

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, July 9, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked when I instructed the Provincial Auditor to do a special audit of a certain nature in regard to the Manitoba Development Corporation; I answered that the date was March 30, 1970. The honourable member then asked whether that was before or after the death of Mr. Alistair Stewart. I can inform him that Mr. Stewart passed away on April 3, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other questions? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question would be to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder whether he can inform the House whether the government has placed any ceiling on the transportation costs for those people who are now going to be employed by the Autopac Insurance Commission, or the Auto Insurance Corporation, for coverage of their personal effects being brought from locations outside of Manitoba. Is there any ceiling that the government has placed on the transportation costs of bringing their personal effects into Manitoba, the personal effects of those people whom the Autopac Insurance Corporation have employed who are now resident outside of Manitoba and who are travelling into Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Management Committee, may I just inform the honourable member that there is a formula, a set rate at which the government recognizes payment of travelling expenses for persons employed, and as far as I know I don't recall any particular change in the last two years although there may have been some modification or variation, and I am not aware that Autopac is following any different procedure.

MR. SPIVAK: Is there a ceiling on the individual costs?

MR. CHERNIACK: In the formula, there is a ceiling.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Finance can inform the House what the ceiling is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago there was a question that was taken, at least part of the question was taken as notice, pertaining to the number of welfare recipients who were on the rolls for March, April and May, 1971, pertaining to the Department of Health and Social Development. It was related to the percentage of unemployment in the Province of Manitoba. I had indicated at that time that there was an increase between March and April, that I would take that question as notice to give the cash figures. The cash welfare payments made by the Department of Health and Social Development, excluding the municipalities, for the month of March was \$5,044,000; the month of April, 1971, \$5,677,000; and for the month of May, 1971, \$4,757,000.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. There's an Address for Papers on the Order Paper. The Honourable Member for Roblin. (Stands) The Honourable the House Leader.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 102, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation. The Honourable Minister.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways)(Thompson) presented Bill No. 102, an Act to amend The Taxicab Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll give the shortest explanation on record. The bill is necessary because of auto insurance coming in, and that is the purpose of introducing it.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further questions?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 40, please?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this this morning because I wanted to have a look again at the Minister's statement from last night. I still don't have Hansard available but I think I'll go ahead and give my comments on it.

Basically, we're a little left in the dark, even following the Minister's explanation, as to what exactly he wants to achieve out of setting up the Bureau of Statistics in Manitoba. We understand his own personal position, his own personal background of wanting to have more statistics available, but the real concern that arises from a bill of this sort is, first of all, it is not possible to set up a statistical group within his own department without coming to the Legislature with an act. He's indicated that it takes an act to get the information from the DBS. It's a little difficult first of all to understand why an act would be necessary to do this, so the explanation of why it would be necessary would be more important to us to know than just a statement that an act is necessary to do this. But the real, the real point of contention in the bill that is difficult to understand, is why the all-embracing powers should be asked for to have access to records.

Now it's a Statistics Act and it's easy to understand why one would want access for vital statistics - births, deaths and other things relating to what we normally regard as vital statistics regarding people - but this one goes far beyond that and, as it says in the opening sections of it, that it covers "statistical information relating to the commercial, industrial, financial, social, economic and general activities and condition of the province and persons in the province."

This is quite different than vital statistics. This is a move into the field of industry and commerce with a statistics branch that under this legislation would give them access to all the private books of all the companies in Manitoba. Now if we -- I know the Minister had some comments last night about Air Canada - he mentioned that along the way -- but of course it's not restricted to specific cases. This so-called snooper section of the legislation which is contained in four or five other bills -- (Interjection) -- the snooper section of the snoopy session, sleazy session, is a part that is of natural concern to anyone.

Now, the general -- you know, the general characteristic of legislation that comes into the House, since it's drafted by people in the public service who generally want more and more control, it's natural that material coming to the Minister's desk does tend to extend and expand the amount of control that the bureaucracy can get, and I think it probably takes the government a while to become aware of the fact that nearly all the legislation that comes before them from civil servants is of a nature that ends up granting more control to the total government. It may not be simply a desire on the part of the Minister that most of his legislation comes from that, but I don't think that's the case in this piece of legislation there. This is one that's very near and dear to the Minister, as he indicated last night, and so I think that what we want is some justification for having the snooper section in it; that is, to be able to go into the documents and records in any department, municipal office, in any company, any business, or any organization from which information sought in respect of the object of this act can be obtained.

Now, you know, taking it at its worst, this means that the Industry and Commerce Department, if it was interested in a particular area of endeavour itself and becoming involved, would have the rights under this legislation to go in and examine the books of all the companies, private companies now in existence, and then base their conclusions on that. That's expecting the worst from it, and of course you have to watch for the worst because the Minister may be well-intentioned but nevertheless the powers are there. For instance, if the Department of Industry and Commerce said it was desirous to become involved in the meat packing business, for instance, in Manitoba, for some particular reason, under this legislation I see no reason

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) why they couldn't go into Canada Packers and Burns and any of the other meat packing companies and say to them, "We want to see your records over the past years and you must make them available to us under this legislation," and as a result of it, put themselves in the very preferred position of being able to base their future action on that information. Now this is not what the purpose of government has traditionally been accepted as their role, and a move in this direction goes far beyond interpreting the role of the Industry and Commerce Department as being a catalytic role. It's much more towards thrusting it into the role of having the very powerful position of going in, gaining information, and using that information for the express purposes of the department in terms of competition with that business. I say that's interpreting it as it could be interpreted. Now that's what's in the legislation that we read into it and that's of course what we're concerned about, so we'd like some explanation of that, because far more justification, I think, the government itself would want to give far more explanation as to why they would want these all-embracing powers in the field of industry and commerce and business.

Now the other question that I go back to in the initial section is; why still is it necessary to bring in a Manitoba act in order to set up a Statistics Branch? And the Minister has said, he's mentioned the three points that are important to him, the main thing being to have direct availability to statistics and to have them available immediately after the work is done by a federal group such as census, and to process the statistics that are of most important interest to Manitoba. If it's enabling legislation to dovetail with federal legislation, that's fine, but this does not appear to be all that is in this bill, and the concerns about the bill are the wide-ranging and all-embracing clause that gives the department, the Minister's department, access to the private affairs of people in business, in industry and commerce, or individuals, and we disagree with that section of the bill and I don't think we can support it even at second reading unless there's a much more adequate explanation of that section.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, my gallery, where we have some distinguished visitors, namely His Excellency Boris P. Miroshnichenko, Ambassador to Canada from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, and Mrs. Miroshnichenko. They are accompanied by Mr. S. M. Belyaev and Mr. G. L. Kotov. On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here today.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - (CONT'D)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 83, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for the Member for Emerson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, we have had a brief time to look at Bill 83 and we see no real reason why we should oppose it strongly. However, we do have a few questions to ask, and probably the main question I would like to ask is, in the proceedings outlined in this bill, when in a dispute the party can address himself to the Court of Queen's Bench for a decision, is there a possibility that application for quashing the matter be given the party in question before it becomes a Court of Queen's Bench procedure? The second question I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, is that I don't fully understand the total reasons or the fundamental reasons why this bill is introduced, and I would appreciate, in closing the debate, if the Minister could outline the real fundamental reason why this bill is brought forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Minister for introducing this bill; I think it's one that's been long overdue. There's just one portion that I have just one query on, and perhaps the Minister when he closes debate on the bill can enlighten me on it, and that's the permissiveness of the bill in that it states that a decision of the

July 9, 1971

(MR. JENKINS cont'd) Arbitration Board will be, or may be enforced as a judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench. Does this mean that the trade union or, say, the employer, whichever the case may be, in trying to enforce an award of the Arbitration Board, are they responsible for the court costs or having that enforced, or is it going to be enforced by the Attorney-General's Department? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Well, the answer, of course, as far as the permissive features of the legislation referred to, it's necessary to have this power. It's not really permissive but it's deemed that we should have the power at the proper court levels to issue in effect of the court order to enforce the provisions of the Labour Relations Act pertaining to arbitration awards. We haven't that power at the present time and, as I indicated on introduction, the reasons are very obvious. We're not trying to supplant or supersede the court, but to make provision for the speedy and proper compliant practice with the decision of an arbitrator or an arbitration board. And the matter raised by the Member for Emerson dealing with the judgment of the Queen's Court, in effect not again supplanting them but making provisions that this will be a judgment, in effect a judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench, subject of course to appeal to the Court of Appeal in any case. So there is basically the reason. Now, my honourable friend the Member for Emerson asked me if I would outline the reasons. I did on introduction; I've done it once again now, and those are the reasons for this bill.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources, who of course is proficient in the law, pointed out to me it cannot be appealed again. I'm not quite sure — possibly he in his capacity and profession is more knowledgeable of that aspect than I am. I do note that in the proposed labour . . . for the federal authority, there is a firm provision within the proposed federal Act that there is no appeal, and I thought that by looking up the federal proposed legislation there was an inference that there could be an appeal here in Manitoba and I'm taking a look at it, but my colleague says there is not.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was holding the calling of Bill 36 for the Honourable the Member for Rhineland to arrive. I understand that he advised the Minister of Finance that if he wasn't here he would be in a position of not speaking today, he would waive his right to speak, and therefore I'm going to call Bill 36 on the basis that it will now be proceeded with.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to burden Hansard with too many words, it's not my habit, but I think I should voice some thoughts that I've had on this bill, on its development, thinking and work that went beforehand. The first interest has to do with positive aspects of the bill in terms of equalizing tax burdens in this city and equalizing revenues to different parts of the city for the welfare of its citizens. The other interest is a matter of concern. I think that it's an understatement to say that I have serious concerns about the effectiveness of the community committees or councils, as they are called, and I think that if these community councils are not effective there will be two results: one of them is that the essential government, the uni-city government, will become an all-powerful government in this province and that local participation at the community level will disappear. This is a concern. I'm not sure that this will happen but this time I would just like to voice this concern and I think it would be only fair of the Minister responsible for this bill, I think to categorically state that if these councils or committees as they are established don't have the necessary powers to effectively involve the local citizens and the decisions that affect them, that the powers of these committees would be increased at the next session, and I would ask if the Minister could make some comments on this subject.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is not present. I made every effort to reach him in the last half hour or so. I did have a discussion with him yesterday pointing out to him that he had spoken just either yesterday or the day before, and that we were anxious, all of us I believe in this House, to proceed with the business of the House. It was indicated to him yesterday when he asked to adjourn debate, that there would not be an inclination to postpone debate beyond this afternoon, and I

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) did speak to him personally pointing out that I have to get ready to leave the city for a meeting of the Ministers of Finance in Ottawa and that that was another reason that I was anxious to deal with it today. And he did say, "Well, there was something else I wanted to say and if I am not able to deal with it, then I'll just pass," and on the basis of that discussion I had with him, my conscience is clear but my regrets are still there.

Let me deal briefly with the Honourable Member for Rupersland's comment, who wanted a categorical statement from the Minister responsible for the bill that if things don't work out quite the way we hope they will, that there will be an amendment of some kind next year to ensure that. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not inclined to make categorical statements nor can I guarantee that the Minister now responsible for the steering of this bill through this session will indeed be the Minister responsible, or a Minister at all, in future years. All I can say, though, is the deep commitment that this government has to the role and the potential of the community committees and the functions that they will perform to keep government at the municipal level as close as possible to the people receiving the service, and I will expand on that a little later on, but our feeling is that no matter how much legislation you bring in, you can't force people to participate but you must make it possible for them to do so to the fullest extent. And if we find that there is some means, some method, whereby there can be an improvement to make it more possible for people to participate and play a meaningful role in municipal government at the most local level, then I am sure this government will support and indeed sponsor that kind of additional possibility.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had rather extensive debate on this bill. We've had some 30 - 40, I think it is, speeches made on second reading of the bill. I think that there has been a great deal of consideration. I am, of course, conscious of the fact that some people have stated that we are rushing this through. I need only remind members of the House that the policy paper was produced and distributed by this government in December; that there were a number of community meetings held which I have no doubt had participation of citizens of Greater Winnipeg to an extent greater than any other legislation I'm aware of has had in the history of the province, and that's a very broad statement. But I honestly can't think of an occasion when there has been a wider breadth of discussion throughout Greater Winnipeg as there has been on this bill.

As far as the House itself is concerned, I took an unprecedented step in bringing to members of the Legislature and distributing to members, or to the municipal councils, a copy of the Act which was itself the draft which was sent to the Queen's Printer for printing, and I distributed at the same time as it was sent to the Queen's Printer, and that was done on April 28th, over two months ago. The printed bill itself was distributed in this House May 28th, over a month ago; that on June 3rd I distributed to all members, to all those recipients of the draft bill, explanatory notes, rather extensive, which would have assisted members considerably in evaluating those portions of the bill which needed in-depth study and those which did not. I'm sorry to say that having listened to much of the debate and having read what I didn't hear - that is in times when I was absent - I have come to the unhappy conclusion that many members who spoke had not read the bill nor even the explanatory notes, and that was a matter of disappointment to me. -- (Interjection) -- The Leader of the Official Opposition always is prone to make comments from the seat, his seat, which I think is a good location for him really, and I very often do slip into responding to him although I do try to ignore him as much as possible and will continue to make that effort.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the debate was long - it was interesting. What I felt was very significant are the omissions, which are noticeable. There was no discussion that I can give much weight to, on the future of the urban area of Greater Winnipeg. There was very little said by the Opposition recognizing the decay of the core area and the impact of that decay on the area as a whole. There was very little said about the obvious need for a change, as is documented by all those reports that have been enumerated from time to time. There was barely anything said about how Greater Winnipeg is to remain competitive with other cities of Canada as long as its energies and its resources as split and dissipated. What is most astonishing to me is that there was no apparent recognition of, or interest in, how the worldwide trend toward urbanization will affect the people - the people - in Manitoba's capital city. And that to me was a reflection of the calibre of the review and study of the content of the bill and of the proposals.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

Dr. Harvey Lithwick, who has been appointed as the chief consultant, I believe, I don't know his formal title - to the Minister of Urban Affairs for the Government of Canada, has made an extensive report on the urban crisis in Canadian cities and has talked about the tremendous impact that there will be on urbanization, and has stressed the fact that the cities on the prairies will be hit hardest by urbanization. He made that comment to the joint Commons-Senate Committee and has talked about the need for adjustment. Mr. Speaker, listening to many of the members of the Opposition, one would think that they were just unaware of what we face for the future and unfeeling about the need that something be done about it, and instead of debating the very real and urgent issues confronting us, members opposite have been attacking amalgamation - which I think it has been clearly established this is not; on the question of certain ill effects, which I believe are fancied and figments of their imagination to a large extent; on the rural areas, which I believe is absurd. It seems to me that members of the Opposition found it necessary to talk, or were instructed to talk, and they immediately started saying, well, what you're starting to do is going to threaten the rural areas of Manitoba; and these people, Mr. Speaker, are people who spend a good deal of their time in the City of Winnipeg, and if they are not conscious of the importance of the interplay, economic, social and otherwise, of the people who live within the city and the area of Greater Winnipeg and all the rural areas of Manitoba reaching all the way up to Churchill, then they're really not aware of what is happening in the world today and they are still being as parochial, as insular, as were the people at the time when Manitoba itself was brought into Confederation. And I'm afraid that there are some amongst us in this room who still think in the terms of those years.

The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, has said that people in the rural areas are concerned that Greater Winnipeg will have a structure with, and I quote: "the political muscle to extract from the Provincial Government funds that may very well be important to them" - that is to them, being the rural people. Then he answered that charge and he said - and it's in Hansard Page 2059 - "There will always be a balance struck between any provincial government attempting to try and satisfy all the needs and aspirations and interests of every group within this province, whether they be from the north, whether they be from southern Manitoba, whether they be from Greater Winnipeg." That's exactly what this government has been attempting to do, and would the Leader of the Opposition in government speak of the fear that a government would not respond to the needs of the people with a sense of priority and a sense of urgency and a sense of need, but would prefer one to another because of the muscle provided by one or another group? There has been accusations in the past that the agricultural elements of Manitoba have controlled the Manitoba Government's policies in past years time and again, and I wonder if the Member for Rock Lake would admit that that is true. And he shakes his head. He would never agree that past governments of Manitoba were strongly influenced by the needs and demands of the agricultural community. He would never agree to that, I believe.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be prepared to answer a question on this particular matter? Could he indicate, give an example of how the farm people of Manitoba have controlled the destiny of the people of the total Province of Manitoba?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to do so, and that's my point. That's my point; that throughout the 50-odd years that I've lived in this province, I have heard time and again accusations within Winnipeg that the agricultural element of Manitoba is controlling policies of previous governments, and the Member for Rock Lake challenges me to support that statement and I can't. I don't propose to try, because I do not want to fall into the kind of a situation in which he was in in this last month, where he said that an element in the City of Winnipeg will suddenly become so powerful as to control government in the future. He is the one who's made the kind of accusation which he has just, by implication, denied would have been justified in years gone by in the rural element of Manitoba. And I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is a false approach that he and others have made where they have been trying to set up city versus country, urban versus rural, as being something that competes and fights for recognition, and, Mr. Speaker, I reject that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. The Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: . . . personal privilege here, Mr. Speaker, if I may. . . . that I

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) believe in the comments I had to make in regards to the city bill, that the city bill as it affects the City of Winnipeg and what may take place in the future insofar as the rural municipalities are concerned, are one in harmony with the other. I didn't segregate either one.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm sorry, there's no point of privilege -- it's a matter of debate. The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Rock Lake points out is the possibility that I attributed to him sounds that I heard from other members from the rural areas of the Conservative Party, and that being the case, I will of course accept his statement because I don't want to go to the trouble of rereading all his speeches, that he is not guilty as I believe others were in his party on this talk about the two areas, and therefore, as my old army buddy, I ask him to accept the fact that I believe that what he said must be acceptable as being correct. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a simple political fact of life in Manitoba that the urban area has a long way to go just to catch up to the traditional advantages held by the rural areas. I just made that statement, Mr. Speaker. And that's the one that the Member for Rock Lake would certainly object to. Had he been listening and objected to it at the moment, I would have taken it back, because I'm hoping that he is right in what he said and that we will look forward to a better working together between the people in the urban areas and the rural areas and the northern areas of Manitoba, because if we don't recognize that need, then we are indeed blind to the future.

Well, we have heard discussions about haste and speed and scrambled eggs and other bogeymen with regard to community committees; some complaints that community committees will be too weak. We heard one from one of the members of my party; we heard them from the other side. We've heard accusations that the community committees will be too strong. We've heard that they're meaningless. We've heard that indeed we are creating or repeating the two-tier system because they will indeed be municipalities themselves. And altogether, lumping what was said by members of the Opposition into one, then one has to say that they have neither listened to what has been said from this side, nor have they read what appears in Hansard, in the policy papers, in the bill, and if they did they certainly didn't understand what it was that we were talking about, and since it is vital that they have a reasoned judgment with which to base their vote, I'll only repeat what I said earlier when I had explained the long process and the detailed studies that preceded presentation of this program, when I quoted from the Greater Winnipeg Boundaries Commission's views.

May I repeat just a short excerpt of what I said when I introduced the bill? Page 1470 in Hansard; reading an excerpt from the Report of the Boundaries Commission's - that is the Greater Winnipeg Boundaries Commission's view - "that as the Greater Winnipeg Community grows and its population increases, its service needs will grow accordingly. The Commission's concern is that in the regional government's attempts to meet these pressures for increased services, the most fundamental need, that is the individual citizen's democratic right to maintain the closest possible identification and involvement with his local community and his elected representative, must not be neglected. In this connection the Commission regarded the community committee components of the regional government as absolutely critical." That's a quotation -- and that's a quotation. And the Member for Sturgeon Creek, who has spoken at least twice on this bill and still doesn't understand it, will I hope continue to listen and to learn, but with a mind which is ready to listen and to absorb and to then react intelligently rather than blindly with blinders, with preconceived ideas, with an inability to understand what it is that is going on in the future of this greater area.

I went on to say on the same page that the decisions to be made on any form of unification I left to the regional council, of which they all form part. All community committees form part. The government is not telling them, "you shall unify one or another service in this bill." The government is making it possible for them to continue as they have up to now, with the same responsibility for the delivery of services they have today, and in their wisdom and in due time and with proper study they can make changes either way. And, you know, the Member for Sturgeon Creek didn't read this, hear it, and if he did he didn't understand it, Mr. Speaker, because he still blindly shouts out such statements that would indicate his ignorance of what it is that we are proposing to do. Nor has he pointed out in the bill any manner in which it could be challenged that that is our intention. We say that these new regional councils will be able to unify certain services, they could decentralize certain services, and that that is something for

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) them to decide.

Well, looking over the various speeches by members of the Opposition, I came to the conclusion that it was ridiculous to try and to answer arguments individually. Most of them are so far removed from anything to do with this bill, it would be wasting the time of this House to do so. But there was one notable exception in the speeches from the Conservative Party, and that was the speech from the Honourable Member for Riel, who I believe may have had some confusion in his mind about some points of detail, but at least, Mr. Speaker, I believe that he seems to have grasped some of the basic points. For example, he said, "A greater number of the clauses in the bill set out what the council may do if it so desires. This would seem an important distinction in that beyond initial changes established by the Act, it will depend on the council to what degree the operation in the city will change in the future."

Mr. Speaker, that is the important distinction in this bill, and the Honourable Member for Riel recognized it as such and I am delighted that he did. Because understanding it, he cannot help but understand as well that by this bill we are returning to the people the right and the power to govern their own local affairs. I only wish that the Honourable Member for Riel would have been able to sit down with his Leader and certain other members of his caucus, and explained to them - and especially to his Leader - what was the philosophic background of this bill, because he understood it. And he would have saved the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition many questions on that list of his that had to do with projection.

Again I'll quote the Honourable Member for Riel: "It would appear that for the first while at least it will be business as usual for many of the present administrative personnel in the Greater Winnipeg area." And further he says, "Therefore most, but not all, of the regulations set out in the Metro Act or the Municipal Act are already in force." And I would recommend that over the weekend and the next few days, honourable members of his party don't read what we have had to say - because I know that they would question it, they wouldn't accept it - but read what was said by the Honourable Member for Riel. His contribution was one that showed an understanding and an appreciation - and indeed the fact that he read it. That alone is a compliment, I feel, that he has paid the bill, which I feel other members of the Opposition have not done. I congratulate him for the time and trouble that he took, as he did, to read and understand these portions of the bill. I trust his reading has persuaded him that this revolutionary upheaval, this chaos which he was concerned about earlier, will not in fact occur.

Just one small point in what he said. He questioned something about the power to tax the utilities, and asked whether on top of the present tax that is imposed by the provincial government on the usage of hydro and gas we are bringing in a new one, I'd just like to inform him that the electricity and gas sales tax has been in effect since 1935 with the last rate change to the above rates in 1962. That tax is levied side by side with the provincial sales tax now, so therefore there is no change proposed by us in rate or structure.

Well, as I said, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of regret to me that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition's understanding of the bill and the background is considerably less clear than that of his colleague, the Member for Riel. He talks about constitutional change, about a pentagon system, and even about Machiavelli, none of which have much relevance to the bill, which is relevant to the people and to their needs, and this he has not been able to ascertain, but he never lost the ability to sit on his dignity and mutter. That he has never lost. And he's still doing it. He's still doing it.

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition admits that alienation and apathy exists among the people of Greater Winnipeg. Then what does he say about that? He says, don't try to solve it; you'll only make things worse. Like saying if you're sick don't take any medicine; you will only get sicker. He says this is an attempt to try and bring about a cheaper form - a cheaper form he says - of reform. Then he starts complaining about cost. We can't have it both ways. It's one way or the other. It is indeed a paradox. And he quotes statistics from "The Place of Greater Winnipeg in the Economy of Manitoba," Metro's recent presentation about the amount of revenues and jobs generated in the city, the distribution of population in the province and so on. I think he even gave us credit for having written the introduction to that document or else he is saying that we blindly following Metro's document, and states the statistics; and he makes no effort to refute the statistics, he just makes it clear, like so many other members on his side have done, that he doesn't like the state of affairs. He doesn't like it. You know, that's a great help. He doesn't like it, so one sits on one's dignity. He doesn't go as far as his colleague the Member for Lakeside, who suggested that the province do

(MR. CHERNLACK cont'd) everything in its power to halt urban growth, but he seems to suggest that if we simply don't recognize the fact of the urban centre's existence and its problem and its potential problem, it may go away quietly. That seems to be the attitude of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. He suggests that the government's urban reorganization program was "conceived in secrecy and will operate in secrecy, immune from popular and political control." And in his ignorance as of this moment he still says "That's right " Mr. Speaker. "Conceived in secrecy, will operate in secrecy, immune from popular and political control. There are -- yes, there are members of the press present who attended meetings, many more than the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition did in the community discussing the philosophy, the proposals of the government. They will be those I believe who would be able to comment on the secrecy involved in the government's program and I want to pay tribute to the coverage given by the news media of all the proposals that we have made and all the discussion that went on. The Honourable Leader wants to interrupt, I assume.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance will be prepared now to name all of those who have been hired by the government as consultants, at the time that they were hired, how long a period they were working, where they gathered the information, and how they assembled it and what information they base their conclusions on?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I propose to present my closing comments in the way which suits me, not the honourable member. I will say only that -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker -- I wonder - I haven't got my list at hand. Is it fair to say that that was a stupid remark, I'm not -- if it's not right to say it I withdraw it, I withdraw it. That, Mr. Speaker, was a remark which I don't have to pay attention to because as usual and as now is being said while the member is sitting on his "dignity" and he's continuing to say it.

Mr. Speaker, at what time has government, any government, developed a policy in a Cabinet room, or in a Cabinet meeting with the doors wide open, the Opposition present, the Press present, the public present, and debated and discussed the manners in which one wishes to bring forth a proposal. How can anybody conceive that as one discusses and develops a program that that is done in public. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, there's a suggestion made that the former government operated that way. I won't comment about the subject matter that is now before another form of tribunal as to how openly these matters are discussed. But I will say this, Mr. Speaker, and I've said it so often that even the Leader of the Opposition who is not often in the House, must have heard me say it, that we started work on this problem before we were in government; that we discussed this problem after we became a government; that a committee of Cabinet -- (Interjection) -- it's none of his business who were the members of that Cabinet -- spends a great deal of time and study to develop this program, and let me tell him we take full credit, Mr. Speaker. We take full credit. We, the elected members of this Legislature, who form part of this Cabinet Committee, take full credit for the development of this concept. And no matter how much he says about the consultants we used, we used them and we are happy with the contribution they made, and with the writing that was done, because, Mr. Speaker, I don't pretend that I wrote the paper - and I do say that not one person wrote the paper, contributions were made. I taken final responsibility, not just -- I take pride in the way it presents the problems and the program. But the development of it was done by members of this government, and that includes not only the Cabinet committee but the entire caucus, because secrecy may be involved in terms of what one does when one develops a program in Cabinet but in the end it was every member of caucus who participated in the development and consideration of the program and the development of the concept. This was nothing that had not been cleared with caucus, and not recently, and not when the Bill was prepared but long before the paper itself was written. So that it is with a great deal of pride, I believe, that I can say on behalf of all members of this caucus that there was full participation and I think the Bill reflects considered thinking.

I heard some more grumbling from across the road but nobody is standing so I'll just assume that they want to grunch on their own.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition really believes that the new Council or the Community Committees could operate in secrecy, or that bureaucrats could possibly operate in secrecy, it's further evidence that he has not read the Bill. And I don't wonder because it is 400 printed pages long, and I don't think he read the Bill. Now he says he read the Bill, and I believe him because I don't believe that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) would deliberately make a statement that is untrue, so I believe him he read it.

Mr. Speaker, he did not understand it, he did not understand it but he read it, he says he read it and now -- (Interjection) -- and now he says that he thinks, he thinks he understood it maybe better than I did. Well, Mr. Speaker, the contribution he has made to date indicates to me that he doesn't, he doesn't really have justification for claiming an understanding because there is section after section in the Bill which requires full disclosure on various levels and once the Bill is enacted the practice of full disclosure at the local government level will to a far greater extent than found in the past in any jurisdiction in Canada as far as I have been able to find out, be a matter of Law and not a matter of practice. There is disclosure required in the Bill, as a matter of fact, to the extent where amongst the amendments we will be bringing in, we will be bringing in certain restrictions on the extent of it as a proposal as having gone a little too far.

The Honourable Member the Leader of the Opposition is apparently unaware of the disclosure provision, of the requirement that there shall be meetings held at which the public may be present, aside from the fact that there will be meetings held with the public participation -- and this is something he knows nothing about because he can sit there and mumble all he likes -- (Interjection) -- to mumble and even to yell as long as he is able to do it when he is out of order, he is happy to do so, but I am not prepared to give him the opportunity.

But he does admit -- and he's still mumbling, and he is still mumbling, Mr. Speaker -- the Leader of the Opposition admits that we need zoning and land use control; he admits, and I have it somewhere, yes, Page 2057 of Hansard, he speaks of the confusion that has existed in planning; "we need a change essentially," -- I'm quoting from him, his speech -- "for some very real reasons, zoning and land use control, the confusion that existed in planning, the whole impossibility of getting things done in the Greater Winnipeg area. And there were failures and I'm the first to admit that there were failures" -- and I'm still quoting him -- "but the question that I'm going to have to ask you is, really would this solve very much?"

Well, he admits that the problems exist. Then he rejects proposals out of hand because he can apparently see no ironclad guarantees about what the future holds. Mr. Speaker, he doesn't propose any alternatives. His attitude reminds one of the people that Noah tried to urge aboard the Ark and he says, come on up and then they held back. And he's holding back and doing that. Does that help him any; does that solve the problems, does he bring any proposals? When I asked -- I think it was him, it was somebody else -- what do you propose, and they say let's have a Commission review what has been said in the past, and let them bring back a recommendation and then we'll be able to decide. One more, one more commission, one more review, and I say it's high time the Conservative Party started to do its own homework, and make its own decisions, and make its own reviews, and to arrive at its own policy and stop waiting for Commissions to be appointed to do it for them.

Mr. Speaker, now the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition quoted Mr. Elsworth Bole -- (Interjection) -- oh, and he's mumbling again, Mr. Speaker. He quoted Mr. Elsworth Bole's figures of 4.9 million dollars as the cost of unifying fire fighting services in Greater Winnipeg area -- that figures's been around for so many years with the courtesy of Mr. Bole and the help of some of the members of the Conservative party that by the very fact of its longevity it should have been changed by now. In any event, Mr. Speaker, the . . .

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

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Finance can indicate whether the Local Government Boundaries District Commission has furnished the government with information of what the cost actually would be, and I wonder if he would table that information in the House so we can see the inaccuracy of Mr. Bole's comments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I intend to continue to make my presentation in the manner in which I see fit, and I will deal with the matters raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I will tell him one of the troubles of trying to confirm a figure that's thrown out just as a figure is that one not having the background for it has great difficulty in even checking arithmetic like is one and one two when all one gets is a total figure. The figure is patently ludicrous and we've looked into that figure to some extent, Mr. Speaker, because it's not in the Boundaries Commission Report. We have a pretty good idea where that figure came from, and I'm talking about the 4.9 million dollars, and the information I'm given is that the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) figure came from a source which was confidential to Mr. Bole, and which it was felt I shouldn't be discussing at all. And Mr. Bole has not, has not given anybody, to my knowledge, the figures to back it up; nor has he quoted the source from which he got it because as I understand it it was confidential too. But to the extent -- (Interjection) -- I will deal with the letter he wrote me because I happen to have a copy with me. We've had discussions, confidential as well I'm afraid but people who would seem to know true cost, and the conclusion I have come to, is that there is really no basis in fact for that sum, no rationale for it.

Sir, I'd like to deal with the matter of Mr. Bole's so-called cost projections, and I would like to talk about them. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I'm aware that the Leader of the Opposition is mumbling. I intend to call the Speaker's attention to the frequency with which he does it but then if I do it every time he does it, then of course I'll be saying he's doing it again as if I'm listening to him instead of talking to you, Mr. Speaker, who is the person to whom I should be addressing my remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think I have indicated on occasion that interruptions and injections into another member's debate are not permissible. I'm certain the honourable gentlemen in the Assembly are going to try to adhere to the procedure that they wish should be conducted in this Assembly. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with some of Mr. Bole's so-called cost projections. May I -- he's doing it again, Mr. Speaker. I really don't mind his doing it if he only did it a little more quietly, because I intend to continue to ignore him to the extent that I can.

Dealing with Fire and Police -- I'm really not succeeding, am I? -- again and again during the past six months we've heard the statement that within two years after Metro Toronto's Police services were unified the cost of Toronto's Police services rose by 75 percent. That statement's been made a number of times -- I'm trying to recall, I believe it was made by Mr. Bole on a TV discussion panel on which the Member for Sturgeon Creek and I participated with Mr. Bole, I believe it was said at that time -- but I was concerned to know whether or not this was really true, what were the figures to back it up. So I had the Municipal Budget Branch of this government check with the Department of Municipal Affairs in Ontario and the figures received from the Department in Ontario were, a comparison of Police increase, cost of police amalgamation, that is not the cost of amalgamation but the cost of Police the increase after amalgamation, and also as a comparative figure the cost of fire protection -- and let's go back and remember somebody made a projection on the cost of amalgamation of fire protection -- the cost of fire protection unamalgamated in Toronto, we find that in 1958 the percentage increase over 1956 for police was 15.2 percent. In the case of unamalgamated fire the percentage increase in 1958 over 1956, 37.6 percent. Not the fault of amalgamation clearly, there was no amalgamation, but the increase was there. We find that the 1959 percentage increase over 1956, which was the year before amalgamation, the police increase was 25.2 percent -- not 75 percent as was quoted but 25.2 percent. The increase for the fire, not amalgamated was 51.8 percent. Well, people who want to oppose amalgamation by using cost projections have to be able to understand that costs rise, that service demands -- (Interjection) -- who, the Opposition? I wouldn't like to think that the Opposition would misuse figures, and the Leader of the Opposition is now asking me the question -- but I do pay attention to what he just said, "Are you saying that costs are going down?"

Mr. Speaker, at no time did a member of this Party, in opposition or in government, in this House or outside of this House -- and let me just qualify that, I said a member of this Party, and I can't speak for all members, we have so many members now in Manitoba, I can't speak for all of them, but I speak for members of this Legislature who are members of the New Democratic Party -- at no time did any of them say that costs would go down. And for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest now that I might be implying -- (Interjection) -- well then why ask the question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, now the Leader of the Opposition saying something for the benefit of the Attorney-General, is already indicating clearly that we should pay no attention to what he said because it is a long time, a long time, since he has said something for the benefit of the Attorney-General or any of us in a sincere way. -- (Interjection) --

Mr. Speaker, at no time did I ever deny that costs are going up, and if the Honourable

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) Member for Sturgeon Creek attended any one - and I know he did attend one of the community committee meetings - he knows that I showed actual slides of the history of municipal taxation and I showed how they were all going up; and to even try to suggest sitting on his dignity that I am implying that they're not going to go up is completely ignoring so much of what I have been saying. Costs are rising all the time, Mr. Speaker, we are using other ways of trying to help control them, but never have we suggested that costs will go down or that they won't go up. What we have suggested is that amalgamation itself is not a major cost factor in the increasing and escalating costs. And I will deal with that - and I'll ask the Member for Sturgeon Creek to keep either quiet or if he wants to ask a question, I have not yet refused him the opportunity to ask a question. So one or the other; either let him stand and ask for permission to ask a question or let him sit and try and be quiet. I wonder if one of the pages could bring him a glass of water, it might help him.

Mr. Speaker, we've heard a figure from Mr. Elswood Bole who to me has always been an honourable gentleman, using the figure of \$18 million, and we've heard that figure repeated time and again, and you know I'd like to be able to deal with it, dispose of it for once and for all, but I don't have the slightest illusion that no matter how I deal with it those members who want to use the figure will continue to do so because indeed they have done so. Some of the people who know very well the lack of information there is in regard to that figure.

Now let's talk about the Boundaries Commission Report which probably has been read in part by some or some part of the members of the Opposition where they did talk figures. Let us recognize that all that they did was to talk about a base year and the cost that they calculated would have been the cost of raising the pay level, the salary scale, of existing employees of all the municipalities to the highest level paid in the categories in which they are employed. That figure - and Mr. Bole quoted it at a meeting which I attended - is one decimal place over, \$1.8 million as being the estimated increase in cost on that calculation. That appeared in the Boundaries Commission report. But try to look for more, try to look for more information to support what Mr. Bole has said because he's been saying 18 million and the Leader of the Opposition used that figure of 18 million. Oh, he says he didn't. Well, there are others in his Party who did. Oh, the Member for Sturgeon Creek volunteers that he used that figure and indeed he did. You know the one thing I give the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek credit for is that when Mr. Bole tried to attribute the entire increase in cost in the St. James-Assiniboia pre-amalgamation to post-amalgamation the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek at the same time practically said, "you cannot attribute that increase in cost to amalgamation itself." And I give him credit for not having permitted misinformation to be spread by Mr. Bole when he was present and was able to deny it and I do give him credit for it. But he did quote a figure of 18 million and for that he had no justification. And I still think the Leader of the Opposition quoted it but I guess I'll have to go back and find it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Bole started using that \$18 million figure I was intrigued, but concurrently with that the Mayor of Transcona was quoted as - (Interjection) -- Yah, well, the successor to the Honourable Minister of Labour was quoted - and I heard this on radio where, nothing was quoted, but there was an excerpt of an interview with him -- where he said that the Greater Winnipeg Boundaries Commission had made projections of cost and implied that there was a substantial increase projected, and I asked him, and I wrote him on February 10th, and I said I was very -- and I quote from the letter: "I would very much like you to indicate to me where I could find the projections which you say were made by the Greater Winnipeg Boundaries Commission and the supporting figures. I still believe that it is impossible to make projections because of all the unknown factors, but if you have more information then by all means I would like to have it." So the Honourable Mayor, His Worship the Mayor of Transcona replied to me on February 15th and he said, "I might say Mr. Elswood Bole of the Greater Winnipeg Boundaries Commission has projected at least a 17 mill increase if your White Paper proposals become law and I believe he personally would be very happy to project these costs for your benefit." That's an excerpt of what was said by the Mayor of Transcona and I wanted to believe as he believed that Mr. Bole personally would be very happy to project these costs and I asked my Executive Assistant to see whether it was possible.

On February 11th the Executive Assistant wrote to Mr. Bole and he said, "On several occasions you have stated publicly that it would cost an additional 17 mills in taxes or some approximately 18 to 20 million dollars to implement a central city plan in Greater Winnipeg." He went on to say, "We have no working papers for this and that I would be very anxious to . . .

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) " . . . see how these figures were arrived at." These are the figures that the members of the Opposition are quoting. It reminds me, if I may digress for a minute, the way the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge was gleefully asking whether it's true or not that there was a deficit in the Health Department of \$30 million and when I reminded her of her use of that figure she said, well I had to quote something to get an answer. Maybe that's the way the Opposition operates. Maybe that's why they've been using figures like \$17 million, \$18 million, in Mr. Bole's case even more.

Well, Mr. Bay wrote to Mr. Bole and asked him if he could let me have the kind of information that would be useful to justify that. Mr. Bole replied to me, wrote to me on February 15th stating that he had received this letter, and I quote from his letter: "No doubt during this time that since the Boundaries Commission Report was published your experts have studied the report carefully and will have noted that in Appendix B, Page 107 of the Report, there is found an amalgamation cost formula for Greater Winnipeg." He says, "Your experts should be able to determine the increased costs involved in the amalgamation of all municipal services presently being handled by the municipalities of Greater Winnipeg by applying the cost formula referred to above." Well, that's what he said and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition who is familiar with all the material in the Greater Winnipeg Boundaries Commission surely knows what Mr. Bole says, that there is a formula there and he may recall, because I do, that there was an occasion when I said to him, if the use of our computers and our experts would be of help to him, if he was prepared to give me the assumption which would have to go into the computer I'd get the calculations produced for him, but the assumptions were the things that I asked for and I never got, Mr. Speaker.

I then replied to Mr. Bole on February 17th and I said that I received his letters which I'd hoped would have helped me for the working basis for his publicly stated costs and I pointed out he of course referred to the projections contained in the report and I said, "as you will be only too well aware this is a formula that can be applied only if one has specific knowledge of all the variables contained in it. Variables - and I'm glad the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is listening to me, - "variables which the Boundaries Commission staff identifies as being unknown, 'unknown'. Had the answers been known or had they even been possible to arrive at I presume that the Commission's research staff would have applied its formula and produced the resulting cost figures." And I said "you force me to assume by your failure to provide me with any working material of the potential costs that both you and the Commission's research staff found it impossible precisely because of the unknown variables involved to apply the formula. In other words, I must assume that there are no working papers to support your projections or any other cost projections being made."

Mr. Speaker, I don't know any other way I could have been more blunt in challenging Mr. Bole to back up his figures by telling him that I believed that he did not have any supporting material for it. I thought at least that would bring about some way in which I could estimate or evaluate his figure. And I then told him of how it proved impossible for me to get figures based on the formula in the Appendix B because anybody who has read the report of the Local Boundaries Commission knows full well that that was an academic exercise, it was one given to the university to say, "suppose you were asked a question how would you approach an answer!" And that is what they did. They dealt with the supposition of being asked a question and making projections how would they then start dealing with the manner in which one does it and then they developed a formula and I'll deal with the formula soon. I pointed that out to Mr. Bole. I said that was an academic exercise because variables and assumptions have to be put into the formula and I said to Mr. Bole, and I again quote an excerpt, "I must tell you frankly that I regret very much that you have not made any effort to substantiate the cost figures you have been stating publicly." And, Mr. Speaker, may I say figures which members of the opposition have gleefully repeated again and again.

Mr. Bole replied to me on February 22nd and he said, "It would be unthinkable and irresponsible for a provincial government to recommend a reorganization without calculating the effect sociologically and economically. As you are having difficulty in applying the formula used in my calculations" - I'm quoting straight from his letter, -- "perhaps I can help you in checking your method of calculation, if you send me your formula and factors for analysis." He says that since I'm having difficulty in applying the formula used in his calculation I should send him my method of calculation so he can analyze it. Well, that may make sense to some, it didn't to me. So I replied at rather great length to Mr. Bole, who is an old friend of mine

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) and I do enjoy corresponding with him, and I concluded the letter by saying to him, "The very fact that you now in the final sentence of your letter of the 22nd request us to send you factors which you know very well cannot be measured and - I refer you again to the conclusions of your own reference to Appendix B - confirms my view that you understand quite clearly the impossibility of making the projections you persistently call for in public." And he replied, and this is the end of our correspondence in this respect, on March 4th, he repeats, "My calculations show an increased cost of 18 to 20 million dollars in addition to the extra costs caused by inflation and growth." He used the factors, the cost factors, applied them in Appendix B of the Boundaries Commission Report, he says, "One does not have to be an expert to project what would likely happen with a plan such as you propose" and then he says, "I've told you how I have arrived at my figures." Then he says, "the fact that some of the factors are unknown does not make it less incumbent on the government to arrive at some calculation of cost." In other words, even if you don't know the factors you can still make a guess.

So, Mr. Speaker, I did call in some people, people with whom I've been working for some time, people who worked for this government and still do, and I asked them if Mr. Bole can arrive at a figure why can't you. Do you know what I was told by people whom I respect, people in the finance field whom I respect? I was told, "what answer do you want and then we can find out the assumptions to be used to bring about the answer." And they said, they said, Mr. Speaker, "do not ask of us as professionals that we do a job in which we have no faith because we don't know what the assumptions should be in order to arrive at a figure." And you know, Mr. Speaker, and I'm speaking now as seriously as I can, I was moved by being told by experts that I had no right to ask of them that they do something which they consider as being inadequate, based on insufficient information or a lack of concept of what assumptions have to be put in in order to project what the future holds in store.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Finance was able to inquire how Hydro was able to arrive at its calculations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, once you are prepared to make assumptions based on knowledge and experience then you can make projections, and that's why I asked the Leader of the Opposition in the past: you give me your assumptions, I'll produce the figures but then they're your figures, not mine. Because responsible government as far as I'm concerned is being asked the kind of questions that are being asked in relation to what other people may do, elected people may do in another area, elected by people of their area who demand certain services, what they will do is a matter for them to decide and if the Honourable Leader thinks that I am going to start debating anything other than - if he thinks I'm going to discuss anything other than the municipal bill before us today he is wrong. With that warning, if he wants to ask me a question, I'll listen to the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I thank the Minister of Finance for allowing me the question, again he may not want to answer. I would like to know how Hydro was able to arrive at assumptions with respect to policy and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I fail to see the validity of Hydro being involved in the debate. Order, please. I am not going to debate the matter with anyone. I said I fail to see how the question of Hydro can be related to Bill 36 which happens to be the uni-city bill. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is either presuming on the fact that we've known each other since he was a young fellow and our fathers practiced law together and is thus taking advantage of me, or else he wishes to take unfair advantage of the fact that I gave him the opportunity to ask a question. Either way, I think he had no right to ask the question and I appreciate your interruption.

Well, Mr. Speaker, these experts, and they are people working for this government, and they are good people whose opinions I respect as I say, did not wish to be given the responsibility of making assumptions for which they would not be responsible and I went back to the book and I said, well, Mr. Bole is able to do it, why can't I? So I went back to the book and this whole section is some pages long, page 107 to 141, there's a whole development, and I said this was an academic exercise and it was, and they talk about the definition of the problem

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) and various aspects and inputs that have to go into it, and I won't bore members who have not read this with it, and those who have read it because they may not be interested, but those that have read it will certainly remember it because they come up with a formula, and the formula gives certain letters to factors which have to be assumed; and it reads: a plus b plus y plus z plus e plus c equals the answer, which has been asked for. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, there's a blank after the equals mark.

But facing it, the opposite page, is the conclusion drawn, and let me read an excerpt from that. "The study group determined that there are factors which, depending on the scale, will influence the cost of amalgamations. Generally these costs cannot be measured. It was concluded that costs of local functions are generally irrelevant as citizen control can be exercised under a structure which maintains local units and local autonomy in some form. The intentional preservation of possible dis-economies of scale in the provision of services at this purely local level is a strong possibility." So we know, it's right in the printed word. They were unable to arrive at a figure and yet the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition keeps saying, well, what did they say? And I keep saying, "Read what they said; it's here." And he has a copy. But if he wants to look at their working papers, I understand there's a room full of them and he's welcome to enter the room and he's welcome to look at them, but since I didn't have time to look through that room full of paper and figures and cards, I thought it might be useful to approach or have approached the Local Government Boundaries Commission people, and indeed I have before me a copy of the letter signed by the Director of Research of the Local Government Boundaries Commission, Mr. David G. Henderson, who is the person who is responsible for the formula evaluation and production and Schedule B of that plan. And I quote from the letter:

"At no time, insofar as I'm aware, did the Commission authorize or undertake any further cost projections beyond that which could be measured reasonably correctly and having assumed that no employees would be dismissed as a result of any amalgamation and also that the salaries would be adjusted within various classifications to that presently established with the staff of the dominant municipality within any amalgamation." That's the study I have already referred to which did show something like 1.8 or 2 million dollars' increase on that assumption.

The Commission did not undertake further projections for three reasons: 1. Budget restraints. I don't know just how much they spent; I believe it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$800,000, but whatever it was, one reason they didn't was budget restraint, the other was the time restraint, but Number 3, Mr. Speaker, the apparent futility of attempting to measure a cost when no base data was available and the factors concerned appeared, as a result of study and investigation, to be qualitative at the best. It is possible that individual members of the Commission did undertake their own projections based on the data already available and employing certain guidelines established in the cost amalgamation formula study. Whether or not this was done and whether any member had access to resources outside these available to the Commission, I cannot say. In any event, no projections which are not recorded here or in the Commission's provisional plan were made by the Commission staff, nor were any authorized by the Commission. --- (Interjection) -- Yes, I'll be glad to table the letter.

So, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we had no help. We had a formula with a lot of letters in it. We had a statement saying that, in the conclusion, that you can't do it, and we had confirmation from the research person responsible for this group saying it wasn't done, and yet we are being asked to report on it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, at no time has Mr. Bole ever stipulated what year he used as a base for measurement, nor has he indicated what level of services, nor has he indicated what anticipated result there would be for wage negotiations, some of which are not even completed as yet, nor has he indicated what increases or decreases in assessment there would be, or in business tax revenues. In fact, none of the factors which would influence a calculation, factors which vary substantially from one year to the next, were ever indicated by Mr. Bole, and if he proposes to come before Municipal Affairs Committee on this, I sincerely hope that when he uses figures he will be able to back them up. And I would sincerely hope that when members of the Opposition use figures, they will be prepared to back them up.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I know I'm taking a lot of time but this is the opportunity that one has in closing debate on principle on a bill and therefore I must do so. I want to deal somewhat on the matter of community committees, because the Leader of the Opposition, the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) spokesman for the Conservative Party, doesn't understand how you can have centralization and decentralization in one bill; therefore, he just cannot quite understand how the system will make it possible to bring local government closer to the people. Well, let's examine the political system provided for in this bill, the decentralization of the political process, because he says he read it and he says he understood it better than I did, so I'll give him my understanding. I have yet to grasp his understanding of it at all. There are two aspects to this decentralization, Mr. Speaker: the single-member ward system with wards comprised of an electorate sufficiently small in number to permit easy access to the elected councillors; and secondly, the aggregation of wards into community committees - I have to say this because he didn't know it apparently - the geographic areas of which in most cases correspond to the existing municipality. Something apparently he didn't know, - (Interjection) - Pardon? And he says, "So why destroy them?" and that shows again the ignorance that he has of the bill and its concepts.

Well, on this question of community committees, there are functions assigned to the community committees. Initially and from day one and onward, until such time as the central council elects to make changes in the administrative setup - that is the service delivery system - the members of council in their role as members of a local community committee will operate substantially as do the existing municipal councils. So the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for once didn't say what I expected him to say, "So why destroy them?" Well if he listens he'll find out.

So on day one of the new system it'll be business as usual at the local municipal offices. They will continue to service their communities. The present municipal employees will report for work at their accustomed places, exactly as they did the day before January 1st, and they'll perform the same duties. The only difference at that stage will be that the elected representatives charged with the responsibility of supervising the local delivery of city services will be elected councillors sitting as a community committee rather than municipal councillors. And soon he will say that - (Interjection) - What? And again he says, "Just the same thing," which again shows he doesn't understand. -- (Interjection) - Municipal councillors? Well, sometimes it's fortunate that I can't hear all he says because then I can go on record and . . .

These community committees will supervise the delivery of local services, those services for which municipalities are dealing, and they will supervise the local delivery of those services for which the central council is responsible, those services which are now under Metro's jurisdiction. And then their general and ongoing function will be responsibility for planning and developing policy on programs, both local and regional, affecting the communities that they represent, where they will have to draw up budgets, where they will have to consider the budgets with the people affected, from which they will have to submit them to Council, and then administer the sums granted for local delivery of services. They will have to account to their local areas at regular intervals required by law on how budget allocations are being spent, and they'll have to account and explain to the people what the central council is doing and then report the reaction of the local people back to the central council.

The absolutely critical aspect of all these duties and functions is that they must be carried out in direct and open consultation with the people of the community. The concerns expressed by the Member for Rupertsland are the concerns reflected in this legislation. The councillors will be required, by law, to be directly responsive to and responsible to the citizens of the community. - (Interjection) - They are not now. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't have the knowledge of what is law and what is practice, and in St. James today there is no requirement for the councillors of St. James-Assiniboia to sit at a meeting in open consultation with the people of the community. There is no requirement there at all, and he doesn't know it apparently - and the Leader of the Opposition apparently recognizes that because he says, well, let's change that law, and that again shows that he has no conceptual idea of what is going on; all he has is -- (Interjection) -- .

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, we have clarified that these meetings will be taking place in a continuing process of consultation with people and it functions effectively. It cannot break down because the bill provides that the councillors in their community committee role must make themselves freely available at regular and well-publicized hours in the community committee offices, be available to talk to citizens who want to drop in, be available to the telephone to citizens who simply wish to call up and discuss a problem. And they have to, by statute,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) hold regular meetings well advertised in advance to ensure that they, the councillors, in fact reflect local wishes and needs and convey them accurately to the Regional Council. They have to hold a community conference at least once a year, and I believe that that is done in St. James-Assiniboia - I'm not sure whether it's by law or by practice, but it is done - to review programs, to review budgets with the people. This will occur in all areas throughout Greater Winnipeg where there will be an opportunity for direct input by the people into the budget process. And they will have to hold meetings at least quarterly to discuss issues, hear views, form plans, policies, programs, with the people in the community. They will have to hold meetings open, public meetings, at least once a month, to discuss with the people any issues of local concern. And again I say - and the Member for Sturgeon Creek is trying to tell me that that takes place in council and I say it may take place but I doubt it, because - in certain areas - because the fact is I have attended many meetings, none in St. James - Assiniboia to my recollection, but many meetings of many councils, and I have seen councils -- (Interjection) -- Will the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek either stand up and ask for permission to ask a question or sit?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Will the Honourable Minister tell me if he knows if anybody was ever turned away from an open council meeting and wasn't given the opportunity to speak or ask questions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have heard and I have seen people turned away from making presentations to councils in Greater Winnipeg. I have seen and I have heard people complain about that, and that's really not what I'm talking about. I believe that just about anybody can appear before a local council and present a brief. That's not what I'm talking about. I'm talking about sitting around a table to discuss a problem and require to do so by law.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Is the Minister aware that a citizen can appear or ask to appear at any committee meeting, committee of council, and discuss even finance, budget, engineering, anything he wants?

MR. CHERNIACK: I am aware that there is a practice in most councils, maybe all councils, giving citizens the right to appear, present briefs, make statements. I am not aware that there is a requirement that the council shall sit and talk and discuss the matter with the citizen who comes in. I am not aware of that. And if that is the case by law in, say, St. James-Assiniboia, I would appreciate the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek indicating to me where I can find it in the statute book so I can confirm what I think he is trying to say.

So the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, who have taken part in this debate, have made the point that this consultative process would only lead to people making all sorts of demands for services which would force the mill rates up. Now that's contrary to what the Member for Sturgeon Creek said they have the right to do and are doing now, because some have said, oh no, you are going to give them the opportunity to ask for additional services and that that will force mill rates up. The converse means, of course, don't give them the right; don't give them the opportunity; keep the mill rate down. What in effect we are saying is that we have faith, which may not be shared by others, that you can trust people to make intelligent and rational decisions about their own affairs. Just whose wishes do governments exist to serve if it's not the wishes of the people?

Mr. Speaker, I said in introduction of this bill at second reading that legislation represents an absolute, total, unqualified commitment to the most basic precept of democracy - that is, the right of the people to decide, and the philosophy that in a democracy the wishes of the people, taken in majority, must always be paramount.

But let's return to the community committees. In addition to the general ongoing duties, the community committees will be charged with a variety of duties and functions of a very specific nature, functions through which they will constitute the local voice on regional matters - the permanent local channel through which they can reach and influence their regional government. And I'm sorry I have now lost, I think, all members of the Opposition in what I am saying. I'm sorry only because I thought that they were not aware of the permanent function of the community committee. -- (Interjection) -- I am told now that I lost the attention of members of the Opposition some time ago; that's what the Member from Fort Garry reports to me. I'm indeed sorry that that is the case. I was not aware of it until just recently, And if he

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) feels that I'm wasting my time in trying to talk to an Opposition that will not listen, then I must -- (Interjection) -- Oh, the Leader of the Opposition has arrived so I think we're back to him. The government has been so thoroughly familiar with the legislation that I would forgive anybody behind me if they didn't listen because they already know what I'm saying. I'm trying to educate some of the members opposite.

Well, let's not get further involved in that and continue with the continuing requirement of the community committee in the budget process, the drafting of the local budget in consultation with citizens and citizens groups, in the appeal procedures, including planning and development matters, zoning bylaws and variations of bylaws, environmental control, Board of Adjustment appeals, building and housing standards. These onerous and responsible duties that are given to community committees. All these appeal procedures will be conducted in open, public hearings within the community affected and with the locally-elected councillors sitting as a community committee conducting the proceedings. They will have responsibility for supervision, deployment, assignment of duties of local staff. Now they won't have the power to hire and fire, the power to negotiate contracts of union agreements. They won't have the power to set fiscal policy for the entire region. They won't have the power to tax or to legislate. But they will have all those powers when they sit as members of the regional council.

Community committees, as such, must conduct a two-way reporting system: report the wishes of the community to the regional council; report to the community on the plans and the programs and activities of the regional council, including the making available of relevant documents. In the event of dissatisfaction with a given community over actions of the regional administration, or of confusion or lack of understanding of the regional administration, the community committee may require the appropriate administrative officer or officers to appear before a community meeting to make explanations directly to the citizens of the community. Thus the community committees will, we hope, provide the vehicle, provide the system within which participatory democracy can truly work.

The community committee, through its various activities, will provide the arena, the place where the local government and the citizens meet in direct, personal, informal contact on the citizens' home grounds. We believe it will work, the citizens will enjoy and take advantage of this heightened relationship between citizen and elected representative, because we are with this bill creating the framework within which it can work easily and naturally, and that does not exist in any legislation of which I am aware in this country.

I might add that there is a more persuasive argument for this belief. There's no other jurisdiction that I'm aware of that compels, compels elected representatives, by statute, to make themselves accessible and available to the people. The result, we believe, cannot help but be truly open government, government genuinely responsive to the people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we had throughout the last six months and more, continuous discussions with members of the public, the public itself, through the press, through the media, with various organizations, and we've even had the benefit of opinions from members of the Legislature, from political parties. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that throughout this debate, the 40 speeches that we've heard on Bill 36, has there been one contra proposal. You know, we've been talking about the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that one member has actually made a suggestion about what we ought to be doing about the problem that we are discussing in this bill. We have had criticism . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): . . . I made suggestions yesterday as to what should be done, what should happen, what the structure should be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I don't withdraw my statement that I have not heard one proposal for what should be done to deal -- (Interjection) -- I was present when the Honourable Member for Rhineland spoke, and I still say we've not had one positive proposal during this debate. There are people who spoke, who represent political parties in Manitoba, parties who should have a positive approach to a major problem in this province, parties who should develop a program and be able to present it, if not to the people at election time, at least when this bill is being debated.

Well, the Liberal Party made several contributions -- I mean members of the Liberal Party made several contributions. The Honourable Member for Assinibola was negative, like others were, in pointing out what was wrong. That's legitimate, but he didn't give anything

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) positive. The Member for Portage la Prairie, I was of course pleased with what he had to say, but also I respected the manner in which he made his presentation, because he did point out advantages he saw, disadvantages and fears that he saw - all of which I thought were legitimate - and then pointed out his approach to the final problem, and that is I think a positive way of dealing with it.

I wish I could say the same about the leader of his party, who is not with us. The leader of his party did produce some kind of a document, a sort of an involvement-plus plan which was really a hodgepodge. It was - well, I can only say that I would assume that since we haven't heard anything about it since it was first proposed, there are not many people that really got involved with it, as I recall it it was something like a three-tier system including the appointment of people elected at one level to sit at another level, and had a number of inconsistencies in it which I found rather difficult to comprehend. But I put more fault on the part of the Conservative Party whose responsibility it has been to lead the government of Manitoba for some, how long was it? - how long? Too long? Some nine years as I read it - his colleague says 11 and I'll accept 11 years as being more correct - for 11 years, which had the courage and the foresight and the understanding of the need to do something back in 1959 and did it, and which then lapsed into some peculiar form of lethargy on what was an increasing problem to the extent where to this day, to this day, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party has not produced a proposal of its own which would be an effort to deal with the problem which this government is now presenting to the Legislature.

The Conservative Party, as I recall it, came up with a statement. They said, well, it so happens that the government appointed three men to sit on the Boundaries Review Commission, so let those three men sit and study all the reports in the past, and let them come back with a report and then let's consider it, and if we can do something with it we will, and if we can't we'll then think about what we should do. And they didn't buy the plan, the provisional plan for local government. They're saying it's a terrible thing; you know, it's a terrible thing, Mr. Speaker, you did not have public discussion on this provisional plan. Mr. Speaker, what sense would there have been to have public discussions on the provisional plan which this government was not prepared to accept? Just what was the sense of doing something which this government was not prepared to follow? The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition just knows - like a broken record; he's now sounding like a broken record and I don't intend to do it.

The fact is that the commission no longer exists; there has been substantial resignation from it and, as far as the government is concerned, there is no point in holding hearings on a plan which is not acceptable to government. But the Conservative Party doesn't even have a plan to discuss. The Conservative Party has questions to ask, some of which make sense; they have criticism to make, some of which make sense; but they have no positive contribution to make, as can be judged by the lack of content of the speeches that we have heard from them. - (Interjection) - Mr. Speaker, I've just heard a new voice. The Member for Charleswood is now into the picture.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Is it necessary, in the Minister's view, for a political party always to have a plan, always to have a proposal on every issue?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . for a political party to have a proposal at all times. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Fort Garry wishes to debate with me whether the boulevard in front of the Legislative Building should be cemented or should have flowers in it, I promise him that I will not ask my party to accept a policy position on that problem. But, Mr. Speaker, when I come to deal with a problem affecting the municipal life of half the people of Manitoba, I would consider it a disgrace for a political party, which poses as a responsible party in this province, not to have a position and develop a position and prepare a program, and present a program on a question of such importance, and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Finance can indicate to this House exactly the date that the government rejected the conclusions and the workings of the Local Boundaries Commission.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the Leader of the Opposition is always concerned with dates - he didn't ask the time of day - because, Mr. Speaker, I can tell

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) you something. I don't know how people arrive at decisions, but some decisions that I arrived at in relation to this document occurred in my mind early, early in the morning when I was having a nightmare, when I thought about the lack of content, this lack of positive contribution I found here; and if the honourable member wants to know when the government made a decision, the final ultimate decision was made by this government at the time that the policy paper published by this government was sent to the printers. Until that time, the government was studying variations to its own approach, which was announced before election time and which the people of Winnipeg understood, as is evident by the people who are sitting behind me from Greater Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- I didn't hear. I didn't hear. Well, Mr. Speaker, fortunately this government operates not in dreams but in practical things, and having had a nightmare, I had to come down to earth and I had to sit with my colleagues and work in a practical, pragmatic way to deal with problems that we were prepared to face, which the Conservative Party is not prepared to face. Mr. Speaker, surely, surely honourable members would help me to arrive to a conclusion of this, my contribution. They will do so by trying not to interrupt or provoke me into making more comments, so I can come to a conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I have some questions before me -- (Interjection) -- Yes. Yes. The Member for Winnipeg Centre is right. I have a list of some 35 questions before me. I think the Member for Souris-Killarney said "Pass." I would . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I should like to indicate to all honourable members, much as I am appreciative of the comments - if I could hear them; I do not have a third ear -- consequently they create a confusion to me in trying to follow the Honourable Minister of Finance in his debate, and I don't think they contribute anything if one can't hear them. Consequently I would ask them to cease and desist. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All right. Questions (1) to (4) deal with cost projections and studies. I consider these questions nonsensical. On what basis, Mr. Speaker, could such studies and projections be made? We're leaving all of the decisions regarding services, whether they're to be unified or whether they're to be further decentralized, the level of services, the salary adjustments, the changes in program and the like, up to the new council. The people of Greater Winnipeg will have to decide and will want to decide what sort of community they want. Certainly we've devoted a great deal of study to the implications of various possibilities, as will the new council, but we don't want to prejudice nor do we want to prejudice the citizens in their decision. The point is, Mr. Speaker, and I wish I could get it through the heads, the heads collectively of the Opposition, that you can't treat a philosophical concept - the concept involved here is an absolute commitment of faith to real functioning grass roots democracy - just like an engineering project, which may be all that the Leader of the Opposition can understand, for which you can cost-account alternatives. You can't cost-account the still unknown and the undetermined will of the people. You can't. But the honourable member would like to do so. Fortunately for the people of Manitoba, he's not in a position to bring in legislation along these lines.

Question (5): What were the results in terms of aggregate figures and functional breakdown of each study or projection? Well, Mr. Speaker, I have limitations - I guess I've never denied them. I don't know. Aggregate figures. Functional Breakdown. It sounds like we're about to purchase a fleet of tractors rather than a system of local government designed to give the people total self-determination.

Questions (6), (7) and (8) deals again with discrepancies between various studies, projections, cost benefits, formulas. I asked the honourable member, and I wish I could remember where but I think he's agreed that I did do this in the past, to do some assumptioning, giving us some assumptions, so we can put our machine to work. If he knows . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: On these questions, then, I take it that the government --(Interjection) -- well this is the question, based on these questions. I'm asking the Minister whether the government did any projection of what costs would be in the future as a result of their plan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry that the honourable member has not been listening to me up to now. I presume he will not listen to me as I go on, so I will continue.

I told him that we've looked at the problem: we've had, and I honour the integrity of the people who have told me not to ask of them to do what they consider is not capable of being done. I have talked to him about this, this document and Schedule B: we've talked about Elswood Bole, and I have to tell him that I'm not prepared to discuss this aspect further with him. I'm dealing with his questions. And I would really like very much -- (Interjection) -- What consultants' report? -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is doing exactly what the House Leader has said is the role that the Leader of the Opposition has decided to play, and I'll let him continue to play that role to the extent that it lends itself to discredit is something that is his problem not mine. I would -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that's right. I must agree with what I just heard said - but I won't repeat it.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like the honourable member to help -- he can still make some contribution eventually I suppose -- to calculate for me, because I'm interested in his opinion, others may not be, just what is the cost-benefit ratio of a children's playground? That would be very helpful, the cost of a children's playground, I guess we can calculate if we knew the dimensions and the facilities. The benefits, I'd like his help. Oh I suppose it depends on the age of the children, and of the playground, and of the equipment.

I'd like to know the cost-benefit of a neighbourhood library or the cost-benefit of an improved morale on the police force or in the fire department. It would be most interesting to know what the honourable member has to say, and he says wages are going up, and does he resent that? Does he begrudge it? Not one member of council, of the opposition has -- no, I started wrongly. There are members in the opposition who have talked about the increased costs in the various municipalities because they're going to be raised to the level, but not one has dared to say that they don't feel that people are entitled to equal pay for equal work with equal qualifications. I wish they would say something about that because they implied to me that they don't want to see the level of all people raised to the highest level, that they're afraid of what will happen but -- and they say that's going to happen and they deplore it, and they deplore it. -- (Interjection) -- The Leader of the Opposition says he doesn't deplore it; other members do, other members do, other -- we have never denied it, and the honourable member is again gleefully proceeding to distort our opinion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, questions 9 and 10 dealing with projections again. I just state we will not make statements about projections for all of the reasons given. There's no way of reading the public mind two or three years hence, or even a month hence. Indeed if that could be done, and if the former Leader of the Conservative Party could read ahead even one month, the Leader of the Opposition would not be sitting in the seat which he occupies today. We have no intention of telling the people of Greater Winnipeg -- (Interjection) -- No, I'm talking about the decision made by his predecessor to call an election. The seats weren't changed since the election.

We do not intend to tell the people of Greater Winnipeg what they should and should not want. If we were prepared to make decisions for them we would form that government and we don't intend to do it. We would suspend the Labour Relations Act; we would prevent people from negotiating; we would decide which services would be amalgamated; we would decide which services would be decentralized; we would decide how much money would be spent on parks, on planning, on recreation centres, on swimming pools, on sewer development; we would be making decisions, then we could make projections. That's why I offered the Leader of the Opposition a long time back, give us your assumptions, we'll do the arithmetic.

Well No. 11 was about releasing the computer printouts. I think I've already offered to introduce the Leader of the Opposition into the room where there is great stacks of paper which he can look at, but I did offer him the facilities of the computer to deal with them.

12. Is it the intention of the government -- no, I'm sorry, that's 13.

12. In view of the government's avowed commitment to true democracy, in view that this is a major constitutional change, why does the government object to the holding of a referendum,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)and when I asked the Leader of the Opposition did he agree with a referendum he wouldn't say, because the truth is I don't think he would. I don't think that any intelligent person would discuss a referendum on this issue, and indeed I've had occasion to quote on previous occasions from the local government -- what do they call it? -- the Local Government Boundaries Commission Report saying that a referendum is the wrong way to proceed and it's not the one way to deal with a problem like this and indeed they have a most interesting quote from Edmund Burke who spoke in 1774 and I commend it to the reading of parliamentarians as to what is the responsibilities of elected people. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, the Member for Riel too has made the statement? Well but the Leader of the Opposition seemed to clearly suggest it in Question No. 12 that there should be a referendum. That's the way I read it.

Question No. 13 about integration of educational system into the amalgamated city structure. Does he suggest it? Is that something he wants? Or do you get away with things by asking questions and then not waiting for a reply indeed, but leaving a problem by asking the question? Well I wish the honourable member would talk to the Minister of Education, or indeed, to the Member from Riel who knows something about education, to see just what he would recommend on this question. And he talks about a structural model - more jargon of an engineering nature, I don't know where he picks it up from but he uses it, and uses it in manners on occasions where it really doesn't make sense to me. But I admitted my limitations. Well what we are doing in regard to the educational system is doing a partial equalization of cost according to a formula based on per pupil cost which we believe will yield the greatest equity possible.

14. Again projected costs. I don't propose to deal with that, I think I have done so. But I do remind members that we do have a personnel resources inventory task force which is dealing with this very question in a realistic way rather than one on theoretical bases.

15. What are the projected amounts of subsidy arising as a consequence of the intended equalization of mill rates? In other words the Provincial Government's subsidization of tax rates.

16. What are the projected costs of the equalization of services?

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government has at no time involved itself in projected costs, and most particularly in regard to equalization of services. The 1970 figures that we presented were made available some time ago, I don't as yet have the data, the 1971 data. When I have it I will make it available as I've already informed the various municipalities in Greater Winnipeg.

Now the question of City Hydro. 17 - What will be the government's policy with respect to City Hydro? Is it the intention that Manitoba Hydro negotiate or have expropriated on its behalf the assets? Will the profits of the City Hydro operation inure to the benefit of Greater Winnipeg? Well since there is doubt in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition I do have to spend a few minutes on that because that is an important and cogent question.

We drafted the legislation in such a way, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that whatever are the existing powers and rights of the City of Winnipeg in regard to the management, ownership and control of City Hydro will pass to the new Regional Council. We did not want to give them greater powers, nor did we want to take away from them any powers that they now have. As a matter of fact members may recall, the draft bill had a certain section in it, we substituted it for another, we are now reviewing the need to still make some further change to carry out our intent, which I repeat is that the regional council should be in no better or worse position in regard to the ownership, use and development of City Hydro than the city is today, but we do intend to limit it to that area which is now being served and that is the City of Winnipeg area, and that is something that we want to do to the extent that the legislation may not be that clear then we want to discuss that in committee.

Now -- (Interjection) -- Now the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition is nodding his head and saying something about blind faith. I want now to ask honourable members, all members of this House, to accept the fact that Bill 36 will pass second reading today. I want them to accept the fact that it will pass, that it will pass third reading and receive Royal Assent.

Until today I don't believe there has been any real measure of contribution from members of the Conservative Party to making the bill work and work better. There have been general

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . criticisms of the government in presenting the bill, and I believe in spite of the Leader of the Opposition's disagreement with me that we've not had positive suggestions. I am looking forward to our going into committee to deal with the bill section by section, and at that time I am hoping and I have some basis to believe that there will be a different attitude from the Opposition than there has been up to now. That is firstly an acceptance, and secondly a desire to try and make it work. In other words, improve it, and it's not going to be improved by negative approach to it.

Now on the question of City Hydro which is the one I departed from where the honourable member said something about faint hope, or I forget just how he put it - blind faith?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: . . . if at third reading, second reading which is the spot where changes are recommended, if they are brought in at committee, will the Minister have an open mind to accepting them?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, you know one of the reasons I'm talking too long, and I know I am, is that I've been speaking so often on this matter and it seems to be on almost every occasion I have said that there are many issues on which we have an open and receptive mind. We do know that we have a certain concept which we believe is correct and which we wish to proceed with. We do believe in the ward system. We do believe in the rough 10,000 to 12,000 people per elected person. We do believe in the community committee concept. We do believe in the commissioner form of government. There are certain matters that we believe are important and vital. There are other matters where we have a completely open and flexible mind, and those matters will be explored section by section, and I assure the Honourable Member for Riel that my mind will be as open and receptive as his was when he sat as a member of government during it. -- (Interjection) -- Well somebody suggests that that would be a backward step but I -- we'll see how we develop that. So on the Hydro question I give you our intent; I tell you what we want to accomplish, and that you help us work out the wording if you feel that the wording isn't sufficient.

I can tell you further that we are now still considering and trying to put into a workable form a formula whereby we can hope to equalize the cost of the purchasing of power amongst all consumers of power amongst all consumers of power in Greater Winnipeg. We want to see to it that just as we are trying to equalize the tax base so we should be able to equalize the cost of power and I would expect that when we come to the committee stage we will be discussing that with honourable members and with those who come to present briefs along the line. So that I would like members to be prepared to discuss that with us, and I'm sure they will because I'm sure that no matter whether they come from the City of Winnipeg or from the area of suburban Winnipeg they would realize the desirability of equalization of costs to the consumer. And that's a matter that we will be dealing with.

Let me go back to these questions to which I'm giving more time than they deserve.

Question 18 dealt with the mill rates . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Just to prevent anybody from getting heart failure the notice that says 8:00 a.m. should say 8:00 p.m. for Industrial Relations Committee Monday night.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Question 18, I've already indicated we are trying to get that information and we'll give it as soon as we have it ready.

Question 19 - the length of the transition phase of amalgamation. Well, Mr. Speaker, it again reveals my plea to the Member for Riel to sit and talk to the Leader of the Opposition so he can understand; that is the latter understand the bill, because if he understood it he would never have asked a question such as in 19. When does the government expect the transition phase to be completed? The Member for Riel who understands that it is the regional council that will be able to answer that question. 19 is the question I'm dealing with.

Question 20 -- (Interjection) -- Oh, do I now have the actual request of the Whip of the Conservative Party on behalf of his party that I stop dealing with these questions and have the vote? Well now the Leader of the Opposition is making that suggestion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The Minister of Finance has the floor. The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I'll just go on as quickly as I can, Mr. Speaker.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)

Question 20 - long run stable revenue source for the city. I suggest that the proper use of the area's economic resources, the integration of its tax base, and an end to the present dissipation of resources should provide the city with some considerable new revenue without inducting any new sources. But that it not to say, Mr. Speaker, that such a suggestion is being ruled out. It is simply to say that at this stage, at this time, there is no consideration being given by government for that other than, I think some members have already noted, that there would be the right for the utility tax which the City of Winnipeg now has, to be assumed by the Regional Council.

Mr. Speaker, there's a great change taking place in thinking on this subject and part of that change is taking place in Ottawa today, and anybody who reads what is being said by the Minister for Urban Affairs in Ottawa is beginning to realize the need recognized in Ottawa of doing something about the resources which are required by urban governments as being a future and important problem; and in order to prepare to deal with that, we have to make a possible structure for a government that has the capacity to handle the problems which will necessarily include additional financial resources.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . the Honourable Minister a question. I wonder whether the Minister can indicate whether it will be the government's intention to have the new Greater Winnipeg Council be a participant in the negotiations with Ottawa in connection with this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sorry that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is ignorant of public statements we've made in the past, but I can tell him that the Minister for Municipal Affairs and I have had occasion publicly to state that - and I think we were the first and maybe we still are the only provincial government to say that we believe that the urban areas of Canada should be able to sit at the same table with the Federal Government and discuss the problems. And that statement was made so long ago that surely the Leader of the Opposition should have caught up with his reading to that extent at least. But he doesn't read very much, Mr. Speaker, because as I now come to Question (21) -- what does (21) say? "Will the government now undertake to make public the terms of reference of the Wilkins Personnel Inventory recently commissioned?" Mr. Speaker, I think that the day he heard the name "Wilkins" he could have learned the terms of reference, because they were announced at the same time. But -- you know, I realize he's carrying the whole burden on his shoulders so he doesn't have time to read it all, but I assure him that the terms -- the announcement was made on May 21st - it appears on Page 1147 of Hansard. If he would like the terms of reference again, somewhere or other here I had the copy of the terms of reference but I don't see it so I'll leave it to him to find it. I'm sure he will, because they were publicly announced long ago.

(22): What permanent employee population ratio is contemplated? How is this related to projected service requirements? You know, Mr. Speaker, this is an absolutely foolish question. It is one that does not indicate a knowledge of how one operates if one now, in an engineering fashion, determines in advance a permanent employee population ratio. It is something that is an engineering question which a technocrat can deal with, but I am not a technocrat; maybe the Leader of the Opposition is. And he is again, he is again interrupting and repeating the same sentences again and again. I think that it is necessary for the council itself to deal with these problems and not for the provincial paternalism, which is apparently the approach by the Leader of the Opposition.

Question (23) dealing with confiscation of assets. You know, Mr. Speaker -- I'm sorry again. I looked at the wrong one. This deals with evaluation of cost experience in other cities. We have seen and digested enough about other cities' cost projections and the comparative results to know that they have had the same difficulty in making cost projections as we have experienced, and that where they've tried to do so they've been wrong, and wrong in a sense that they were not able to forecast the assumptions with any degree of foresight, sufficient to indicate that they were of no help to them nor would they be to us.

As to confiscation, the Honourable House Leader has dealt with that; I don't intend to repeat it. I think it's just nonsense.

Question (25) - financial or other latitude will be allowed. I believe that I've already dealt with it and point out that it's a matter of decision between council and the community committees as to what latitude will be allowed for the provision of services by the community committee.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)

(26): On what criteria were the community boundaries determined? If the honourable member doesn't realize that, then I don't understand how he has been approaching this problem. We've announced it time and again and I believe it was amplified in the report of the Boundaries Commission Review and indicated that what we wanted was to deal with the situation as it is today and be able to continue it and have a gradual transition, rather than to have any marked changes in geographic boundaries. I do contemplate that it won't be long before community committees themselves will develop new geographic areas and will recommend them to the government for change. That includes River Heights and every other part of Greater Winnipeg.

(27) -- No. (27) deals with the choice of dates -- as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I just want to check this for a minute. Question (27): Did the government study the question of minimum time necessary to properly organize a new council? The fact is that we have been in constant consultation with administrative staffs of Metro and of certain area municipalities sufficient to satisfy us that there should be no problem - lots of work but no real problem - in making that transition as of January 1st. There's a question of supervision by this government over the regional council. We have no intention to supervise. We do provide for the Municipal Board being involved. We want to give all the assistance we can. We do not propose to be paternalistic about it.

(29): Factors considered in deciding on the administrative and political structure, was the study we have made of our own, with our experience - and there has been considerable - on the form of government, and we believe that the council or commission formed is the one which will best work in this area. Mandatory representation on community committees on executive committee, we believe that would be unwieldy. We figure it will defeat the purpose of the executive committee. We can discuss that in greater detail when we deal with this section by section, and we do not accept that. We believe that three standing committees are sufficient unless the new government wants to lapse into a council committee form of government, which will be their prerogative, and they will be able to come back on it.

No. (e) is one that couldn't be understood at all: Was any study made of the plans which the proposed committee structure would create between the degree of power effectively residing within the committees and the degree of power effectively residing with the bureaucracy? That's a question which the honourable member will have to repeat at a time when he is able to be more understandable -- (Interjection) - Yes, he's just been given credit for having written it.

The relationship between administrative personnel and community committees was dealt with. At the local level the community committee members are responsible for supervising the delivery of services at the local level. If those services prove unsatisfactory or clarification is wanted, then senior administrative personnel could be brought in. Thus there's an open relationship and the all-powerful bureaucracy acting in secrecy, which the Leader of the Opposition seems to fear, is to my way of thinking impossible.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with (30), there is no decision to control council's 1972 budget. We've undertaken to draw up a draft budget for them to assist them in arriving at their decision, only it won't be in any way binding on them. I can tell him that when I was a member of the first Metro Council, we too were presented with a draft budget from which we could start work.

(31): What formula has the government adopted to relate power to function throughout the new civic administration? I suppose members of the Opposition are able to understand that question but I find it impossible to grasp just what is meant by that question.

(32): What power is given the new civic government beyond those already possessed by municipalities? Well, I thought he would have understood. The central council will be the exclusive law-making body. It will have control over finances, hiring, firing, wage negotiations regarding personnel, extended planning powers, and, together with the community committees, to frame policies regarding the administration of services in the city.

And then another question: What will happen to the existing City Hall? Will they be used by community committees? Just to ask a question like that, Mr. Speaker, seems to deny any understanding of what we're talking about when we talk about self-government at the municipal level. I would think that if I were a municipal councillor of the regional council, I would say: "There's a City Hall. Use it for the community committee." But the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, he doesn't know what it could be used for so he has to ask me to tell him what I

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) think makes sense, but what I do not propose to instruct the regional council to do.

Will any consolidation of Metro buildings be undertaken? What does that mean? How do you consolidate a building? He may understand what it means - I'm lost again. I'm sure that he has help behind him who can advise him on that.

Has the government attempted to secure advice and assistance of existing municipal administrative staffs in planning the transition? Mr. Speaker, we have had tremendous help from various individual members of the administrations of the existing municipalities and from some of the elected people, and that is an ongoing daily process.

Who are the personnel - may I say the final question? - who are the personnel in the provincial Urban Affairs who are going to administer the transition? Mr. Speaker, I wish the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would understand it is not our purpose to administer the transition. I see the Member for Sturgeon Creek himself must see the nonsense in the question to be reacting as he does to this. There is no intention for us to administer the transition. We will try to provide the technical help and the assistance, all we can give, as and when it is required or asked for. The members of the regional council - I wish the people would understand that - the members of the regional council, when they are elected, will make the decisions as to who shall do the administering.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude. I've already invited members of the Opposition to be helpful in dealing with the amendments and with all the review of sections at the committee level. I mentioned the Hydro. One thing I don't recall hearing from any of the members of the Opposition, what is their opinion about whether or not there should be a municipal board as spelled out in the Act. The fact is the City of Winnipeg and St. Boniface do not come under -- (Interjection) -- the Member for Sturgeon Creek -- the Member for Sturgeon Creek again shows his ignorance by saying we have a municipal board now. Of course there's a municipal board, but it so happens that one half of Greater Winnipeg, namely the City of Winnipeg, does not have to appear before the Municipal Board, and I guess the Member for Sturgeon Creek didn't know that. It so happens that St. Boniface doesn't have to -- (Interjection) -- You see. So now he is indicating that, having learned something from me, he has an opinion. I appreciate that. I hope that we will get opinions from him that will be helpful -- that was the reason I mentioned it.

I have heard nobody make a suggestion as what should be the name of the new entity. You know, that's a decision that has to be made. I think it's one that many people are concerned with - I imagine we would be discussing that. We'll probably be discussing matters such as whether the Mayor should be elected or elected from council. I hope that there will be a real positive approach to the fact that there will be a bill; let's make it work.

Now as to amendments, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, as did his Deputy Leader, I think, is going around the figure of 250 amendments. I don't know where he got the figure but maybe he got it where the Member from Fort Rouge got her figure of 30 million - maybe the same source. But in any event, I propose that early in the week we will make available to all members of the House a number of -- well, copies of proposed amendments. I don't say they'll all be there, but the majority of those that we have in mind will be available early in the week, I would hope not later than Monday. I won't be here to ensure that but I think that'll be done, and there will be possibly a few more which I hope to present to members in sufficient time so that they can assess them and deal with them in a positive way. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that I -- I know I took too long but I'm sorry, I was unable to control my . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would submit to one question. The Honourable Minister is asking members opposite to vote for this bill without any projected costs supplied by the government. Is that correct?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have asked all members of the House to vote for a bill which I believe will spell a very important change, vital and worthwhile, for the citizens of Greater Winnipeg.

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

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The matter before the House is the proposed motion by the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill 36.

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

July 9, 1971

2717

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Beard, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Gottfried, Gonick, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, G. Johnston, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uruski and Walding.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Craik, Einarson, Froese, Girard, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McKenzie, McKellar, Moug, Sherman, Spivak and Weir.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 31; Nays 15.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

The hour being 5:30, the House is accordingly adjourned until 8:00 p.m. tonight. (Friday)