notify them of the availability of recent publications in the library. In order to provide information on the availability of Manitoba government publications, the library has compiled, since 1970, a check-list of Manitoba government publications.

During the past year, the staff has been increasingly busy handling over 11,000 reference and research inquiries in the form of personal requests, telephone calls and correspondence for government personnel and for the academic community.

The relocation of the library in the Manitoba Archives Building in September, 1975, represented a great advance in comfort and elbow room and an ascetic improvement over the former crowded stack room areas in the legislative building. A satisfactory level of service in the members' reference and reading room in the legislative building is maintained by reference staff, a direct telephone line, and the fast messenger service in operation between the two areas. The public library services branch of the department continues to provide assistance in the development of library services in Manitoba. New libraries were established in Gillam and Selkirk as well as in the Reston, Minnedosa and Parkland districts.

At present there are 32 regional and municipal libraries operating in the province. Grants for these libraries for the past fiscal year amounted to \$943,800, more than a three-fold increase since 1972. Because of the greatly increased demand for services the operating budget of the Public Library Services was increased by 100 percent and provisions were made for a 33 percent increase in the staff complement.

For 1977-78 an increase in numbers of libraries and the expansion of some existing facilities are anticipated. Library grants during the year are expected to be \$1,588,000, a further increase of almost 50 percent over 1976-77. A number of studies were conducted in the 1976-77 fiscal year and evaluation of these studies in 1977-78 will possibly result in improved policy changes with regard to public libraries.

The central agency of the department concerned with the development of artistic and cultural life in Manitoba is the Secretariat from Dominion Provincial Cultural Relations. Over the year the Secretariat continued to expand its activities in the area of liaison with ethno-cultural organizations within Manitoba in promoting, preserving and developing the cultural heritage of the province. In addition the Secretariat maintained liaison with more than twenty Franco-Manitoban cultural committees within the context of the Official Languages Act programs in Manitoba. Many ethno-cultural organizations in the province took advantage of the Multicultural Project Grants Program. This program is intended to support ethno-cultural organizations in the preservation, promotion and development of the cultural heritage of the many people who make up the mosaic of Manitoba.

In applying spending restraints to multicultural programs the Secretariat encountered some difficulty in being able to support new grant applications although these grant applications will be reviewed in the 1977-78 fiscal year.

The Secretariat with its staff will be placing increased emphasis on consultative and resource assistance which need not necessarily mean grant support.

Among the Grant Support Programs was a special program designed for Folklorama 1976, which provided direct assistance to the individual pavilions for the upgrading of their cultural displays and performances. Folklorama, one of Manitoba's major festivals, is fast becoming an event of international repute and my department is extremely proud to have been of assistance in this project.

With student employees and the Student Temporary Employment Program we look forward to providing similar assistance in 1977.

The highly successful Linguistic Support Program continues to expand at an ever-increasing rate with some 200 students of ancestral languages in Manitoba being taught outside the Public School System. In addition to the traditional languages which were being taught and supported by the department, Sauiteaux, Croatian, Korean were three new language programs established. It is anticipated that in 1977-78 the program should be supporting in excess of 6,000 students.

As an adjunct to the Linguistic Support Program the department also conducts or provides support for the Language and Cultural Camp Program which is intended to create an interest in and an appreciation of both the ancestral language and culture. As a new thrust for the coming year the Secretariat will support camp situations which are based on a sharing and co-operation between cultures. To this end the Chilean and French camp will be held simultaneously at Camp Manitou and Riding Mountain National Park; as well a Ukrainian camp and a Chinese and Philippine co-operative venture as well. This program is being sponsored both by the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs and the Department of Education in co-operation with the Federal Department of the Secretary of State.

The Multicultural Capital Grants Program which provides assistance to organizations in either the purchase or the restoration of buildings culturally significant to the province was continued in 1976-77. A significant undertaking was in the core area in the City of Winnipeg with the establishment of an enlarged Indian and Metis Friendship Centre, and to this end \$50,000 was awarded to this organization.

Other ethno-cultural groups which are considering the establishment of Multicultural Centres in Winnipeg are the Italian community and the Lebanese community. A highlight of the Secretariat's activities in 1976 was the preparation of the cultural component from Manitoba to the 1976 Olympics in Montreal. To this end a variety of performing artists and artisans including the Royal Winnipeg Ballet; Lawrence Lederer, violinist; Contemporary Dancers; Manitoba Artists, French and English poets; and 85 ethno-cultural performing groups were in attendance at the 21st Olympiad.

The success — if I may, Mr. Chairman, it will take me a minute, less than that, a matter of two seconds, to complete this portion of my remarks — the success of this Manitoba representation at the Olympics was assisted by a grant from the Western Canadian Lottery Foundation. I have a few more comments to make, Mr. Chairman, which I hope I have the opportunity to make them when the Committee next sits.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please. The hour being 4:30 and in accordance with Rule 19(2) of our House Rules, I am interrupting the proceedings of the committee for Private Members' Hour and shall return to the Chair at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

#### **PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The first item Private Members' Hour is Bill No. 24. The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member wish 24 to stand?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 37. The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** If that's the bill that I think it is, Mr. Speaker, then . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate Heller-Natofin (Western) Ltd.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** No, it was the other one.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member wish the other one? I'm easy. Does he want to go to 24?

#### **BILL (No. 24) - AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE AMALGAMATION OF LA CENTRALE DES CAISSES POPULAIRES DU MANITOBA LTEE AND LA CENTRALE DES CAISSES POPULAIRES DU MANITOBA CREDIT UNION LIMITED.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris on Bill 24.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** If I did that, Mr. Speaker, it would not be unusual in this Chamber. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I don't want to unduly delay the passage of this set of routine amendments to an Act that I think will enable the Credit Union movement to more effectively deal with their particular business. But I do so, Sir, in raising one cautionary note and that is based on the news report that appeared in the papers a few weeks ago in which the headline indicated that there had been some 30 credit unions had found themselves in a deficit position. That was 30 out of 160, and that has become somewhat of an increasing problem in the last few years. I can't help but wonder, Sir, if the greater authority that has been given to credit unions — and I don't want to suggest that credit unions should not assume a more important and a larger role in the conduct of the

particular line of business that they are in — but I wonder if the expansion of that road has not created problems for them that they are having difficulty in handling.

I would suggest, Sir, that if greater and greater authority is going to be given to credit unions to expand and to service this population to a larger extent than they have in the past, that we ensure that we don't do it at a pace that they are not capable of handling and creating the problem that seemed to be evident in the news release of a month or so ago.

I would hate to think that because of a too rapid expansion, or whatever the reason is — and I have no way of knowing what the reason is — perhaps the sponsor of this bill in his usual lucid way could answer that question for me when he closes debate. I note that he's not in the House but I am sure honourable gentlemen opposite will want to take the adjournment for him so he can provide an answer to that particular question because I think it is important in the consideration of this piece of legislation.

Is there a danger that a too rapid expansion, too great an authority may be more than the movement at its present stage is capable of absorbing and handling? I do so, not because I am opposed to any of that kind of expansion, but I am concerned that we may destroy that which we want to encourage by permitting too much of an expansion in too short a time. That may be an unfounded fear, but the sponsor of this bill I am sure is informed on all these matters and I would certainly want to hear from him before this debate is adjourned.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill 37 we will forego.

**BILL (NO. 55) - AN ACT FOR THE RELIEF OF ANNE MARIE MUMFORD.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 55. The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am just going to say a few words on this bill. I am going to vote for the bill to go to Private Members' Committee. I am voting for the bill mainly because the child that is involved in this case is one that is under age. I do in some respects agree with what the Honourable Member for St. Johns said. I think that the Statute of Limitations since we increased it, is something that should be adhered to. But in this case here, this is a young person who has not yet reached the age of majority. It is unfortunate that the mother and whatever legal help that they had did not take advantage of the law as it stands, but notwithstanding all that, I feel that after all this is the court of last appeal I guess, and it is perhaps a good thing that sometimes we as legislators can do something that we hopefully hope will alleviate the situation for this young person.

We are not by passing this bill to committee and extending the statute to the time of limitation, actually stating that the child will receive compensation one way or the other, we are just giving the child an opportunity that her case may be heard in a Court of Law. I am prepared to see the bill go to Private Members' Committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**BILL (NO. 58) - AN ACT FOR THE RELIEF OF PETER MARTENS**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 58. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. HENDERSON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Radisson introduced this bill he didn't really explain it as much as I think he probably should have because it is a case of an accident claim against the Public Insurance Corporation.

He did state that they had been offered a settlement, but he didn't state what it had been before the courts. He did state that he had been notified that the time was expiring for appealing it, but he didn't state in what way he'd been notified, whether it had been by word of mouth or whether through his lawyer or whether through a registered letter.

So I feel in this case where we are dealing with something which could keep coming up all the time, that we are going to let the time of limitations expire when he was warned and did nothing about it — that we are just going to have any amount of cases. Now there may be exceptional reasons, I really don't know them. I think probably I am in favour of this case coming up, but it is just something that has to quit in connection with the Public Insurance Corporation where the man was probably represented by law and where he was warned that the time was running out.

I wish the Member for Radisson was here so that possibly he may choose to speak on this again. I just feel that this sort of a thing cannot be happening all the time. However, I am in favour of possibly letting this man come before a committee so that we can ask him these questions and see if he really was offered a proper settlement, and the right time' and if he has proper excuses for bringing in this bill.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 17. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. BARROW:** Stand.

**BILL (NO. 41) - AN ACT TO PROHIBIT THE DISCONTINUANCE**

of heat, LIGHT OR POWER TO CERTAIN CONSUMERS.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 41. The Honourable Minister for Mines and Resources.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate following the introduction of this bill because I wanted to read it to make sure that I understood what it said. I just wasn't certain and I am still not certain as to whether the intention of the bill, as I understand it from the reading of it — now, Mr. Speaker, in introduction of my remarks let me say that possibly I have a psychological childhood trauma with respect to this bill.

My father was a coal dealer and therefore was operating a service for the delivery of heat. I used to deliver coal with him and I remember him getting up at 7 o'clock in the morning and loading the truck and delivering it to a purchaser and receiving payment. The notion that he would have to do that and not get paid is what disturbs me, and I wonder whether that is what this bill actually says.

We know that this year there was a situation in Winnipeg where a man was found deceased in his dwelling and the heat had been cut off because he had not paid his bill. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a tragic situation and that certainly if one wanted to deal with a legislation to make sure that that kind of thing would not occur, it should be possible to deal with that specific situation. It should be possible to say that before a utility will cut off heat to a residential quarter that they shall have to notify some authority; that the authority would have an opportunity of going down to wherever it was, whether it was the Welfare Department or whether it was perhaps a medical authority or an ambulance authority or somebody to deal with what might be a disturbed person, to see to it that that person is not left in a premises which is going to be cold.

But is it conceivable that we would legislate, Mr. Speaker, that between the months of October, the first of October and May 31st, that Central Park Towers need not pay for its heat, that this would be a matter of death. Because, if one wants to extend a law suit, one could extend a law suit for six months and the owner of the premises could, after six months, leave and leave the utility with a debt and I ask you to think of that in various grades of how it could happen. It could happen with regard to one tenant, it could happen with regard to a whole series of tenants and, indeed, Mr. Speaker, in my private practice I was made abundantly aware of tenants who would be willing to last out the process of eviction without paying rent because when a person didn't pay rent, first of all you couldn't do anything for the first three days that rent was not paid, then the delivery of the documents and the obtaining of a court appointment would mean that a month could elapse and then after the month elapsed and the judge made various pleas to the tenant to leave, it would take another month to get an eviction order which a bailiff would enforce. So two months' rent were gone and the person went on to the next. —(Interjection)— The member is in real estate and will know. And then they went on to the next unlucky landlord that they could take advantage of.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't say that there is no problem. I think that there should be some pretty precautionary methods and I would hope that they would be used in commonsense by anybody who supplied heat, such as hydro-electricity to a home or gas power to an apartment building or other such position, but I find it very difficult to say, Mr. Speaker, that the utility is going to have to continue to supply gas to an apartment building if the owner refuses to pay rent — excuse me, if the owner refuses to pay the utility charges. Now, what the utility could do is go and tell all the tenants that the owner has not paid the utility charges. That in one month's time there will be no longer utilities supplied to the tenants and that they will have to make arrangements to deal with that problem with their landlord and I can see, Mr. Speaker, that this is not likely to be a big problem. The Act will create a problem that doesn't exist at the present time because the Act gives a bonus to somebody who doesn't pay his utility charges until such time as you could get judgment. And let me tell the honourable member that getting judgment doesn't mean payment. When you get judgment and register it against the apartment building, you have to then issue a notice exercising a power of sale on the judgment. And you have to take proceeding after proceeding after proceeding and I tell the honourable member that there are some people who are willing to say that they will continue to receive the services while they are waiting for this to occur.

Now, perhaps I have not read the bill properly. I mean that is entirely possible, but as I see it, Mr. Speaker, if my Dad was still in the coal business, there would be a law making him subject to a fine for \$100 a day if he did not deliver coal to a customer who refused to pay for it. Now, I know that the honourable member didn't make this bill for my father. My father is deceased and there are probably not that many people who are delivering heat in the form of coal. Pardon me? —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, it says here, "A person who operates any system, works, plant, pipeline, equipment or service — service, for the production, transmission, delivery, or furnishing of gas whether natural or manufactured, heat, light or power, either directly or indirectly." Well, it seems to me that that is a delivery of a service for delivery of heat. In any event, let us assume that we both agree. I did not think that the honourable member would be legislating to deal with the coal dealer, but is there any difference between that and a gas company or a hydro-electric company who is asked to continue the supply between those months without any payment and is that the way of dealing with what we know to be a problem, that there did occur in the City of Winnipeg a problem related to a person who

didn't pay his charges and the gas company or, I gather it was the gas company, stopped the delivery of gas. I think that that is a situation that should be dealt with, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think it should be dealt with by encouraging the possibility that a whole bunch of purchasers of heat will see that they can get a postponement of payment for at least the length of time that it takes to issue a writ and get judgment and execute the judgment or . . . pardon me? —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member then says he is making a law for a once in a lifetime possibility. I say that it's the reverse.

Mr. Speaker, if that same person, if that same person bought a block next year, where in the Act does it say that next year he's not entitled to get gas and then he's not required to pay for it between the months of October and May? I mean, that's what the bill says. Mr. Speaker, if I had a house and I was receiving gas in that house and I didn't pay for it between May and October and they got a judgment against me and then they try to execute it and next year I bought another house and got the gas connected, and there are ways of doing it, then they would not be able to stop supplying gas for the next period of time, even though I had previously done it. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says I have to buy a new house every year. I tell the honourable member that there were people who moved from landlord to landlord who got by without paying rent on the basis that they would wait until they were evicted, the whole thing took time and then they would move to another premise. And this type of thing, Mr. Speaker, is not one month, it is between the months of October 1st and May. For a block, such as Central Park Towers, it could be thousands and thousands of dollars, which are not paid for and for which judgment has to be obtained before the matter can be dealt with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable member has presented or is aware of a problem, as we all are, which should be dealt with and that there are ways of dealing with it without giving an open invitation to people not to pay their gas bills until that judgment is obtained against them. I don't think that that is a satisfactory remedy and if I'm wrongly interpreting what is being said in this bill, or if there are jurisdictions where this has been put into practice and works, I would be interested in knowing about them. In any event, I am awaiting further explanation as to what this bill means.

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

**MR. WALLY JOHANNSON:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 49. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. SAUL CHEIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I would like this to stand, but if anyone else wishes to speak, then by all means.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 14**

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

**MR. JOHANNSON:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, Resolution No. 14.

WHEREAS the existence of our country is now being threatened; and

WHEREAS it is being suggested that a further delegation of powers to the provinces will answer the threat; and

WHEREAS the less affluent provinces and regions of Canada will be impoverished by any weakening of the equalization role of the national government;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba affirm its determination to maintain a strong united country; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we maintain undiminished the powers of a strong national government; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an engrossed copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Government of Canada.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Resolution No. 14 be now debated. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

**MR. JOHANNSON:** Mr. Speaker, ever since last fall when a separatist government was elected in Quebec, we've had a series of statements by different people regarding the problem that has emerged because of this. Now the problem didn't just emerge because of the election of the P.Q. Government in Quebec. The problem has been developing for some time. But since the election of the Separatist Government, we have had a number of occurrences. For example, John Turner, the former Minister of Finance in the Federal Liberal Government has called for further delegation of powers to the provinces, this happened just recently. There was a press conference in Ontario by a number of eastern intellectuals and these eastern intellectuals including New Democrats, Liberals and Conservatives, called for special status for Quebec and they called, among other things, for the establishment of new native states in the north.

There are times, Mr. Speaker, when I begin to despair of the role of intellectuals in our society and

this is one case where a group of intellectuals has produced what one can only call a series of idiotic suggestions. They, for example, recommend a constituent assembly be set up to draft a new Constitution and this would be composed equally of French and English Canadians. Interesting, Mr. Speaker. French and English Canadians. —(Interjection)— No Icelanders. I guess no natives, no Ukrainians. English and French Canadians. That's a typical kind of suggestion coming out of eastern intellectuals. They call for special status for Quebec. They call for new native states in the north.

In Canada we have had a pressure continually, almost since 1867, for a further delegation of powers to the provinces. In the past this has come primarily from Ontario and Quebec, who are the two wealthiest provinces. And for awhile you had the Duplessis-Hepburn axis, Ontario and Quebec fighting for greater provincial power and fighting against any equalization role being played by the Federal Government. Now you have not only a pressure from Quebec, but a pressure from Alberta, demanding greater provincial power. So now I guess we have the Lougheed-Levesque axis emerging and the danger of this kind of pressure is that what will emerge in Canada are ten semi-autonomous states or provinces. This could develop.

We have had proposed in the province of Quebec, by the Separatist Government a referendum which is supposed to make a decision on whether Quebec stays in Confederation or not and since the election of the P.Q. Government we have had a variety of people raising the possibility of a Federal referendum. Now, to me a Federal referendum, in effect, considers legitimate a proposal to destroy this country. The prospect is simply ludicrous that the people of Canada should be given a choice as to whether or not they should destroy this country. To me that is absurd.

In my opinion — and I think probably most members share my views and I think the majority of people in Manitoba share these views — in my opinion we should not make deals about destroying our country. We should not make deals with Separatism. What we do if we start making deals, or even consider making deals, is we give credibility to the Separatists, we give credibility to their proposals and I think that's a drastic mistake.

The P.Q. Government in Quebec was elected as the legitimate Provincial Government of Quebec. It has the same mandate as this government, no more no less. It was elected to govern the province of Quebec. It was not elected to take Quebec out of Confederation and, in fact, their gimmick of the referendum was a means of avoiding the electors in the province making a decision on that basis. And the legitimacy of that government — this is the irony of the whole thing — the legitimacy of the P.Q. Government in Quebec is based upon the BNA Act, upon the Constitution of Canada. They have no legitimacy otherwise. When they propose taking Quebec out of Confederation, they challenge their own legitimacy, which is based on the BNA Act and on our Constitution. To me a national referendum is unthinkable. The authority for the Canadian Confederation doesn't come from any referendum that was held in 1867 or 1864, it comes from acts of the former colonies, the provinces, Upper and Lower Canada, the province of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia. It comes from Acts of provinces. It comes from an Act of the British Parliament. That is the source of Canadian Confederation, rather than any referendum.

Our system is a parliamentary government. Our system is a parliamentary system and a referendum really is foreign to the parliamentary system. It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, back in 1911 an article was written by one member of the Fabian Society. 1911 — that's 65, 66 years ago. The case against a referendum and this gentleman, Clifford D. Sharp, employs almost all of the basic arguments that can be made against a referendum in a parliamentary system and yet we have intellectuals in this country proposing referendums today when they are clearly absurd in a parliamentary system. A referendum really undermines responsible government. It is a means by which a government escapes its responsibility for which it was elected and there are all kinds of difficulties, practical difficulties, in referendums but the basic objection to it is that it is an escape from responsible government. I don't think we should countenance this for one minute.

I think that the proposal — and this is made not only with respect to Quebec, it is made also with respect to native peoples in the north — the proposal that we should separate people on the basis of race and on the basis of language is historically retrogressive and dangerous. Canadian history, I think, is a history in many ways of progress. Canada has evolved from what were rather distinct French-Canadian communities and British or English-Canadian communities into a multicultural nation. To me, this is progress. I think we have made historical progress. What is being proposed to us now is a backward step, a backward step from progress we've made. We have this kind of narrow nationalism which is based on race being proposed not only in Canada but elsewhere and I think it is wrong and I think it can only lead to trouble.

I agree that there should be friendly co-operation between provinces. I think that what this government has done with respect to the new government of Quebec is probably wise. I believe that, for example, the Cultural Exchange Program, is a good one but I do not think that we should encourage in any way any pretensions or encourage in any way any belief that we are favourable in the least to separatism. I think that the record of our government with respect to the Francophone

community in Manitoba is a record of which we can be proud. In our government, for example, we have three MLAs who are Francophones. Two members of the Francophone community are senior Ministers in this government and that is important. I think — I may be historically inaccurate — but I think that this is the first government in the history of Manitoba that has had two Francophone Ministers. I stand to be corrected but, to my recollection, I think this is the first government that has had two Francophones.

We have moved ahead in the area of providing French education from kindergarten to Grade 12 with Bill 113. We have tried to promote the desires of the French-Canadian community to preserve their own identity and I support that. However, the election of a Separatist government in Quebec in many ways poses a threat to Francophone communities, Francophone minorities, in the rest of the country. There are a number of people in the P.Q. government who have in effect written off the Francophone minorities in the rest of the country and they have written them off . . . some of them have written them off . . . I still haven't. I think that the Francophone communities can realize their aspirations within the present constitution.

In the last 100 years of Canadian history, the people of the French community and particularly in Quebec, has followed a strategy and it has been a strategy that has been remarkably successful. Generally what Quebec has done is that it has allied itself with some other region of the country to prevent the domination of Ontario in Confederation and they have had remarkable success, primarily through the vehicle of the Liberal Party. They have, during the days of Macdonald, Cartier, Sir George Etienne Cartier, wielded a great deal of power within the Macdonald government. Then, of course, Laurier was elected as Prime Minister and he was Prime Minister for 15 years. Since then, we have had St. Laurent as a Prime Minister, and now we have had Trudeau as Prime Minister for a number of years. Throughout the history of Canada, the Province of Quebec has had a great deal of influence by attempting to play a strong role in the Federal Government and in federal policy making and I don't think one can deny that, right now, the French-Canadian ministers in the Trudeau Cabinet play a major role in policy making. And this is good. This is a mark of the success of this traditional strategy.

I think that a unified country is the best, it is the best for all. It is the best in the long run for Manitoba; it is the best in the long run for Quebec; it is the best in the long run for the other provinces. Because if there is a movement toward separatism, towards greater provincial autonomy, what will inevitably happen will be that the separate fragments will be absorbed by the United States. One only has to look at the Francophone minorities in the United States to see what kind of survival they have enjoyed in the American system. They have not survived as French speaking communities, they have been absorbed. It is best for all parts of this country to have a unified country because that's the only way we are going to avoid absorption by the United States.

It is also important that we do not devolve federal powers upon the provinces, that we do not delegate present federal powers to the provinces. The Province of Manitoba under John Bracken, under Stuart Garson and under Ed Schreyer, has always been a strongly federalist province and it is in the interests of Manitoba to take a strong federalist position because Manitoba is not one of the more affluent provinces in this country and it is not likely ever to be one of the more affluent, no matter what the government. Therefore, it is in the interests of Manitoba, it is in the interests of the entire country, in terms of equality of treatment of the people in this country, to have the Federal Government strong, to have that Federal Government playing a strong role in equalizing services, education services, health care services, to all parts of this country. If we permit, if we encourage further delegation of powers to the provinces, we will undermine this role of the Federal Government. Now, Trudeau has already started moving away from this role and this government has fought that move away from an equalization role by the Federal Government. We have fought it on the recent tax sharing and equalization talks. We have fought it on the question of the succession duties, the inheritance tax. We have continually fought that battle for a strong Federal Government and a strong federal role in equalization. And we must continue to fight that.

I think that strong political leadership is necessary at this time. A national referendum is ridiculous but what we do need is action by provincial legislatures and that's why I'm proposing this resolution. I would like a resolution passed by this Legislature, which represents the people of Manitoba, strongly endorsing a strong unified country and a strong Federal Government and I would like all the people of Canada to know that the Legislature of Manitoba, speaking for the people of Manitoba, stands for a strong united Canada.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MR. SPIVAK:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews and there are some of the things that he said that I think I would agree with and I will probably reiterate in the few remarks that I have.

I think it's rather incredible, Mr. Speaker, that in a country that has provided a lifestyle, and a quality of life for so many, albeit not everyone, of such a high standard, that we find ourselves in the Provincial Legislatures, in the provincial federal constituencies of this country and on the platform,

intellectualizing and discussing the breakup of our country. It's almost preposterous, Mr. Speaker, based on the conditions we live under. We know our history, we recognize our problem ' we recognize the tensions that have developed over the years that have tested the federalism that we have developed, which is really unique to our country, which has qualities that are similar to other federal jurisdictions, but on the other hand have peculiar qualities, and peculiarities that are distinctive to us.

To find that we require a resolution such as has been introduced for debate as a means of demonstrating to the Federal Government and to the country, our concern and desire to see to it that our Federal Government is strong, and that our country remain as one. You know, in the debate that is now taking place in this country, and in discussing the prospects of the future as to the potential breakup of this country, one finds a contradictory position I think, that has developed among the people of our province.

I think in many respects, Mr. Speaker, there has been an apathy towards the propositions that have been put before the people. In an earlier stage, several months ago, it was generally expressed by, "if they want to go, let them go," but really we don't know too much about it. Now it comes to a debate as to what really do they want. Now I'm referring specifically to Quebec, because this is where the focus of attention has been. But, Mr. Speaker, our problem at this point is that the very positive things that we should be talking about, and thinking about, the reality of our country, that its physical presence, its texture, its people, the lifestyle I referred to, what we have in fact accomplished, have apparently been ignored in the kinds of debates that have taken place.

To those who are in leadership and government, the physical problems of the day are paramount, and in negotiations with the Federal Government, which is a constant daily negotiation for all the range of programs that the province is charged with the responsibility of carrying out' in which there is support from the Federal Government, there is a tendency to look at Canada in the perspective of the fiscal arrangements that are arrived at between provinces and the Federal Government with respect to the whole range of services that both the Federal Government and the provinces have to deal with, and because of the inflationary conditions we live under, to deal with the physical problems relating to the question of economy. And so when we talk about our country, we talk in that perspective, but realistically when we talk about our country we have to talk about something far more than just the fiscal arrangements, the responsibility.

We have to talk about our history, the spirit of this country which has welded us together' the tensions which are real which could possibly separate us, and the need for understanding in our relations with each other. For too long, Mr. Speaker, the politicians of the day have exploited in both cases the problems relating to the founding cultures, and founding races of our country. I'm not suggesting that there are not others equally responsible, and I think that that is a valid point. There has been a problem in discussing it, not to deal with those things that have really brought us together, and the way in which we have really come together as a country. We have a problem today of a debate, which from a legal point of view has no real prospect, because I do not believe that a province really has a right of self-determination. I do not believe that a section of a province has a right of self-determination. I do not believe that there is a right under our constitution for that to take place. So those politicians who talk about this, are talking about something constitutionally that I do not believe we have a right to consider, notwithstanding the fact that that debate is continuing, and there are assumptions that that possibility can and will come about. —(Interjection)— Well the problem of "who has" — the problem is the people have a right. But the question at this point is whether the people exercising their right to a referendum on one occasion' the people exercising the right through the election of a government committed to a particular project, or a particular policy, which would separate it from Canada, really have the legal right. I do not think they have.

I think that there is nothing either in our national law or international law, that would give that right to those who suggest that they will have that right in time, either by way of a referendum, or by way of an election, because I think that there is far more based on the history of international law, and based on the realities of a constitution which would prevent that from happening.

I think it would be preposterous to suggest that the City of Montreal has a right to separate from Quebec. I think it's preposterous to suggest it and I think we realize that. —(Interjection) Or does it suggest that Northern Manitoba secede from the rest of Manitoba? Does anyone conceive that that really is a common sense proposition? So what I am saying at this point, is that in our discussions in debate on the national issue, it's time to start to be a little bit firm about where we really are, and where we stand without in any way taking away from the real problem areas that we have to deal with when we talk in terms of our country.

I think that the debate so far, Mr. Speaker, has been a very negative one. I don't mean the debate in this House, but I mean the debate with respect to the prospects. I think it has been negative. I think we have failed. I've had occasion, as many of you have, to listen to the members of the *Parti Quebecois* before they were in office, and since they were in office, talk about separation. There are fundamental changes in their attitude. You almost have to consider that they are lawyers looking for whatever

legal loopholes they can have, to be able to achieve their objectives, and they are not consistent in the kinds of things that they've talked about.

I recall on two occasions when Rene Levesque spoke in Winnipeg. He spoke on one occasion — this was prior to the election of 1968 in Quebec — and he spoke on one occasion one year at the University of Winnipeg, and the following year at the University of Manitoba, and he contradicted himself in dealing with the type of economic association that could possibly exist, and how Quebec could survive independent of Canada. His thinking was not clear. His statements of the type of association that he proposed had not been well thought, and the approach, and with that the information that was supplied in effect was a very different kind of approach.

We talk about an economic association today. We talked about a common market. We talked about a free trade area, but we are talking about many different things, and the implications, and the suffering that will occur. I say that very directly for the whole host of people who are going to be affected by the tinkering of a lot of politicians at this point, it becomes a very serious situation.

I've had the occasion of listening to Claude Morin when we was in Winnipeg and some of you may have heard him. This was the occasion on which he spoke to many of the people at the university. I do not believe that other members of the Legislature were present on this occasion but he did speak to the Société Franco-Manitobaine and I believe expressed a similar position. Certainly the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources had the occasion of talking to him privately and there may very well be information that he could supply which he would be entitled to supply considering that those conversations may not be private in nature.

But the thing that struck me in the way in which he talked is that here was a person who was talking about the break-up of Canada, who was talking about his particular situation with respect to his own position as far as Quebec is concerned, who talked about economic association and said that when they had worked out the principle they then would maintain a dialogue with the people on the principle of economic association but that would be tied in with a referendum and so therefore the dialogue would take place with the announcement of what form this economic association would take with the rest of Canada together with the referendum itself. When the question was posed, "Well, will there be a dialogue with people before the referendum is presented along with the proposals for economic association?" No, no, that's being handled by the people within his department and those who have been brought together, not necessarily from within his department, to form their task force on this.

As I listened to him I wondered, you know, his motivation and his concern and the kind of things that he is working towards are known but he is an elected representative representing the people of his province. Is he concerned about their prospects? Does he concern himself about the actual disruption that is going to occur because of the proposals that are going to be put forward or the implications of what may happen if in fact he proceeds? — (Interjection) — No, well I'm suggesting I don't know what his concerns are. I don't know too much about his background but I wonder whether he really has had to work for a living. I know his background is that of an academic. I know that he has been in government and I know he enjoys power today. But I wonder if he has ever had to work and I don't know whether he has really had to work in a factory, whether he really has had to collect unemployment insurance, whether he has had to maybe maintain his family because he has not been able to find work through some support of the state, and whether the kind of disruption that has occurred to so many people when economic chaos occurs has really been considered by him and is really part of his experience. As a matter of fact, part of the experience of those intellectuals who at this point are leading Quebec in a particular direction and are talking about, in academic terms, an association which has not been spelled out, which has not been placed before the people, and which at this point is really almost pie in the sky. We talk in this country about the reality of having to deal with this situation in time and it appears to me that we're not really prepared to say the kind of things that have to be said.

I don't want to see a break-up of this country and I'm prepared to say that it's time that a lot of people say that and a lot of people talk pretty directly. And to the extent that the Member for St. Matthews has introduced a resolution which talks about the unity of Canada, which talks about a Federal Government which is strong, I think that has to be supported. I think it is time that those who are afraid of the emotion that will develop with respect to this debate, and are afraid of meeting head-on the basic negativism that has existed and some of the cause of racism that exists within our country — and I say that very directly because that is, again, part of it — they have now got to recognize that there is a need to stand up. It's hard to do it in twenty minutes in a speech in this Legislature. In fact, it's hard by the very nature of the load that we have in this House to deal with this problem and it may very well be that we will have to deal with it at the next session, whoever is here, assuming that we're all not here at the next session.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You have five minutes.

**MR. SPIVAK:** But I have to say this, the debate that has taken place so far, the statements of those who have been prepared to speak are not very satisfying for our country. I think far more has to be

said. I think that for many of the politicians there is going to be a need to be counted and to provide leadership. I think that the bewilderment that exists among the people, combined with the apathy, and that's the contradiction that I referred to earlier, which I think really exists at this point, is something that has to be met head-on and I think it requires the support of many. The various suggestions that have been made in terms of the approaches probably do not recognize the reality of our political structure and our political system whereby, at least to the extent that federal parties will present themselves to the electorate in the next federal election, that the issues will have to be quite clear and the policies will have to be pretty straightforward as to where they are going to stand with respect to our country. And there is going to be a requirement which may very well cross party lines in some respects — well not party lines but individuals who are members of parties to stand up and recognize that the time will come to support the basic thesis and kind of proposition that the Member from St. Matthews has suggested.

We have provided services to the people in this country that could never have occurred unless we were able to use the tax base of this whole country and unless we were able to have the Federal Government as the agent equalizing opportunity and equalizing services and providing those requirements for the people of this country.

We have tremendous problems, we are capable of meeting those problems. Our need now is to talk very positively about our country and to talk about unity and to recognize that we can create it if we have the will.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson will be recognized the next time. The hour being 5:30 I am now leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene after supper recess, at 8:00 p.m. with the Member for Logan in the Committee of Supply.