

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, June 22, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface) introduced Bill No. 92, an Act to amend The Law of Property Act.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the Gallery where we have 140 students of Grade 4 standing of the Strathmillan School. These students are under the direction of Mesdames McLeod, Duncan, Purdy and Robertson, and Miss Young. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

We also have 80 students of Grade 6 standing of the Van Belleghem School. These students are under the direction of Messrs. Kingersky, Matthews and Miss Wicks. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Riel.

And we have 30 students of Grade 11 standing of the Birtle Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Messrs. Edberg and Parnetta. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce but in his absence I wonder if the First Minister would take a question. In view of the largesse that was distributed to the province this morning by the federal Minister of Supply, I wonder if the Premier is contemplating any further delegations to Ottawa, which seem to have produced some pretty spectacular results.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member's question is to be interpreted as a recommendation that we accept the federal offer with respect to the Gimli Defence Base, then that will be taken under consideration.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): A supplementary question. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate what the net loss for Manitoba is as the result of a loss of the Gimli Base and the recent announcement of what the Federal Government will now do.

MR. SCHREYER: Well Mr. Speaker, no doubt there is, despite the offer of the Federal Government, still a net loss to be calculated. Nevertheless, I think it has to be said that defence bases have been closed down in the past and I'm not aware of previous provincial administrations receiving any direct financial consideration for it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources. Could he again undertake to provide the members of the Public Utilities Committee with the transcript of the last meeting?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, we'll have the transcript prepared and supplied in the same manner as it was previously.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise when the next meeting of the Public Utilities will be called?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAIK: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise whether it will be called before the summer recess?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I couldn't advise as to when it would be held.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . . to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Is it compulsory for a farmer who has a loan through the Agricultural Credit Corporation to take out crop insurance?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): I believe that if they are requested to protect their credit through the provision of crop insurance that they must comply.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it compulsory for a farmer who is in default or partial default of his 1970 payments to the Agricultural Credit Corporation to assign all benefits accruable from crop insurance to the Agricultural Credit Corporation?

MR. USKIW: I'm not sure specifically, Mr. Speaker, but I would assume that the Corporation has those powers if they want to enforce them.

MR. GRAHAM: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it compulsory for a farmer who has subscribed to the hail insurance program under crop insurance and is in arrears on his 1970 payments to the Agricultural Credit Corporation, to assign any payments from hail insurance to the Agricultural Credit Corporation?

MR. USKIW: Well I think, Mr. Speaker, that the best thing that I can do is take the three of those questions as notice as a whole to give a specific answer. I'm not sure of my ground here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation and I would like to ask him whether he gave any undertakings of financial assistance this morning to the Get Together '71 group?

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Tourism, Recreation, and Cultural Affairs) (Dauphin): Well, Mr. Speaker, no, not this morning; I was out of town the last couple of days. But we did give an undertaking, I believe it was yesterday, by letter.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise the House as to the extent of the aid?

MR. BURTONIAK: We had a discussion on this last year as well as this year. Both Metro and the Provincial Government contributed to this event last year to the tune of \$15,000. This year we've committed ourselves to \$10,000.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister in charge of Manitoba Hydro. Can he indicate whether or not the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro will be out of the province for the next six weeks, or is presently out of the province and won't be available to us until a six-weeks period?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can advise the honourable member that the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro has been participating in a panel that has been convened by the National Energy Conference -- or National Energy Council, and this National Energy Council convened a conference which was taking place in Montreal just in the past few days; and further, that he is also attending the World Energy Conference at this time and -- correction -- next week, and I'm not aware of the precise date that the chairman will be back.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Then for certain the next ten or twelve days or two weeks the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro will not be available to us should we call the Committee of Public Utilities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the First Minister. I understand the First Minister made a statement regarding the effect of the Federal Budget on Manitoba's economy. I wonder if the First Minister can tell the House if the government is contemplating to bring in estate tax, or to impose estate tax, provincial estate tax, in addition to the capital . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Matter of policy. Order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I noticed that yesterday the Member for Rhineland asked a question as to the procedure that would be followed by the Province of Manitoba with respect to concurrence of -- with the proposed constitutional charter and this question was taken as notice by my colleague the Minister of Labour. The answer is that the Province of Manitoba will be following the procedure that was agreed to by all of the provinces and the Federal Government, that we would be submitting the proposal to our respective Legislatures at the next regular session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to rephrase my question to the First Minister. Is the Provincial Government contemplating to bring in provincial estate tax?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, despite the honourable member's rephrasing of the question, the answer remains the same. It is a matter of policy which has yet to be determined.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In the event that Public Utilities is not called until the fall, will it be the government's intention to stop the work on the control of regulation of Lake Winnipeg until that meeting takes place?

MR. SCHREYER: I think it probably is just as well that I make it very clear, very clear to honourable members opposite, that when a Board of Directors of a Crown corporation vote with near unanimity on a matter, all concurring except one and when the government of the day sees no reason to want to change the policy recommendation, then there is no reason whatsoever to change the proposed course of action.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the Board is not accountable to this Legislature under its Act.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for the decision-making in this context lies with the Board and with the Cabinet, and the Standing Committee does not make decisions of this kind.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether in a matter that has caused such controversy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. Would the honourable member state his question?

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the First Minister. Does he not think it wise for the report of the Committee to be received in this House and passed before work is fully commenced on the Hydro project?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there has been a clear indication of position on the part of the Board of Directors of Hydro. The government has considered the matter and is like-minded, and therefore I don't believe that there is any point to the honourable member's question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and that's in view of the statement made this morning by the Minister of Supply to the effect that there be a speed-up in the amount of work given to CAE, whether he anticipates there'll be further layoff at CAE or whether the employment position will remain . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I must caution all members that I have distributed a copy of Beauschesne's citation in respect to questions. Now, honourable members are all starting to debate questions instead of asking them. The first item in Citation 171 says: "In putting a question, a member must confine himself to the narrowest limits." The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Is it correct that the Cabinet recently granted a substantial pay increase to Mr. Cass-Beggs with increases in isolation from other civil service increases?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is no, it is not correct. And furthermore, I can advise my honourable friend so as to enable him to put his suspicions to rest, that the chairman of Manitoba Hydro is paid at about the average of the chairman of the provincial Hydro utilities across the country. It's about at the average.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, subsequent to that question. I wonder if - the practice has been in past years - if the government would undertake as part of the Estimates to give us a list of the Deputy Ministers, heads of commissions, and heads of boards, with their salaries, expense accounts . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. That question can be used as an Order for Return. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: If I may, Sir, I would suggest in all seriousness to the Honourable Member for Riel that that is the kind of information which I think is properly forthcoming and we would be glad to do so if you would just simply take the trouble to file an Order for Return, because there would be at least -- offhand I would say thirteen or fourteen separate entries,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . so that is something better given by a written answer.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if I'm allowed to raise the point of House procedure, we have always before concurrence in previous years had this list made available by request of the House and not by Order for Return.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm not sure if I'm speaking to the point of order, Sir, but with your indulgence and that of the House, if the Honourable Member for Riel is referring to a document that I seem to recall vaguely that was circulated just -- that's right, just prior to the concurrence motions, which set forth the staff establishment as to numbers, but I don't believe it gave any detailed information as to names of the incumbents and their salaries. Now what is it precisely the honourable member wishes? The number of establishments per department or the names of the incumbents plus salary?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I said specifically in my opening remarks: Deputy Ministers, heads of boards, heads of commissions, or, to simplify it down, those personnel which do not fall within the ambit of the civil service. Non-civil service appointments.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 36, please?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, may I at the outset welcome the Minister of Finance back to the Legislature. I would like to in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, attempt, if I may, to bring this matter back to the simple issue that must be decided by this Legislature. In doing this, I may say that in reviewing what has taken place in the Legislature and in examining the implementation steps of the White Paper, one comes to the conclusion that the government intended to debate this issue in the public meetings held prior to the Legislature sitting, but realistically had no intention of debating it in the Legislature itself, because if we examine what has happened, Mr. Speaker, we find that we do not have a debate - we have a presentation by the Minister of Finance of the legislation, we have the presentation of Opposition positions, and we have one presentation on the government side so far, and it appears that the government, in deciding its implementation step, forgot one aspect that should have been included. I'd like to read the implementation steps for the benefit of those who may not be aware of it.

The implementation steps of the White Paper suggested that there would be public meetings throughout the Greater Winnipeg area - and there were, and we will discuss what type of meetings they were in a few moments - we'd have presentation of the legislation at the next session of the Legislature, and the government in a thoughtful manner presented us with the draft legislation followed by the printed legislation. The third item was the establishment of ward boundaries and names - and something that possibly was not contemplated was undertaken and that was the establishment of a Ward Review Board and subsequently their report was adopted - the enumeration which is now either completed or in the process of being completed, and the next step was nomination and elections in the fall of 1971 and the rumours are that the dates of September 9th and September 21st or 22nd are the dates upon which we can expect nominations and elections. But, Mr. Speaker, one thing that they did not indicate was, when the presentation of legislation was going to begin, that the government would present the legislation, hopefully allow the opposition to exhaust all the arguments, not attempt to defend its position at all, and therefore minimize the kind of debate that they think is so important under normal considerations for the will of the people to be expressed.

This is an interesting situation. We have without doubt one of the most important pieces of legislation to be presented within a decade in this House, and so far we have not had any kind of meaningful debate. Now, to debate it -- (Interjection) -- Well there have been presentations, yes; all right. There have been presentations made by the members on this side and those presentations haven't been documented into the same degree as other presentations have been made by the government on other matters, but nevertheless the questions that have been asked, the comments that have been made, the thrust of the argument, have not yet been answered; and I would think that the government would hope that there would not be any controversy on this because they are hoping that what will happen is that the document will pass, that they will have a quiet period in Law Amendments, we will then go into the final and third reading, and then they can proceed on their implementation program. They may be able to

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . do that, Mr. Speaker, but there are certain things that must be said for the record and it's my intention to try and do that today.

First, we start with a basic paradox in the government's presentation. They are attempting to eliminate a two tier system which they claim is confused, which they claim is remote from the people, which they claim is partially inefficient, and they are substituting it for a system that promises to be as equally confused and much more rigid. The basic contradiction of the NDP approach is that they are promising administrative centralization and they are promising political decentralization - and that's not my terminology; that's the terminology of the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Urban Affairs, and I suggest that if you examine the legislation in its detail you will find, Mr. Speaker, that the likelihood is that neither administrative centralization or political decentralization will in fact be accomplished.

Now the Minister of Urban Affairs and Finance's first statement in the House, or statement on the bill, on page 1464 he said and I quote: "This legislation, Mr. Speaker, it's really much more than merely a blueprint for restructuring the Greater Winnipeg community along better or more rational lines. It's first and foremost a total and absolute and unqualified commitment to real democracy at the local level. It's a categorical commitment to the belief that if you make it possible for people to determine how their own community shall be run, determine it in a most direct and personal way and in all aspects the daily affairs of the community, they will do it very well indeed."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government's position seems to be that the best way to give the people the maximum choice in running their affairs is to give them no choice as to the . . . of the structure under which they are going to live, because there is no choice. There is no choice. And I'm going to come back to the argument that's now advanced by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources because I have heard this over and over again.

On page 1468 of Hansard, the Minister of Urban Affairs states, and I quote: "Well, we sought to find a way to gather together the urban communities' various sources of physical and economic strength -- (Interjection)-- I heard the Member for Rhineland and I assure him it's not necessary for me to say that Manitoba is lucky that we have a New Democratic Government. It's for the people of Manitoba to say that, and they have said it in sufficient numbers to make sure that we are the government and that the bill we are dealing with is the one they wanted presented. And I say we are lucky to be dealing with this problem now while achievement rather than decline is still possible. Therefore we started to look at the factors."

Well I ask you, Mr. Speaker, did the people of Manitoba know that Bill 36 was going to be presented to this Legislature? Now, this change in many respects is similar to a constitutional change. We are proposing a restructuring of Greater Winnipeg, and while the municipalities and cities are in fact creations of the province, and while we do not have the kind of federal constitution which delineates and separates federal and provincial responsibilities in a way which cannot be altered unless there is agreement or unless the amendment procedures are followed, surely it's not too much to suggest that the fundamental constitutional change which is being brought about by the restructuring of Greater Winnipeg should have in fact involved the very people who we are now going to allow them to give them the new democracy.

Mr. Speaker, there is a movie playing, and I advise the Honourable Minister of Transportation to see it - it's playing in Winnipeg - called "Bananas", and there is a certain comparison - and I hate to make a comparison because I do not think that the Honourable Minister of Finance or the First Minister look or act like Woodie Allen - but there is a comparison to be made in the movie, where the gorillas are successful in a South American country in taking over and, having taken over, they now say, "We are going to take over and we are going to conduct it, because we are obviously so democratic, but we are not going to give the people their democratic rights because we fought for democracy and we won and now we're the leaders!" -- (Interjection) -- That's another story -- because, in effect, this is a constitutional change which cannot be answered by the trite answer of the Minister of Inkster, who continually stands up in this House and says that the government fully reflects the wishes of the people, because I suggest that the people of Greater Winnipeg who in fact voted for the NDP, and those who voted against the NDP, did not know that this kind of fundamental change was going to take place.

If the people had listened to the Minister of Education, they would have been thinking of a different kind of constitutional change for Greater Winnipeg. If they would have listened to the Attorney-General, they would have been thinking for sure of another kind of constitutional change. If they would have listened to the First Minister prior to the election, they would have

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . . been thinking of another constitutional change. And I suggest that any argument advanced by the members opposite that the people of Greater Winnipeg and the people of Manitoba knew that this fundamental constitutional change was going to take place, in this Legislature, in the manner in which it is being presented, is incorrect, and I suggest that those who feel that they are providing more democracy for the people are denying the people the very right of making the decision as to whether they want to work under that basic structure.

I have indicated before that so far we have no debate, and I'm hoping that maybe my contribution will provoke a debate. This is a serious and complicated piece of legislation. The implications are of importance to the province as a whole. There is something else very interesting, Mr. Speaker, and that has to do with the timing. We are dealing with this matter in the month of June, the end of May, at a time when most rural people are concerned about agricultural matters, most city people are concerned about planning their vacations and taking advantage of our short spring and summer period, and one must really say *touché* to the government for their political judgment in bringing such a massive bill, such a controversial bill, at a time when the public's attention will not even be focused on the Legislature or even on the antics of the Minister of Transportation, but on the pursuit of their own living or the pursuit of their own pleasure. -- (Interjection) -- That's not feeble, that's design; and I suggest, as I will later on, that the whole approach of the government has a bit of Machiavelian characteristic to it.

Now I'd like to quote, if I may, from the White Paper on page 2, and this deals with the critical problem which is the individual sense of frustration and alienation from government, the government which has supposedly been created to serve him, and I quote: "The lines of authority in many instances were blurred, or else duplicated. Individual citizens and development investors alike became confused and often exasperated in any attempt to unravel the complex lines of authority."

And just above that: "Regrettably, it also aggravated a much more fundamental and critical problem - the individual's sense of frustration with, and alienation from, the governments supposedly in existence to serve him."

But Mr. Speaker, if we examine the legislation and if we stop listening to the opposition's position that what is going to be proposed is in fact going to solve this question of alienation, we find that what is being proposed will cause a great deal more confusion, as it has already, for the people of Greater Winnipeg, and with that confusion you will have apathy. Because, Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is the confusion that has caused apathy, and with that confusion, what we now have, what we now have in our system and what we will have in the proposal that's going to be undertaken, is the development of a powerful bureaucracy which will be able to take advantage of the political situation and in fact conduct the affairs of the City as remote from the needs and the interests of the people as they are now, and as they have been in the past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggested before that this matter had some Machiavelian characteristics, but we have to now deal with this matter and understand why is the government so insistent on pressuring this and to try and follow a timetable that almost anyone who has had contact with municipal affairs says is impossible to undertake. There isn't anyone that I have had an opportunity to speak to, whether it be in Metro, whether it be in the City of Winnipeg, whether it be in a municipality, in the other cities, who have indicated that the timetable that has been set can realistically be met in order to meet the problems of staging that are necessary, accepting that the government has a majority, accepting that the government intended to try and push this through as quickly as possible. So then one has to wonder why, why the necessity for this kind of pressure? Then we have to then look at this in the perspective of a total government's program and we can't ignore that perspective.

Last year we had automobile insurance; this year we have the unification of Greater Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the government has attempted and is pushing this through for one very obvious reason.

A MEMBER: Call an election.

MR. SPIVAK: Not now. Call an election -- no, not in September, October -- I can't call the election. The First Minister can call it and he knows that and I know that and there's no point in quarrelling about that, but I suggest to the Minister of Finance that at the time you do call an election, if you want this Bill passed, if you want the new Council in place and you want to be able to say to the people of Manitoba, "Well, we have accomplished reform," but the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . reform that you are accomplishing is not the image of reform of the New Democratic Party. It's not the reform that was to attack the social problems of Manitoba. Not at all. What you've attempted to do is to deal with those matters which essentially would not cost the money, which would not require the administrative and total capacity that would have to be generated to take our budget, to pare our costs, and to transfer that to the real programs of reform in this province; and what you have done is you have substituted an effort to attempt to try and show reform to the people - and the smile on the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' face I suggest gives this away. It's not becoming and it's characteristic of him. I suggest that this is the attempt, the attempt to try and bring about essentially what is a cheaper form, a cheaper form -- (Interjection) - No, I don't know whether it's a good reform. I would say to the Minister Without, that as far as I'm concerned, as far as I'm concerned it may work, but it may not, and I'm wondering whether we really require change for change's sake because this is essentially what we are being asked to approve today.

Now there are a couple of very interesting features, some of which may have been anticipated, some of which may not have been anticipated, that occurred after the timing of the White Paper, and I can't be sure, but I'm going to try and draw a conclusion from what I'm going to read into the record. I have "The Place of Greater Winnipeg in the Economy of Manitoba." It's a red book that the Minister Without enjoys and wants to identify with, but the Minister of Municipal Affairs doesn't, the Minister of Industry and Commerce doesn't, because this says things . . . doesn't want it to say, and I quote from what it says -- no, it's not my book, but the similarity between the statement here and the statement in the White Paper would lead me to the conclusion that the same hand wrote both. And I'm going to quote them if I may.

On page 3: "In spite of this overwhelming contribution of a metropolitan area to the economic life of Manitoba, successive provincial governments have developed and pursued policies which virtually ignored the presence of the city or which seemed to be based on the assumption that the city could look after itself very satisfactorily if it could retain all of the revenues which it produces and which under present arrangements are paid to the province. Although Metropolitan Winnipeg provides 65 percent of all provincial revenues from taxation, and 66 percent of all the jobs in the province, and contains 54 percent of the total population, it receives only 9.5 percent of the provincial expenditure on highways construction, and of all the capital expenditures by all levels of government in the province, only about 35 to 40 percent is spent in the Metropolitan area. This unbalanced treatment of Metropolitan Winnipeg in itself would be quite acceptable if the massive urban problems now facing the Metropolitan area could be solved within the legislative powers and financial resources now available to the urban government, but this is not the case. The Metropolitan area is facing a desperate situation in which the intensity and extent of its difficulties are increasing annually and its powers and financial resources remain fixed."

Let me now read page 2 of the White Paper: "But this community has an additional set of pressures with which it must cope. More than half the people in the entire province live in the Greater Winnipeg area. Greater Winnipeg is a prime generator of economic life in the province. The greater part of all the goods and services produced in the province are produced or generated in this area. It provides the most jobs and produces most of the tax revenues needed to run this province, and it has become the greatest single repository of social ills within the province."

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the same hand wrote the White Paper that wrote this section, and the attempt by the members of the government who come from rural areas to disassociate themselves because of the consequences of that, I think is a very futile attempt. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I am prepared to answer the question that you have given me. I beg your pardon? No, I intend to answer it now. Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I would ask the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition whether it is his personal view that that statement that he has read from the Metropolitan Winnipeg study is a statement that he should concur in, and also whether he's aware that apparently some members of his back benches are making statements in rural Manitoba to the opposite effect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intend to tell it as it is. You know, I have been in the fortunate position of attending constitutional conferences as the First Minister, and I recall Premier Bennett standing up and basically making the same kind of statement that the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . report of the Place of Greater Winnipeg in the Economy of Manitoba makes, but he was talking for all of Canada; and he talked to the provinces of Manitoba and the Maritimes and he said essentially, "You know, we produce all of this and, you know, we in effect see to it that part of our money goes towards equalization to pay you have-not provinces. I want the reactions of our own people and I wonder what the reaction of the Minister would be."

The problem here is what this focuses on and what this paragraph focuses on. Is the prime importance of Winnipeg and the division that should occur between the financing for Greater Winnipeg and the province, what should be considered and what this report should have said, and what this report should have said, is the total need for the interdependence of the rural area and for Greater Winnipeg. Because what we're talking about is not the emphasis on Greater Winnipeg or an emphasis on rural Manitoba. What we are talking about is the interdependence of Greater Winnipeg and all of Manitoba, rural and the north, and how you can attempt to divorce one or even to indicate and highlight one as a basis for reform - as a basis for reform - I think is unrealistic at this point. It's unrealistic because it fails to take into consideration the past hundred years of our province and it fails to recognize the necessity of the degree of interdependence that must in fact exist in the future. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SPIVAK: If the Honourable Member for St. Boniface could tell me what this proposal is going to cost in two years or three years from now, then I'll listen to him, but he doesn't know it and I'm not sure that too many others on the other side know it, so therefore -- (Interjection) -- Well maybe I know it, but I'm going to try and give you some costs and then we may be able to debate that if we can.

Now, there's another interesting part of the White Paper, and in view of the Minister of Transportation's estimates yesterday and the day before, I think it would be important to point this out. On page 17 -- (Interjection) -- Oh I wouldn't pick on the Minister of Transportation -- On page 17 of the White Paper there's another interesting passage. This is called "Accountability". "At both provincial and federal levels, Ministers in charge of government departments are required to defend their departmental estimates before the members of the elected assembly. In this way, all elected members can obtain desired information on departmental expenditures. Similarly through vigorous public accounts committees and the functions of the auditor-general, elected members have the opportunity to initiate an intensive public debate, if they so desire, on the way in which the funds appropriated are actually spent."

Now, it's very interesting to know that this principle of accountability is one of those things that has motivated the changes in the restructuring of Greater Winnipeg, because it really doesn't exist under the present government. If we examine what the Honourable Minister of Transportation has done in his Estimates, where he has read from his press releases, from Information Service, from I guess football schedules and a few other things, as a presentation of his Estimates, when was the last meeting of the Public Accounts Committee of the Provincial Government called? -- (Interjection) -- Yes, we're on Bill 36, and I'm suggesting that the person or persons who wrote this particular accountability section in the White Paper would have to understand that this doesn't exist realistically under the present government's administration.

This is very important because it goes to the heart of another matter with respect to the presentation. And I must say, for the benefit of the Minister of Finance, that these are general remarks before I get into my specifics. I'm suggesting that -- I don't think Public Accounts was called last session, if I'm right. -- (Interjection) -- When will it be called this session? Next October? Well, I'm sure that Public Accounts will now be called, yes. Well, vigorous presentation of Public Accounts - one hour or an hour and a half?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate to all members "Decorum in Debate," our Rule 40: "When a member is speaking, no member shall interrupt him except to raise a point of order or privilege." Secondly, I should like to indicate that if the member who is debating the point would address himself to the Assembly in general and to the Chair in particular, he will get no interruptions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Institute of Urban Studies presented "The Future City," a series of articles on the government White Paper. Lloyd Axworthy, in the summation and conclusion, presented a paragraph that I would like to read into the record, and he said and I quote: "The traditional trappings of democracy: elected councils, secret ballots,



(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . public hearings, appeal boards, basic rights of free speech and assembly, are not sufficient in giving people real involvement. If you apply some basic measures on how well these structures work, then it's quite apparent that we only have the form not the substance of democracy in our city. Very few people are really informed on the decision being made in the local government. Very few have access to the decision-makers, very few vote and very few participate." His statement is correct, and the Minister of Urban Affairs agrees and I agree, and I suggest, Mr. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, you disagree?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I suppose this is a point of privilege. The honourable member is trying to make me part of his speech and I just don't want to participate in his speech at this moment, so I think that if he has any comments to make he should make them on his own behalf.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I'll look forward to the Minister speaking. I do, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that after I've completed all the questions I'm going to ask him that we'll have some answers.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I read the passage by Professor Lloyd Axworthy for a reason. The impression that the government has been making is that the trappings of democracy will now work, but in effect, if one examines the bill, one realizes that it's not going to work. All we do is have a further extension of the trappings but not the real working of democracy. They have failed, Mr. Speaker, really to recognize and consider Winnipeg as a unique area with its own particular economic, cultural and social and political characteristics, and what they are attempting to do, Mr. Speaker, and this is an unusual characteristic to be able to apply to them, but what they are attempting to do is to establish what amounts to a pentagon system of government for Greater Winnipeg, a pentagon system of government with an entrenched civil service who will have such supreme power, that will be so highly elaborate, so highly rigid, so highly artificial and virtually irrelevant to the mass of people in Greater Winnipeg. It's a pentagon bureaucracy that they're creating because it is huge, because it is conceived in secrecy, because it will operate in secrecy and, if we judge by the manner and the approach of the government in dealing with this matter, you can realize that it will operate in a way in which it will be immune from political or popular control.

Now, I think we have to now deal with several basic questions. Why was there a need for a change? And here I think we have to deal with realities and impressions. Is Bill 36 the answer? Was there any other alternative? What are the implications for the rest of the province? And what are the faults of the government's plan? Well, let's now deal with why we need a change.

We need a change essentially 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, but the question I'm going to have to ask is: really, will this solve very much?

Secondly, the whole issue, the reality of the whole issue of equitable taxation, the taxation that's levied in some areas as opposed to other areas for people who in fact do their business in Greater Winnipeg although they live in the suburbs; the problem of the core city services, the fact that Greater Winnipeg has to bear what probably all Winnipeggers should be bearing, all Greater Winnipeggers should be bearing, with respect to core service costs which either are directly related to the core or which benefit them all, including firefighting, the welfare costs, some of the costs related to the police department . . . ; the emerging issues that are developing with respect to housing and urban renewal, planning in its broadest sense, and liaisons with other governments.

And here I'd like to refer to that discredited Conservative stooge book called The Local Government Boundaries District Report, and I'd like to refer to page 29, because in it they stated pretty specifically the perspective problems for Greater Winnipeg; "The kinds of problems with which the Metropolitan Winnipeg area will have to grapple are likely to be related to an adequate use of increased leisure time by people in all age groups; a greater degree of protection for the air, water and land resources of the area; a greater capacity to manage and control large masses of people in the area; an era when civil disobedience and demonstration appears to be on the increase; a more sophisticated and co-ordinated program designed to deal with the social diseases which are generated by easier access to certain drugs, alcohol and similar matters; a greater use of technological tools in the area of

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . transportation, communication, protection and education."

So, Mr. Speaker, what I'm suggesting is that the reasons for change, the reasons for the necessity of something better than what we had before, are there and they are real, and I'm not for one going to suggest that they're not, and I've tried to cover them, albeit just touched and . . . with it superficially, to indicate that I accept them, but there are a number of popular impressions which people have based as the reason for change, that have to be discredited right now because they will not serve any useful purpose in our argument today.

First, the popular impression is that one city requires one government - we are only truly one city; that one city one government is cheaper; that there'll be less confusion and it will be more effective; that there will be a single city focus and that we will all have the civic pride of knowing that we live in one area, Greater Winnipeg; that the way in which we operate has made people remote from government; that in effect a change will make people become more allied and less remote from government; that over-government that now exists in the proliferation of councils is costly, is inefficient; that we have an apathy on the part of our electorate that will be changed immediately, or changed very soon, as a result of the proposals that are brought forward; and that the bickering that we have had in the last ten years will stop. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say this: that the bickering we had in the past will continue, because I suggest that when we have the election for the 50 wards, the same politicians who have been bickering are going to be re-elected and they are going to be bickering again, in every area, in every phase that they will be dealing with, and that the suggestion that the bickering will stop, the suggestion that the apathy will be changed as a result of this structural proposal, I think is wrong; and these popular impressions should be dismissed because they do not deal with the real problems which in fact should be solved, and we then have to come to the basis of determining whether the proposal that the government is making is really the one that can work, or whether there are other alternatives, or whether they themselves at this point really know whether it's going to work or whether there is some refinement that in fact should be made. Because, Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to you, that if I felt at this point that the approach of the government was correct, if I felt that what they were proposing would in fact work and accomplish the over-all result that I suggested must be met to meet the realities of the problem today, I would stand up and support it. Oh, Mr. Minister from Inkster says no. But I suggest to you I would. -- (Interjection) -- Well you can doubt it. You're doubting a lot of lawyers these days.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me say this to you. I would support it if I thought it could happen. So far, I see no evidence that it will happen. What I do see is the application of an experiment in Manitoba and in Greater Winnipeg by people who without question are leading academics in the field of urban government, who in fact applied the knowledge that they have obtained particularly from the MAWD Report in England, and have adopted in the main that report, and are going to implement it in the laboratory of Manitoba. Now that's very interesting except that we have to live with it, and that's very interesting because we have to make it work in this province, and notwithstanding all the charm of the language of trying to bring it close to the people, if in fact it isn't going to bring it close to the people, if it's not going to accomplish the objectives that we're setting then one has to question whether this effort is really worth it, and until we have more information and until we know some specifics, I'm not sure that anyone really can make that judgment.

Now, Bill 36 is far more than just a change to meet the requirements that I suggested for the need for change, the realities of the need for change. It's destroying some of the unique heritages of the communities that have in fact developed and been built up. We can talk about the City of St. Boniface - and possibly the Member from St. Boniface will enter the debate. But in truth, Mr. Speaker, there is a heritage; there is a tradition; there has been something developed that in fact will be destroyed. -- (Interjection) -- I'm not worried. I'm suggesting that the bill goes much farther than it was necessary to accomplish the results that were required. It . . . to, for all intents and purposes, because there's no other way. You know, we can suggest that it's up to the council to make the decision as to what's going to happen, but for all intents and purposes it merges the police, fire and welfare services in this proposal, which means increased costs for the people of Greater Winnipeg. And so therefore, in answering the realities of the problems that I've presented, it has brought forward unknowns which I don't think should be unknowns at this time. I don't think we should be asked, or the people of Manitoba should be asked to in fact approve this without knowing some information

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . on costs and it's far more fundamental than it appears.

Now let me just talk in terms of cost. I suggest that basic and inherent in the legislation is the merging of police, fire and welfare services. On page 75 of the Local Government Boundaries District Report, they indicate that they in fact have -- well, they state that "people have been misinformed considering many aspects of the important local government function. For example, many people believe there are large economies of scale to be achieved by amalgamating the various police forces into one. The commission found that exactly the opposite was true. By the act of unification without adding to the numbers of personnel or any new equipment, there would have been an added cost in 1969 of approximately \$443,000." This is the Boundaries Commission Report which indicates that if the police in fact were amalgamated, there would be a \$443,000 additional cost. Now . . .

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

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . section is making, is amalgamating the police force or the firefighters?

MR. SPIVAK: . . . suggest that there is no alternative but the amalgamation of the police, fire and welfare services as a result of this Act, and I say that that's inherent in the whole Act and there is just no question about it. That's what's going to happen and that's the . . . That's what's going to happen. The people who are going to decide are the bureaucrats. The politicians are going to decide. They'll approve what the bureaucrats tell them to approve. -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

MR. SPIVAK: Now, the other interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe that the government has in their possession some working papers that the Boundaries Commission have prepared dealing with the amalgamation of various costs, and I'm going to indicate a figure and it may not be correct and the Honourable Minister of Finance will be able to indicate if it isn't, but I understand that the amalgamation of the cost of fire was undertaken by one of these reviews and that the estimated cost was 4.9 million. Now, I don't know whether that was correct or not. If it was, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that figures such as those figures, or information that the government does have of the working papers of the Boundaries Commission prepared of the amalgamation costs, should be presented before we are asked to make a decision on these matters.

So the question, Mr. Speaker, that has to be addressed, is whether Bill 36 is the simplest, most direct and least costly solution. Could the problem still have been solved by a two-tier system of government? (And then we're going to ask another question towards the end, whether we really are not going to end up with the two-tier system of government in any case.) But could it have been solved by the present two-tier system with a clear division of responsibilities, with representation from the existing councils, and with a form of gradualism?

On Page 66 of the government Boundaries Report, it stated: "It is erroneous to suppose that our area is suffering from the same ills that are besetting the large and seriously fragmented urban areas of the United States of America or of England. Our situation does not parallel the situation in these countries even in a microcosm."

Mr. Speaker, this then deals with the question of urgency. Was it necessary for the bill to be presented in this sort of a rushed way? Was this really the answer, or was there another way of offering and correcting the problems with Metro and with Greater Winnipeg. Because, Mr. Speaker, to a large extent the problems of Metro and Greater Winnipeg were the problems of personnel and with the problems of the personalities involved, and I suggest that the bickering will continue notwithstanding the fact that we have a change which essentially, I think, is for change's sake.

The implication to the rest of the province, Mr. Speaker, are significant. The people from the rural area, who have expressed their position in opposition - and I haven't really heard too many people from the rural area on the opposite side express their position in support, nor have I heard too many rural politicians of any political stripe stand up and present the report - are concerned. They are concerned about the fact that there will in fact be a structure that can demand and can have a political muscle to extract from the provincial government funds that may very well be important to them. There will always have to 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. But there

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . is a recognition of the political reality of a structure of 50 politicians who are capable of exerting a great deal more pressure than the rural municipalities with their councils, or with the small towns and small cities, and who are concerned about the thrust of what the government intends. And they are concerned because in fact we do have the report from Metro, and because that report indicates their specific belief of the importance and of the necessity of recognizing the importance of Greater Winnipeg and of the necessity for a greater demand by Greater Winnipeg of the provincial resources. And I suggest that the government has an obligation to present, and it's not presented in the White Paper because in effect Greater Winnipeg has not really been discussed in the rural areas; Greater Winnipeg has not been presented to the rural areas - it's been presented to the Legislature. The rural members have in fact made their presentation. So far no one on the other side has spoken and we've been on this for three weeks - except the Minister Without, yes.

Well, let's now deal with the faults of the government's proposal. The government's proposal can be attacked on the basis of democracy, timing, the workability of the structure, and the costs. First, -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SPIVAK: All right, let's talk about democracy. Let's talk about cost. Let's talk about workability, structure and timing. -- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate that Rule 40 applies to Ministers too. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: The hasty and undemocratic way in which the government has formulated announced and scheduled the implementation of its plans; the obvious defects of the legislation due to both haste and cynicism; the costs are unknown; the government's action blatantly contradicts its intentions; and these are why there are basic faults. And I'm going to elaborate on them with a bit more detail,

In formulating a schedule in the implementation of its proposals, the government violated three basic principles of political reform: the need to proceed at a reasonable pace, the need to learn from the work and experience of others, and the need to consult with the people involved. No one can suggest that we are proceeding with a reasonable pace. If we have learned from the experience of others, I'd like to know whose experience we've learned from, because in effect what has been suggested has been presented to us, is a new basic concept, a new plan, and in presenting that plan there has been no reference made by anyone opposite of the experience of others and why the basic experience was in fact rejected. The need to consult with the people involved. Well, let's talk. Who have we consulted with? We have had 12, 14 public meetings.

MR. CHERNIACK: Very satisfactory.

MR. SPIVAK: Very satisfactory; very satisfactory. What we had was an attempt to try and have the municipal politicians exhaust themselves, as I think they did, in the various public meetings so that in fact when we brought forth the legislation and dealt with it in this Legislature, the basic argument would have been exhausted and would have been met. We had not any consultation with the people, and I must suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority, the vast majority of the people in Greater Winnipeg have no idea of what is really happening. They know that there is an attempt here to amalgamate Greater Winnipeg. They know that the government has brought forth a program. There has been no discussion, no debate. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if the Hydro Board can spend \$10,000 of the people's money by advertising its position, surely the government should probably not present the White Paper but should present its arguments, its arguments to the people of Greater Winnipeg, so at least we would know. At least that would be a proper way in which to present their position. And if the Minister of Finance is asking whether I suggest that he do this, yes, I do. Because I would like to see the government present to the people of -- (Interjection) -- You didn't suggest it. I'm suggesting that you look . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SPIVAK: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if this was done, we would then possibly have a debate within the community, because no one really knows what is happening. I'm not sure that the members of the caucus of the NDP Party really know what is happening. Yet -- know every section. I wonder if the Member from Radisson can indicate whether he's read the 400 or 500 pages, or whatever the . . . -- (Interjection) - Oh he didn't say that. But he knows what's happening. Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, not too many of them know what's happening.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)

Reform, Mr. Speaker, is by definition an improvement, an improvement over what we have, but if you violate the principles of political reform, the government has really, I think, sacrificed the possibility of an enduring reform in favour of what I suggest are the political gains to be made from an immediate change - and I think that there are political gains to be made from an immediate change - but to call this change which I suggest is change for change's sake, a reform is enacted and this is what the government is doing.

Now the way in which the government has violated political reform deserves closer scrutiny. First, the government has proceeded really with a reckless and rapid pace, and this would be excusable if the government had identified and isolated specific problems and developed solutions for them. What the government has done is to promise that all of these problems would be automatically eradicated by the imposition of a perfectly political structure. Perfection of political structure is indeed the only tangible promise which the government has made. Yet ironically the government's blind pursuit of perfection has been so frenzied that the government really has tripped, for it has really not mentioned how it intends to reform the Greater Winnipeg educational system. And every taxpayer, Mr. Speaker, knows how heavy a burden education costs are. -- (Interjection) - Not fast enough. No, it's not a contradiction. It's not a contradiction.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to the members opposite that to suggest that there can in fact be a reform of Greater Winnipeg and that in fact you can promise this without indicating the objective and the intent and the probable structure of the reform of education, I think is wrong, because education costs are what the taxpayers are paying their fair portion of. And if in fact what we are doing is, to solve the problems at the same time equalize taxation, then I think educational taxes must be brought in. . . and at least some kind of proposal at least introduced. -- (Interjection) -- The taxes are reduced?

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . permit a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: the Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: It's similar to the question that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked of the Member behind me. I'm wondering if the person who wrote his speech read the paper in the Act.

MR. SPIVAK: For the benefit of the Minister of Urban Affairs, I wrote this speech so I have some idea of what it contains. Yes, I did. Yes, I'm suggesting to you -- but I'm suggesting to you that you have no tangible way in which educational costs in Greater Winnipeg are going to be reduced, nor do you have a reform of the educational system. And I'm suggesting to you that if we talk -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm suggesting, and I'm suggesting as well that if you're going to deal with the reform of Greater Winnipeg - and I'm suggesting that - because we come back to something very basic. Was there an urgency just to reform Greater Winnipeg because of the problems that arose, or was there an urgency to try and reform the municipal government of Greater Winnipeg along with the educational system of Greater Winnipeg? And I think that this is what really was required, but this would have meant you would not have been able to have proceeded with the reckless pace on this one matter.

Now, have the government provided an administrative apparatus for the 1971 deadline that they've set? Now no transitional measures are provided either in the form of a stage by stage centralization of council authority such as suggested in the Mayor's plan. And Mr. Speaker, it would be my suspicion that at Law Amendments the great argument by many of the politicians who will accept that the government has the majority and that this it's going to proceed with, will warrant and will require a stage by stage planning, and there has not been the staging of a gradual phasing of a service unification.

Now I suggest that excessive haste has to be incompatible with perfection, because haste not only creates short-term chaos, and there is bound to be short-term chaos, but it also will have some long-term disastrous effects on what the objectives are intended to be and on the objective of at least reducing costs or at least controlling costs. Excessive haste is incompatible with flexibility, which would have to be the most reasonable approach to perfection and because this is what we are attempting. We are trying to develop and present almost a perfect kind of new structure. There is no flexibility in the plan, Mr. Speaker. In fact, as I've suggested, the plan is really one of mathematical rigidity.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . .

Well then, how do we explain the government's haste? Now here, Mr. Speaker, I think we go back to one of the things that I've said before. The government's haste in proposing this has to come from some divine revelation, which seems obvious to them, which isn't obvious to us, and by relying on the delusion that the structural symmetry will solve all the problems, and I suggest now that the government has violated the second principle of reform, the need to study the experience of others.

Now, what we have attempted to do, or what the government has attempted to do is to provide simple answers to complex questions, and it has either ignored the need to accumulate information or if it has the accumulated information, it has chosen to ignore the weight of the evidence. And we don't know what accusation is worse because there is no indication from the government that they have any information because they have not been prepared to furnish that information to us.

And here we go to the question of costs, and their silence is rather curious. They make no comment on almost the universal experience of every other area that's been involved where increased size has meant increased costs. They chose to ignore the Government Boundaries District Report, the Commission report, which indicated that there was no real evidence that large amalgamation would produce efficiencies and economies. On the contrary, the Commission's evidence tends to indicate the existence of a very substantial cost disadvantage arising from larger amalgamation. And Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the Minister will table the working papers that are in his possession on the costs forecast that the Boundaries Commission presented, that we would then be able to prove this to the satisfaction of everyone here.

Well, how can the government not be criticized for failing to undertake or perhaps just to publish cost projections for the amalgamation plan for Greater Winnipeg. Is it not aware that the level of cost increases is dependent not only on the degree of amalgamation, but also on which this . . . will occur. And are the facts not worth knowing? I mean, are we supposed to simply buy this without a cost projection? Is that what is intended for the people of Manitoba? -- (Interjection) - No objection. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the fundamental right of the taxpayers realistically should be ignored. Should a taxpayer's position really be ignored at this point? Surely the taxpayer is entitled to know what the costs will be. Surely we are entitled to know, when the government imposes something so major as this reform, how the money is going to be raised and what monies we are talking about. Is the government going to prepare or produce for us the cost data on the equalization of the mill rate? On the equalization of salaries and other benefits? On the equalization of services? On the confiscation of assets? On the assumption of liabilities? On the position of City Hydro? On the position of school costs?

Now the Minister has basically said that the costs are irrelevant and the structure is all-important, and he will simply say that what he has proposed is a beautiful structure which will instantly produce a better and more democratic way in which the individual will be able to participate in his local government. Well, this is basically the ideological keystone of the whole plan and without it the whole system collapses. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want the system to collapse, but there are certain questions that have to be answered and I'm going to pose them to the Minister because I think they are basic if the system is going to work. But what has happened is that the government's entire approach in forcing amalgamation is calculated to make the system a motorless vehicle right from the start. It's producing and has produced the most comprehensive municipal reform in Manitoba's history, and it expects its almost dictatorial efforts to produce a civic Utopia. But equally important is the fact that the proposed system appears incapable of delivering the vastly improved performance which its designers have promised.

Now, we are going to be able to deal with it clause by clause when we get to the committee and certainly we'll be able to deal with the defects of the various sections. But on the matter of principle I think that we have to talk about the delusion of democracy with which the government has embellished this plan. One of the reasons used by the government to explain the absence of published cost projections was that the benefit that widespread citizen involvement would derive from the creation of community committees, more than outweighed any possibility of the cost increases due to the amalgamation. Now if we analyze the bill we find that there is a much more complex situation, because, Mr. Speaker, not enough is said in the bill about the relationship between the Mayor, the various standing committees, the council

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . and the commissioners. From a purely administrative point of view, this adds to the confusion right from the start, but the general impression we gain from reading the bill is one of reduced democracy and increased cost.

Now, let me try and explore some of the implications of the document. Depending on the development of party politics in a city, the Mayor may become little more than a ceremonial figure. In fact, the chairman of our new restructured uni-city will become like a Lord Mayor - bejewelled and powerless. Depending on the interpretation given to their power, the community committees will either wither on the bloom, blossom into administratively-handicapped and politically-vocal urban fragments, which is what some of the politicians have said, and these are the uncertainties. There are other uncertainties in the bill but there are also certain factors which can be discussed with greater degree of certainty. One thing as I've suggested, Mr. Speaker, is that the bureaucrats are going to remain supreme. It's reasonable to predict that an intolerable amount of power will rest with the Board of Commissioners. They won't have to grasp it - it's been given to them by the government. From a practical point of view the Board of Commissioners is about equivalent to a City Manager System. If that is the intention of the Act, there is really no need for an elected council, but maybe the government is right when it says that there will be less bickering to be done in the new council. There is little cause for bickering when there are no decisions to be made, and outside this quiet council chamber the bureaucratic machine will roll quietly on.

Another certainty about Bill 36 is that it gives to the new civic administration, powers which have previously never been given to a municipal government, particularly in the area of planning, and I'm concerned about the possible bureaucratic abuses of these new powers, and we hope to correct some of these actual and potential faults of Bill 36 with the government's cooperation, but I suggest that many of the design faults could have been avoided by the use of proper democratic methods. Let me indicate the principle I'm concerned about by mentioning the experience of other provinces.

I would like to read from "Proposal for Reform of Municipal Structures" by the Minister of Municipal Affairs of the province of Quebec, on page 37, and I'd like to quote this for the benefit of the Minister of Urban Affairs: "And finally, and this is probably the most important reason in implementing this policy, the government intends to respect the basic principle of real participation by existing municipalities. Our intention to ensure local participation is so strong that in some cases we believe it is preferable to put up with delays at the time of the creation of a municipal community in order to give the local opinion time to express itself. Our policy will have no chance of success if the people concerned are not convinced of its value. After all, citizens are those who will have to live in the setting of these municipal communities once they are created." Mr. Speaker, I'd like to apply what the Quebec Minister of Municipal Affairs has said to our situation here and suggest that this is what the present government should have done.

Well the government hasn't followed this procedure. Instead, as I suggested, its laboratory experts in Toronto have concocted a plan which attempts to reconcile administrative centralization with political decentralization, and I suggest it has failed at this point. It has failed because the value of administrative centralization lies only in efficiency but the government's attempt to create savings will only cause it to create bureaucracy. The value of political decentralization exists only when the people recognize that the bottom-most levels of government have significant decision-making power in the areas of local concern, and if it's a fact that the community councils are going to have that authority, then we have a two-tier system. If the community councils are not going to have that authority, then we do not have political decentralization, and you are not going to have it both ways and that's the basic contradiction of the whole proposal.

The government says this is amalgamation, but if it is amalgamation then it's a two-tier system, because if the community councils are going to have the power and the authority, then in effect why destroy the existing community? Why create a community council of St. Boniface? Why not have a city of St. Boniface? You know, if in fact government was remote from the people, then why didn't we simply take Greater Winnipeg and set up a ward system of Greater Winnipeg and make it less remote for the people. We could have done that. So in effect what we have is a proposal that will either develop into the two-tier system or, if it doesn't develop into the two-tier system, will develop into the kind of federalized system in which the bureaucratic control will be supreme and the cost will escalate.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)

Now let me deal with costs. The proposals of the government have certain sections and I realize I can't deal with the sections, but just to indicate where it starts and where it can be found. The costs of the one-city plan are contained in the Government proposal to equalize the mill rate and provide a partial government subsidy to those municipalities affected by the increase over a two-year period. However, Bill 36 contains many clauses which suggest cost increases and the effect of these sections - and we're talking about 663, 666 and 668 - the effect of the above sections indicate that under the headings of cost, the following items must be considered: The equalization of the mill rate. The equalization of salaries and other benefits. The equalization of services. The confiscation of assets. The assumption of liabilities. The position of City Hydro, and the position of school board costs.

Let me now deal with the equalization of mill rates. Although this is not specifically dealt with in the Bill creating the City of Greater Winnipeg, the government White Paper proposes that the municipal mill rate and a portion of the special educational levy mill rate be equalized throughout Greater Winnipeg. The example given in the government White Paper is that if the equalization had occurred in 1970, only four municipalities - Charleswood, North Kildonan, St. James-Assiniboia and Tuxedo - would have experienced a net increase in the mill rate. This of course refers to the residential mill rates which in 1970 were - and I have a table here and I possibly should read it into the record because I have the figures for 1971, which I am going to hope that the Minister of Urban Affairs will either confirm or deny, because my information, Mr. Speaker, is that if in fact the mill rate is applied on the 1971 basis, it won't be four municipalities, it will be everybody but Greater Winnipeg that will have a substantial rise -- (Interjection) -- Over Winnipeg. Everybody. All right. Let me read these figures to the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . before "it will be" - I didn't hear that.

MR. SPIVAK: Everyone except Greater Winnipeg. Everyone except Winnipeg itself. I'm sorry, I meant Winnipeg.

All right. The mill rate in 1970 for Charleswood was 48.62; East Kildonan 70.40; Fort Garry 67.60; North Kildonan 55; Old Kildonan 63.95; St. Boniface 66.643; St. James-Assiniboia 53.31; St. Vital 63.48; Transcona 71.61; Tuxedo 44; West Kildonan 65; Winnipeg 66.63. It's obvious now, as it should have been obvious then, that the illustrations that were based on the 1970 mill rate were unrealistic because the City of Winnipeg had artificially lowered its mill rate in 1970. Thus a truer reflection of what equalization of mill rates would mean in the new city can be ascertained by looking at the 1971 mill rates in Greater Winnipeg which are as follows: Charleswood 47.88; East Kildonan 71.40; Fort Garry 67.03; North Kildonan 60.50; Old Kildonan 62.67; St. Boniface 69.22; St. James-Assiniboia 55; St. Vital 67; Transcona 64.33; Tuxedo 46; West Kildonan 60.88; Winnipeg 73.151.

It's obvious, from reviewing the 1971 existing mill rates, that the picture is much different insofar as equalization of mill rates is concerned in its impact on area municipalities. Using the same formula in 1971 that the government used for the 1970 mill rate equalization, it appears that the following municipalities will have a resulting increase in their mill rate due to the equalization of the mill rates, as follows: Charleswood, East Kildonan, Fort Garry, North Kildonan, Old Kildonan, St. Boniface, St. James-Assiniboia, St. Vital, Transcona, Tuxedo and West Kildonan. When this increase is translated into dollars and cents, the total annual cost is estimated at \$5 million, and this is the figure that the government proposes to subsidize for a two-year period. And if my figures are wrong, I would hope that at an appropriate time the Minister of Urban Affairs would indicate such.

Now I feel that a reorganization of local government as has been proposed herein, will require between three to five years for the full integration and adjustments of salaries, pensions and other benefits, and an upgrading of services, so that the impact of the increased costs will be felt for at least a five-year period initially, and therefore the government subsidy should in all fairness cover the full increased costs for the first five years of the operation of the one-city plan.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that any government subsidy is really using the taxpayers' money. In this case it would mean that the rest of the province of Manitoba would be helping to foot the bill for the increased costs incurred by the reorganization of Greater Winnipeg, and in this respect opposition has already been indicated from areas outside



(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . . of Greater Winnipeg.

Now let me talk about equalization of salaries and other benefits. A recent survey of the total number of permanent employees on the staff in the area municipalities indicates that, other than the City of Winnipeg and Tuxedo, the other area municipalities employ a ratio of one permanent employee for every 200 to 300 of population, and the following is a detailed breakdown: West Kildonan, permanent employees 75, population 23,277, per capita 310.4. I'll just go down the per capita: Winnipeg 62.4; East Kildonan 244.3; St. Boniface 181.5; St. James 216.8; Transcona 306.7; North Kildonan 381; Fort Garry 170.2; St. Vital 256; Charleswood 343.3; Old Kildonan 131.9; Tuxedo 80.8.

From the above chart, one can reasonably assume that not only will there be an increase in costs due to the upgrading of salaries and pensions and other benefits, which Mr. Elsworth Bole I guess has estimated at \$16 million, but also the setting up of the new bureaucracy will inevitably lead to an increase in the number of employees in the suburbs due to the upgrading of services. These are real costs which . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . I'd like to ask of the member. When he prepared or presented that list of employees per capita per municipality, have I the right to assume that he took into account the numbers of persons employed by contractors who do work for the municipalities in the same relationship as, say, the City of Winnipeg which had people working for it and doing the same kind of work, on the payroll.

MR. SPIVAK: No. As a matter of fact, that's an interesting question. No, Mr. Speaker, I did not. With the exception of Charleswood, which would have the RCMP included in it, the other areas did not -- it does not include what the Honourable Minister . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . and contracts . . . ?

MR. SPIVAK: No, it does not include that. It includes its employees. But that's an interesting feature, Mr. Speaker, because I have presented something that the Minister should have presented. I am in fact presenting something that the government should have presented, because of the fact, Mr. Speaker -- yes. The government owed an obligation, if they were expecting the people of this province to buy this, to have reduced the information, to have related the cost, and to have indicated its position, and in fact I want -- I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the great weakness of the government's position is that they have either been afraid to present those figures, because I am sure that they have done some mathematical calculation on these figures, and, Mr. Speaker, if they have not any mathematical calculations, then I must suggest that I would have lost some of the respect for the administrative competence of the Minister of Urban Affairs. Surely he, at least he, would understand that it's necessary to at least have the arithmetic done before you are going to make this kind of political decision.

Now I've suggested, Mr. Speaker, that the cost will be borne by the taxpayers of Greater Winnipeg and it will be subsidized by the Provincial Government in order to avoid a hardship for the residential taxpayers of Greater Winnipeg.

Now when we talk about equalization of services, when you talk about bringing up the highest level of salary, pension and other benefits in the upgrading services to that of one having the highest level of services, it has to assume that this is the corollary of what's going to happen. It's the necessary corollary to equalization of mill rates, because if everyone must pay equally for local services, then everyone is going to want to benefit equally by having the same standard of service that prevails in other areas. Now anyone who suggests that this isn't going to happen, anyone who suggests that this isn't going to happen can't have much, or does not give the people of Greater Winnipeg credit, because common sense is going to tell them that they are going to want that. If I'm going to have to pay the same taxes as someone else, then, by God, I'm going to want the same services.

Now in 1968 the council of the City of Winnipeg and the council of the City of West Kildonan prepared a study of what the effects of amalgamation of Winnipeg and West Kildonan would mean with the equalization of services and standards. The conclusion resulting from the study is stated as follows, and I quote: "These would probably be put in perspective best by relating them to a total taxable assessment in each city. If the position taken is that such a comparison proportionately measures the required service, the resulting differences should be indicative of the variation in standard or variation in cost. This attached statement of services also includes the comparison of costs per capita, which is particularly significant in the areas of health, welfare and education, and existing assessments in order to improve on West

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . Kildonan's realty taxes for municipal purposes, the combined budget would have to be affected by expenditure reductions, revenue increases totalling approximately \$4,400,000."

What this means is that the amalgamation of Winnipeg and West Kildonan in 1968 would have resulted in an increased cost of \$4,400,000 and, as a result, both councils decided not to proceed any further with this plan. And for those who doubt that amalgamation results in an increased cost, I would refer you to the amalgamation of the police departments in Metro Toronto, which resulted in a 72 percent increase in two years. The costs of amalgamating fire departments are even greater. When the . . . of the municipalities were reduced from 13 to 6, the cost of the new amalgamated Toronto fire department increased, for the suburb alone, from \$7.8 million in 1966 to \$14.6 million in 1969 - almost 100 percent increase in the cost.

And closer to home, the recent amalgamation of St. James and Assiniboia resulted in an increase of \$5 million in their gross budget in a two-year period.

Finally, the example of Edmonton and Vancouver, which are one-city concepts, indicates that their 1969 costs are higher for one city than operating their services for the 12 metro municipalities; that for 1969, police per capita costs for Edmonton were 19.78, for Vancouver 21.69, and for Metro Winnipeg 15.26. The 1969 fire protection costs per capita in Edmonton were 15.84, in Vancouver 17.21, and 14.13 in Metro Winnipeg. When one examines these figures, one begins to wonder whether the amalgamation of municipalities is worth the costs involved, especially when the resulting costs are staggering.

Now one of the items that requires special attention, Mr. Speaker, in the proposed amalgamation, is what is to be done to the reserves of the area municipalities? If no special provision is made concerning these reserves and they are just thrown into the pot, not only would this work unfairly on the areas which, by thrift and industry, have built up these reserves and are now losing them, but it would be very easy for the new councils to dissipate these reserves in a short period of time.

The assumption of all existing liabilities by the new one-city structure merely compounds the inequity . . . -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm sure it's in Hansard but I'll repeat it again. Yes. It would be easy for the new councils if they wanted to dissipate those reserves - yes. They're thrown into the pot. They can dissipate the reserves. They're not earmarked for the area that has them, are they? They're thrown into the general pot - that's right. The new council.

The assumption of all the existing liabilities by the new one-city structure merely compounds the inequity referred to in dealing with throwing all the reserves into one common pot. The capital debt for 1970 in millions of dollars are: Charleswood 2.3; East Kildonan 1; Fort Garry 4.3; North Kildonan 1.2; Old Kildonan 6,200; St. Boniface is 4.9; St. James-Assiniboia is 4.2; St. Vital is 2.9; Transcona is 4.2; Tuxedo is 2.4; West Kildonan is 1.5; Winnipeg is \$110 million; Metro 84.4.

The indiscriminate assumption of liabilities as presently proposed would mean that the residents in many areas would be paying twice for a service-once when they paid for their area, and again for the debt incurred in another area. The government's proposals do not in fact equalize mill rates throughout Greater Winnipeg because they will still be left a residual special levy which the school board may be able to levy on the communities forming part of the school division, without any control by anyone outside of the school board. So in fact the government's plan will not result in total equalization of the mill rates, and some areas will still be paying higher taxes than others.

The government's answer to this is, I assume, would be that there is no reason why any community cannot pay a little more for extra services that they want and this is the justification for leaving the residual special levy. It's curious that this reasoning does not seem to apply to area municipalities as the government seems to think that the services in area municipalities must be the same and will not allow any municipality, through its community committee, the right to have and pay for any extra services over and above the common services provided throughout Greater Winnipeg.

This not only seems difficult to justify and will really mean hardship to some areas in Greater Winnipeg because of the higher taxes the school board will be allowed to levy for the extra services. Surely it is more consistent to put some control on the school board costs which accounts for at least 60 percent of the total municipal tax dollar expenditures whether by

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . way of referendum, the Minister, the Metro School Board or the Schools Finance Board. The above merely illustrates the naive approach of the Provincial Government to the financial problems of Greater Winnipeg. Instead of dealing with the control and streamlining of education costs which are 60 percent of the municipal tax dollar expenditures the government is concentrating on unifying the 40 percent of the municipal tax dollar expended and hoping that the school tax dollar will somehow take care of itself. And of course, Mr. Speaker, it can't. How can this happen when no control will be exercised on educational expenditures specified as the residual special levy? In order for the whole scheme to make sense the government while placing control in the hands of the Minister over the municipal portion of the budget must at the same time place the control over the education portion of the municipal budget, as otherwise my prediction is that the government's proposed one city plan will fail miserably, that the cost to the taxpayer will go up while many of the services in many of the areas will be reduced or will deteriorate and the only one that will be the loser will be the citizens of Greater Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, the attempt has been made to cover a wide range and it's not an easy subject. I suggest that there has been no debate. Mr. Speaker, because we're dealing with the principle of the bill and because there has been a lack of information supplied by the government to the members on this side for us to make that determination, I am going to pose to the Minister of Urban Affairs several questions that I hope will be answered. They deal with the question of principle, because we cannot determine the principle of this bill or its approval until these questions are answered.

First I'd like to know from the Minister how many separate projections or studies of the cost implications of the government's municipal reform proposals have been made? Who made each study and projection? When was each study projection made? With what aspects of civic government did each study projection deal? What were the results in terms of aggregate figures and functional breakdowns of each study or projection. -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition actually asking for names of specific civil servants which made any studies which he is interested in? The actual names? Does he want their salaries as well?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: As tempting as that may be, Mr. Speaker, I want to know who made each study projection, if in fact they were made within the civil service within the particular branch I'd be satisfied with the branch name, but I would also like to know what studies were made outside of the civil service; I would like to know the studies that were made by the consultants who were hired by the government and who have designed this basic plan. I want to know what were the results in terms of aggregate figures and functional breakdowns of each study or projection. Were there any discrepancies between any of the separate study projections, and if there were I'd like them specified and explained. And I'd like to know, Mr. Speaker, which, if any, clauses of Bill 36 were determined or influenced by the results of any cost studies or projections. And what if any cost benefit formula was applied by the government to any cost studies for the purpose of developing its urban policy. And also, Mr. Speaker, when will any cost studies or projections be made public?

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there are no cost studies whatsoever, if they were not made, was this conscious or an unconscious omission on the part of the government? Will the government release the unpublished Local Government Boundaries Commission background papers, the papers dealing with the cost of amalgamation of various municipal services? These papers, Mr. Speaker, are known to be in existence and to be in the hands of the government and I think they should be released and should be made available to the members before we're asked to vote on this bill. In view of the government's avowed commitment to true democracy -- and I'd like the Minister to answer this question before we're asked to vote on principle of this -- in view of the fact that Bill 36 is equivalent to a major constitutional change, and I suggest it is for the people of Greater Winnipeg, why does the government object to the holding of a referendum? Is it the intention of the government to integrate the educational system of Greater Winnipeg into the amalgamated city structure? Have any cost projections been done on this subject? Has any structural model been developed? What system of control will be adopted, central, school board or community committee? What are the projected costs of the government's proposed employment and salary policies; in other words the cost of upgrading salaries

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . and other benefits to a common standard? What are the projected amounts of subsidy arising as a consequence of the intended equalization of mill rates? In other words, the Provincial Government subsidization of the tax rates in areas experiencing a mill rate increase based on the 1971 figures. The Minister then can indicate whether the \$5 million proposed figure is correct or not. What are the projected costs single and aggregate of the equalization of services? 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 of City Hydro or will City Hydro be given distribution rights for all of Greater Winnipeg? Will the profits from the City Hydro operations inure to the benefit of Greater Winnipeg as a whole?

Using the same formula as 1971 that the government used for the 1970 mill rate equalization presentation I would like the government to confirm whether the municipalities will experience the increase in the mill rate that I've suggested. When does the government expect the transition phase of the amalgamation process to end? Was the year 1977 chosen for review on the basis of such estimated time span; and when will the full cost impact of amalgamation be felt? What measures, if any, will be taken to provide the city with a long run stable revenue source beyond that provided by the real property taxation? Surely this is a very basic problem that cannot be ignored in any restructuring - and I want to repeat that question for the Minister of Finance. What measures, if any, will be taken to provide the city with a long range stable revenue source beyond that provided by the real property taxation? Will the government now undertake to make public the terms of reference of the Wilkins personal inventory recently commissioned? What permanent employee population ratio was contemplated? How is this related to projected service requirements? And I think this should be specified.

Has the government decided on a policy of attrition to limit the size of the municipal civil service? Are they hoping that there will be a policy of attrition as one answer? What evaluation of the cost experience of other cities which have undergone total or partial amalgamation has been done by the government in forming its amalgamated plan? What, if any, controls will be provided governing the disposition of the reserves formed through the confiscation of the assets of the absorbed municipalities? Will any portion of the reserves be placed at the disposal of the community committees in the respective areas from which they were derived? How much financial or other latitude will be allowed to any area through its community committee to provide extra services over and above the common services provided throughout Greater Winnipeg? And this has to be specified. What factors were used by the government in determining what constitutes a community? On the basis of what criteria were the community boundaries determined? Why would not the ward system have been preferable for the attainment of the government's objectives? How much likelihood is there of the community committees evolving into eight municipalities; and has the government not really construed a two tier system? Did the government study the question of the minimum time necessary to properly organize a new council administration? Was the choice of January 1st, 1972, as the inaugural date made on the basis of such a study and if it was made on the basis of such a study will that study be furnished to the members of this House? Will any special supervision be exercised over the operations of the new civic government during the transitional period either by the Minister or the Director of Budgets? What factors are the government considering in deciding upon the administrative and political structure which it is proposing in Bill 36? Specify with respect to the mayor, the council, the standing committees, the community committees, the executive committees and the board of commissioners. Was any consideration given to mandatory representation on the executive committees from each of the community committees? Is three a sufficient number of standing committees? Was consideration given to the establishment of a standing committee corresponding to each of the major functions of municipal government? Was any study made of the plans which the proposed committee structure would create between the degree of power effectively residing with the committees and the degree of power effectively residing within the bureaucracy? What relationships will exist between administrative personnel and community committees? How does the government reconcile its position on democracy with its decision to control the civic budgets through the calendar year of 1972? What formula has the government adopted to relate power to function through the new civic administration? What powers have been given to the new civic government beyond those already possessed by existing municipalities? For what reasons were these additional powers given? What will happen to the existing city halls throughout Greater Winnipeg? Are they to

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . . be used by the community committees? Will any consolidation of Metro buildings be undertaken?

Mr. Speaker, if in fact the government says that the city halls are to be used by the community committees as their meeting place, as their place of residence, as the identity for the community with its officials, then why the hell do we have to go ahead and destroy the existing cities for in fact you are sitting a community council that is going to operate through the same politicians and who are going to operate out of the same building. And the government has to answer that to the people. Has the government attempted to secure the advice and assistance of existing municipal administrative staffs in planning the transition? And if not, why not? And who are the personnel in the Provincial Department of Urban Affairs who are going to administer that transition?

Mr. Speaker, there are 35 questions that I have asked. They relate to much of what I've said. They have not been answered by the members opposite. They have not been answered by the government. We on this side are entitled to these kind of answers because without these answers how can we be expected to make the kind of judgment or decision to support the government's intention? The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is one who believes that the sole object of the members opposite is to try and defeat the government; that everything they do and everything they maneuver is done for one purpose, to defeat the government. Mr. Speaker, we will not defeat the government on this issue and I accept this. He is shaking his head and I agree with him. We're not going to defeat it -- they have a majority. But, Mr. Speaker, we are interested in at least seeing that the restructuring that is going to be undertaken will be better than what we have, will be really in the interest of the people and is really something that will work because the structure is both workable and possible. We cannot do this in abstract. The government has the resources of the civil service to assist them and has the resources of their consultants to help them. It has been privy to the working papers of the Boundaries Commission Report, which we have not. It has been given the opportunity to plan in advance and to make its presentation. It has presented us with a bill that is probably one of the longest bills in terms of the number of pages and the number of sections that's been presented, and it is asking us to pass it in second reading very quickly to go into committee, hear the few presentations that I believe will come because I do not believe the people of Greater Winnipeg really understand what is happening, and then bring it back for third reading and hopefully pass it so we can all go away on recess and then come back and worry about Mr. Benson's budget in the fall. That's what the government wants us to do.

. . . . . continued on next page

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . .

Mr. Speaker, let's go back over the record. We had The Municipal Act examined and changed. I don't know how long that took but I believe it took a couple of years. I certainly know that the committee met over a period of time and went over it section by section, that was a detailed debate. We had the Consumer Act and the consumer legislation which to the credit of the present government was finalized in their administration, work was commenced earlier, it went through the several stages, it went through a White Paper, it went through a draft bill that was presented to a committee and then in turn was discussed and went into a final bill that was brought before the committee and we had intensive debate before the ultimate legislation was presented and before it was approved. The Consumer Protection Act is working reasonably well in this province and no one has any objections to the process that was undertaken. But what do we have here? We have the government proceeding and asking for approval of something that should take at least six months of intensive work by a committee who would have the opportunity of investigating, in hearing in detail the presentation and reports in answer to the questions that I've suggested.

The individuals who have been responsible for the development of this particular legislation - you know, Myer Brownstone and Mr. Feldman - and everyone knows that they are the ones responsible for this; and everyone knows that this - you know this plan is really essentially their brain child and their idea. They should be before the Committee on Law Amendments, they should be presenting their position and they should be giving us the advice and the experience. I have, without question I have nothing to say in terms of their academic ability; I think their credentials are extremely high. I would welcome the opportunity for them to make their presentation. I would welcome the opportunity for the Boundaries Commission personnel to make their presentation. I would welcome the opportunity for Mr. Bole to make his presentation, he possibly will. But I would welcome the opportunity for the members on this side to be given and to be privy to the information that the government has to be able to make the kind of judgment to sense what is happening.

I've made a conclusion that the members on the opposite may disagree with. That what is being established is a bureaucratic machine which I referred to as the Pentagon, and that is the best example that I can say. I think that the basic bureaucratic creature that is being developed is probably beyond the comprehension of most of the present administrators in civic matters in Greater Winnipeg with the exception of one or two, and the probability is that those one or two are going to gain control of the situation. I'm suggesting as well that this change is possible, that the proposal could possibly work. I suggest it could work - given the opportunity for proper debate, given an opportunity for people to understand the detail, given the opportunity for a contribution to be made by opposition. And I suggest that this is really what is required at this time.

The members on the opposite side may not like the result of the tax legislation that was just introduced by the Federal Government, but the truth of the matter is this, that I believe that it really reflects the majority view of people in Canada and there will be an opportunity probably when the Federal Government goes to an election to determine that. But, Mr. Speaker, let's understand the process that that legislation went through. We had a Carter Commission Report, we had a White Paper, we had stiff opposition, we finally had a bill which I think reflects the wishes of the majority of the people in Canada, whether they're right or not. I know the implications of what that legislation means for Manitoba and I know the implications of what it means for the Minister of Finance and the First Minister. I'm sorry for them because I know the kind of effort that must now be put forth by them to cut government expenditures so that the tax rise will be not that great in Manitoba next year. But having said that, I believe that the legislation probably reflects a majority view of the people in this province. But what we had was discussion, what we had was debate, what we had was committee hearings. What we have here is an attempt to try and push through in a six-month period with, you know, two weeks' debate in the Legislature and possibly 48 hours or two days in Law Amendments, a bill that is a major bill restructuring one area of Manitoba, affecting half the people of this province, and I've posed 35 questions that have not yet been answered by the Minister and probably will not be answered in any direct way. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is an obligation on the part of the government to present, in debate, to present the information for us to be able to make the decision.

The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will say it doesn't make any difference what

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . . we say; even if we present the information you're going to vote against it. And I'm sure that this is the view of the members opposite. But I wonder really how many of them have had the opportunity -- have you had 35 questions answered to your satisfaction? You have? You've seen the cost studies? You've seen the cost studies? If the members opposite have seen the cost studies then we should see the cost studies. If the members opposite in their caucus have not seen the cost studies then I say you have an obligation to the people you represent, those of you who come from Greater Winnipeg, at least to know, to know what those costs were. If you shake your head as the Member from St. Matthews does -- (Interjection) -- St. Matthews says. Well I've been listening, there is nothing that's been said that answers any of these questions. Then I suggest that what we've come down to is the divine revelation which the NDP has on all issues which gives them the opportunity to say to the people of Manitoba, you elected us, you obviously wanted this, you're going to have this. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in doing this they defeat the very obvious ideological basis on which this proposal has been brought forward. The proposal has been that what we are attempting to do is to bring city government closer to the people to make it more democratic, and yet in the actual handling of the presentation to the members opposite and to the people of the province you are not handling it in a democratic manner nor are you giving the people the information. You are basically attempting to force it through and force it through rather quickly.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 40 students Grade 11 standing of the McCreary Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Venton Beatty and Miss Carol Boyd. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. On behalf of all honourable members I welcome you here today.

#### GOVERNMENT BILLS - CONT'D

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? He referred to the question of referendum. Does he support and sponsor and favour a referendum in this instance, and is it to all of Manitoba or to any restricted part of Manitoba?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to answer that question. I await the answers from the Minister to questions that I have given him, and when he answers my questions, I'll answer that.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has indicated that he wants to see government members in the debate and that he feels that without the participation of government members that really there has been no meaningful debate. And in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that all of the debate that has just taken place, other than the introduction of the bill by the Minister of Finance and the remarks that were made by the Minister Without Portfolio, have been speeches by the members of the Opposition, then I would infer from his remarks that he regards the speeches of the honourable members whom he is supposed to be leading as meaningless, or as being not meaningful. And, Mr. Speaker, if there is any question, if there is any question about whether that is an inference or a direct charge, I intend to state right now, that as a result of my honourable friend's remarks, I can go further and say that not only is he inferring that what was said by his members of caucus is not meaningful but he has directly said so. Because the Member for River Heights has got up - and this, Mr. Speaker, has been the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. GREEN: . . . foundation of his entire speech. The foundation of his speech is that it doesn't appear to be -- and I'm now speaking as to what I say goes on in his mind; if he's entitled to say what goes on in the Minister of Finance's mind, then I'm entitled to do the same with him. What he is saying is that if what we are doing up until now has not really made any impact, if it appears that the government's program to have a reorganization of what takes place in Greater Winnipeg has generally found large acceptance by the people of Manitoba, and if we are to really make a position for the Opposition in this debate, then we have to take a new tack. We're not going to get anywhere merely opposing it, so let us present a different position. Let us present the position - yes this plan is complicated. It might work, but we don't

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . have any answers and if I were satisfied -- and this is what he said and this is what impressed me -- that if I were satisfied that what the government is now proposing would work, I would vote for it. Those were his words.

Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, let's look at that from the broad viewpoint. Here's an issue in which the government is presenting a proposal for municipal reorganization. It's something which the Leader of the Opposition has classified as being one of the most revolutionary steps that would ever take place in municipal government - that has ever taken place in municipal government in this province. We know that there is a great group of people who are opposed to this position. We know that it is an issue, which if the government succeeded in doing would undo - and he says that if it would succeed he would vote for it - that it would solve the problems, the existing problems, because no program solves all problems and I would accept the fact that he is talking about the existing problems, that suddenly the New Democrats have come up with a program which he agrees is going to substantially deal with the problems in Greater Winnipeg and that he is going to vote for that program. Mr. Speaker, let us really catch the implication of what he is saying. Because if he was forced into that position then it wouldn't be us who gave ourselves the political advantage that he talks of, of having accomplished this great procedure, but he would have admitted that it was so.

Now first of all does anybody believe that the Leader of the Opposition -- (Interjection) -- no, I'm not going to submit to a question. Does anybody believe, does anybody believe that the Leader of the Opposition, knowing what he has said in the past two years about this government, knowing that he regards this government as being the most terrible thing that ever has happened in the Province of Manitoba, knowing that he has said, that everything that he says is for the purpose of undoing this government, does anybody believe that no matter how good this plan looks, that he would vote for it and support the government and maybe have to acknowledge that this is the best government that this province has ever had? Does anybody believe that he made that statement; because, Mr. Speaker, it was shortly after he made that statement during his speech that almost everybody stopped listening, because they knew that at that point that what the honourable member said was not credible. Because what he said is that he would support that legislation - ignoring the speech that was made by the Member for Sturgeon Creek; ignoring the speech that was made by the Member for Charleswood; ignoring the speech that was made by the Member for Souris-Lansdowne who said that we are destroying West Kildonan - what will it be a dream; we are destroying Transcona - what will it be a dream; ignoring all of the speeches of the people who he is supposed to be the leader of, who have expressed, Mr. Speaker, in no uncertain terms what they say about this legislation - that he would get up all alone, despite the fact that his party was voting against him, and that he would support this legislation if he was convinced that it would work.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the honourable members without answers to these questions, without asking them, have got up and made speeches which in no uncertain terms made known what they have said about the legislation, and what bothers my honourable friend is that nobody is listening, the Opposition is not being registered, it is not being registered either in this House, nor is it being registered with the citizens of Greater Winnipeg, nor is it being registered with the citizens of rural Manitoba, because they are not accepting, Mr. Speaker, they are not accepting the suggestions that are being made and in desperation the Member for River Heights comes in and says - it's not working, we have to try a new approach, we have to say if it was only otherwise, if we only had certain answers, if they only weren't rushing so much. And you know they took ten years, so the fact that we have been in government two years and have brought about this change, they took ten years and did very little about Greater Winnipeg, so given those standards of time, which apparently my honourable friend accepts, that if we didn't do anything in ten years then they shouldn't be doing anything in two years, given those standards of time, we are moving more quickly than the Opposition would have moved.

But let's examine each, Mr. Speaker, of the material suggestions, of the material suggestions that have been made by the Member for River Heights and see whether what he says is believable or credible. He says, Mr. Speaker -- and this is one thing that I admit, and I'm not I don't think ordinarily hurt by a statement, personally hurt by a statement that is made - but the honourable member says that this program was created by academics who know nothing about civic government in Greater Winnipeg. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't like to accept a



(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . . program on the basis that the people who have created it apparently are deserving some extra respect. I like to look at the logic of a program and whether the person who created it is worthy of respect or not - if it's illogical I don't want it. If it's logical and has not been created by a person who has earned some respect, then I'm quite prepared to have it and look at it. But let's examine the people on this side of the House and their experience in the form of government that you're talking about. Let's compare it.

The Minister of Education has been chairman of the school board and the mayor of his local community. The Attorney-General was a councillor in his community for many years. The Minister of Finance was a school trustee, an alderman and a Metro councillor. The Minister of Labour was mayor of his municipality, and was on the school board. I served on Metro Council as a councillor. The Member for Wellington was a school trustee. The Member for Logan was chairman, I believe, of the Winnipeg School Board -- (Interjection) -- vice-chairman and sat on the school board for many years, and I haven't gone through them all. And we have a man who is asking questions and claiming that we have had nothing to do with this program, that we know nothing about municipal politics, who has never served in municipal politics - or should I say that his experience in municipal politics, practical experience in municipal politics is equivalent to his practical experience as a lawyer. Zip, absolutely nothing. And these are the people that he says did not design the program. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that everybody speaks from his own perspective.

The honourable member when he was a Minister, when he was a politician with some administrative power in each of the areas that I have referred to had administrative authority, when he was a man with some administrative authority he knew that he didn't make the decisions; that it was the bureaucrats who make the decisions and therefore he assumed that when we take over the administration that we also do not make the decisions, that it is the bureaucrats who make the decision. And therefore what is troubling him is that when he says these people didn't make the decisions, the people who have been involved in municipal politics, that they had nothing to do with creating this plan, that this was created by bureaucrats, he really reveals himself and reveals nothing else about what the members of this side of the House had to do with this program of municipal government. Because the honourable member knows full well that all of the people concerned have not only been involved in municipal government but have been studying various forms of municipal reorganization for many many years and the program that now comes forward is one which has input in different forms from all of the administrative municipal experience that is represented on this side of the House and which the Honourable the Member for River Heights has had none of. And it is not the bureaucrats who do it as it was, according to my honourable friend, under the administration in which he was a Minister. So that's the first item, Mr. Speaker, which I suggest to indicate that my honourable friend is not making a credible approach, that he's just trying a new tactic to see whether this will now work in overthrowing this government which he is so anxious, and as Leader of the Opposition, which I suggest is perfectly legitimate for him to be anxious to undo.

The next feature, Mr. Speaker, is the - and let's see whether it's credible. He takes the argument and he says -- they're moving much too fast. This kind of thing couldn't possibly be done in the short period of time that they are giving us - and that we are pushing through a bill. Last year we passed a piece of legislation, which frankly if I was a member of the Opposition I would have been much more worried about if I really was concerned that democracy was in trouble, which I would have been much more concerned about than I would be concerned about a government bringing in this piece of legislation. Last year we announced to the House that municipal reorganization will be on the table at the next session of the Legislature. We passed a bill, Mr. Speaker, which went at the very fundamental roots of democracy itself; we said there would be no election of municipal councils during the fall of 1970, that all of the people who had been elected and who should have come back to the people for accountability, and I believe in that, were to be kept in power by a legislative government. The government was going to say here are your representatives, they shall not be elected, because next year we are going to be involved in municipal reorganization and we don't want to upset the structure for what will happen in the fall of 1971. Mr. Speaker, there wasn't a peep from that side of the House. Apparently at that time they thought it was good timing; or worse, Mr. Speaker, apparently at that time, they said let them do this and then when they come in with their program for municipal reorganization, we will scream haste and we'll put them in the position where they will not have provided for what will happen in the fall of 1971.

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . .

Well not only, Mr. Speaker, did they not raise a peep about time and timing and haste at that time, but Mr. Speaker, I don't remember a single politician on the municipal scene complaining about the fact that they were being kept in power one year longer in order to prepare for a scheme of municipal reorganization. Not a word was said. If I can recall it properly, Mr. Speaker -- and I'm trying my best to do so -- we went through that particular bill like a hot knife cutting through butter. And you know bills are difficult to pass in this House when there is anything that can be made out of them either from the Opposition side or from the government side. But there wasn't a word said about that measure, which if we are talking about democracy, Mr. Speaker, that measure, potentially -- and I suggest to you, the only reason that it was only potentially, did not interfere with the democratic structures of this society, is that everybody in this Chamber, everybody in Greater Winnipeg and everybody -- the Member for Rhineland had made an objection -- (Interjection) -- no, Mr. Speaker, I intend to continue. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that that bill went through this Chamber, that it was a bill which if there was a potential problem would have been raised by the members of this Chamber, if it wasn't raised by the members of this Chamber, it would have been raised by the people of Greater Winnipeg. If it wasn't raised by the people of Greater Winnipeg it would have been raised by the people of the Province of Manitoba as a whole. And the reason it wasn't raised is that everybody knew that potentially this is not a danger because the government, and this government perhaps distinctive to other governments, says it's going to go ahead in its municipal reorganization next year, and when it says so, it does so. And perhaps that's why there was no complaints raised.

The honourable member brings up a different contra distinction. He says with the Carter Report they never did that. With the Carter Report they went ahead and hired the best experts in the country. They found out what New Democrats had been telling them for many many years, that a dollar is a dollar, a buck is a buck; that if you earn a buck you should pay taxes on it. And then the lobbies from the mining companies, the lobby from the insurance companies, the lobbies from all of the other interests who have something to protect, as a result of the Carter Report, Mr. Speaker, came and said, no don't do it. And the difference, Mr. Speaker, he refers to them as the people. I challenge the honourable member, I challenge the honourable member to show one citizens group that came out against the Carter Report. The mining companies came out against the Carter Report, the insurance companies came out against the Carter -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the farmers came out on the question of the amount of the exemption that would be permitted for estate tax. But I don't, Mr. Speaker, wish to get into that question. All I'm saying is that if what my honourable friend is arguing is that we should buckle under like the Federal Government did on the Carter Report, then I'm very happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that we are not buckling under like the Federal Government did with the Carter Report.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says first of all -- and let's examine each one of these questions as to how it relates to whether or not he's making a credible approach. He says we're moving too fast, and secondly, we are not dealing with the educational system this year, that we are not dealing with what the future educational system is going to be like in Greater Winnipeg next year. Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member concedes that there is any problem, or that there is a problem in moving with regard to municipal reorganization in one year, then he knows very well that it would be impossible, and for that reason it was not done, to deal both with municipal reorganization at the governmental level and to deal with the school board level in the same year. And it just so happens -- and this is not of our creation -- but it so happens that in Greater Winnipeg there is a different administration for school boards and a different administration for local government, and if my honourable friend is saying that one of the problems with this program is that we have not been able to deal with them both at the same time then he can't have it both ways. He can't also say that we are moving too quickly with the program.

Mr. Speaker, in an attempt again to suggest -- and this is a bit contradictory -- to suggest that the municipal reorganization that he might vote for if it would do what he says it should do, he uses phrases such as "confiscation of assets." I suppose that when the Metropolitan Government came into existence that the Member for River Heights if he were in this House he would have said that Metro confiscated Assiniboine Park from the people of the City of Winnipeg, that Metro Government confiscated, that they confiscated the golf courses that had been set up by

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . . the City of Winnipeg. He would have said that Metro Government confiscated the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District assets, that they confiscated the sewer system, that they confiscated all those areas which people in different municipalities had worked together to build up and which were subsequently changed from one administration into the hands of another administration. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Assiniboine Park is still the property of the citizens of the City of Greater Winnipeg, the assets of the Sanitary District are still the property of the citizens of Greater Winnipeg, the assets of the golf courses and the other assets that were taken over when the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg took over this problem, were the assets of Greater Winnipeg and remained the assets of the people of Greater Winnipeg. And if he agrees, which some of his colleagues have not agreed, that there has to be an equitable system, that it is wrong - and I think I'm using his words - for people who are outside of the core system not to be responsible for some of the expenses of the core system, if he agrees with those things how does he propose to deal with them? To do nothing? To follow the course of action that was followed by his administration when they were in power, to do nothing. Because, Mr. Speaker, that's not the intention of the present administration, it's not the intention of the present administration to do nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has brought up what has so far been the main stick of the opposition to this plan. They have continually said, in some of the meetings that I have attended they have said "what will the plan cost." My honourable friend says he is a democrat and he accuses me of being an autocrat, but he says that it should be possible to say what the plan costs. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's examine the credibility of that statement. Is the honourable member saying that the cost of municipal government, as reorganized, can be predicted, whether the Member for Rhineland or 50 members for Rhineland are elected to that government as against let us say 50 members -- 50 -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me? That's easy to predict? Well it's easy to predict what 50 representatives representing the party for the Member for Rhineland, what their costs would be if they came into government, but it's also very likely easy to predict that there won't be 50 of them in government. The real question is that if we say, if we agree that the reorganization of Greater Winnipeg will be a democratically elected government then, Mr. Speaker, nobody in the world, but nobody, can predict the costs of that government, because if the Member for River Heights was elected as one of the delegates to that government the costs would be different than if the Minister of Finance was elected, and would be different if I was elected or different than the Member for Roblin being elected. What if -- what if the 50 members, the 50 members who are elected to that government through whatever form is set up for them to make decisions, decides that they are going to eliminate the transit system and let there be a private transit system. Does the honourable member say they are not free to make that decision? Because if they are free to make that decision then how can he calculate the costs of the government on the contingency of that decision being made. Or is it possible that 50 people will be elected to Greater Winnipeg government in Metropolitan Winnipeg, and is it possible that those people will say that they are going to have a community centre located within every ten block square in Greater Winnipeg, that they're going to be a community centre and they will argue about whether there will be a swimming pool in that community centre and argue about how big the playground should be and how much assets are required to expropriate in order to have a playground in that area. What if the municipal government of Greater Winnipeg decides that, as is the case in the north end of Winnipeg between Arlington Street and the river, that there is almost no community centre and that one of the things that these people need is a community centre, and in order to have a community centre you have to build a building and you have to tear down a block of houses and put up that centre. Is the honourable member saying that he can now predict, because if he does say so then it's he who is the autocrat, because I, Mr. Speaker, easily acknowledge that the costs of running Greater Winnipeg as a reorganized municipality will depend on the elected representatives of the people of Greater Winnipeg elected to this council. The honourable member says that that's not so.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's turn the question around. Can the honourable member - and I asked this question at numerous public meetings so the honourable member should have notice of it - we make no pretense at predicting what the costs of reorganization of Greater Winnipeg will be. Does the honourable member pretend to be able to say what it will cost to run the existing inefficient, difficult, badly organized, wrongly conceived, got together just as a matter of growth and has to subsequently be dealt with, can he predict what the costs of running

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . . those thirteen municipalities, plus the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, will be during the next two or three years? Because that's the system he's advocating. Mr. Speaker, that is the system he's advocating. And just, Mr. Speaker, as nobody was able to predict during any of the two-year period between 1960 -- I think, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Bonnycastle once predicted that the cost of running Metro would be a package of cigarettes a day, and I had every respect for Mr. Bonnycastle, I worked with him -- well when I was a councillor on the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg, but Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. GREEN: . . . Mr. Bonnycastle regretted during all of the time that he was Chairman of Metro that he tried to place an estimated cost of running the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, I remember watching a program in 1962 when my colleague, the Minister of Finance, was elected to the Legislature and I believe that the program consisted of the former Member for Wolseley, the former Premier of this province, Mr. Roblin and Mr. Paulley, the Minister of Labour, and I believe the former Member for Ste. Rose, Mr. Molgat, and Mr. Roblin said -- and at that time I think the budget of the province was -- and I'm guessing and I hope I'm not way wrong -- I think he said it was about \$180 million a year -- and Mr. Roblin said that if the New Democrats came to power the budget would go to \$300 million a year. Mr. Speaker, during that very term, during that very term of office between 1964 and 1966 -- and I would indicate the Minister of Labour is now here and he was on the program -- that Roblin had said that if the New Democrats came to office the budget would grow from I think \$180 million to \$300 million a year. And during that same administration the budget went to \$300 million and Roblin was elected to office.

Mr. Speaker, those people over there who are suggesting to you that either the costs of the existing municipal governments or the cost of the future municipal government are capable of precise definition, are capable of even intelligent estimates are attempting to fool, because the people will not be fooled. They are attempting, Mr. Speaker, they are attempting to fool the people of this city; and, Mr. Speaker, that's really one of the big reasons, that is really one of the big reasons that they have made absolutely no impact. Because the people are more intelligent than that and the people know, the people know, -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people are entitled to a lot more credit than the Member for River Heights is prepared to give them. The Member for River Heights says that the people of the Province of Manitoba did not know when they elected a New Democratic Party Government that they were going to be bringing in -- and I measured his words carefully -- a program of municipal reorganization "of this kind." He specified "of this kind." But what the people of Manitoba did know was that if they elected a New Democratic Party Government that that government was committed to a municipal reorganization in Greater Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no doubt that they knew that this party was committed to such a program and the details of the program, and I have said this on numerous occasions, I say have improved as a result of the fact that there have been input of divergent opinion from various members representing the government caucus. I, Mr. Speaker, have had no difficulty with that at all. I've never felt -- perhaps the Member for River Heights who gets up and says that regardless of what the members of my party have said about this bill that they will vote against it or that it's centralization or that it's going to ruin Greater Winnipeg, regardless of that if you can convince me I will vote for it, that was his speech to us -- I have never had the grandiose notion that anything that I think will subsequently be the plan, and I submit that what has happened is that as a result of a group of people who have indicated that they were going to do something about the problem and have been willing to work at it, that they have been willing to take their differences and have a better program, because the differences are reflected in it. And really what does this program say and what is the Member for River Heights objection to it, and at this point I'd like to get to the real meat of it, because I'm quite certain that my honourable friend has not understood the program. He doesn't understand it because he has never understood the democratic process. When he was on this -- (Interjection) -- That's true, that's true. You know the honourable member can call me an autocrat, can call me an autocrat . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. GREEN: . . . and that's perfectly legitimate, but the Member for River Heights is wounded or the members of his party are wounded, the members of his party are wounded

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . . when I say that he doesn't understand the democratic process. I say that a man who gets up and says of an elected government that the politicians will not decide, the bureaucrats will decide, he doesn't understand the democratic process. I say that a man who says that this program is not -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I say that that man, or if that is his understanding of the democratic process then it's to the great benefit of the people of Manitoba that he doesn't have a role to play in the administration of this province, because I have. Because, Mr. Speaker, I, too, have no intention of being run by bureaucrats and I have always considered whether I was on Metro council or anywhere else, and he can go to any bureaucrat and get verification of it, that I've always considered that the main role of the elected representative is to steer that bureaucracy in the direction of the will of the people of the Province of Manitoba. The Honourable Member for River Heights wasn't capable of doing that, that's his problem. But don't say, don't say that it applies to members of this side of the House because it doesn't.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I say the honourable member does not understand the plan because he says that certain things are inevitable under this plan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be able to conclude in five minutes. The fact is that the beauty of this plan is that nothing is inevitable under this plan. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this plan is the first plan for Greater Winnipeg that really puts the nature of Greater Winnipeg government into the hands of the elected representatives of the people of Greater Winnipeg. The people of Greater Winnipeg can decide, Mr. Speaker, and they couldn't decide it under any existing form of municipal government. Metro couldn't decide it nor could the City of Winnipeg decide it. The people of Winnipeg can decide through this plan that in Greater Winnipeg if they want it there will be 13 fire depots. They can decide if they want it that there will be one fire depot. The people of Greater Winnipeg can decide under this plan that there will be 13 units of a Greater Winnipeg Police Force. They can decide under this plan that there will be anywhere between one and thirteen or twenty-six or any number of units within such a plan.

The people of Winnipeg can decide, Mr. Speaker, under this plan to decentralize whatever form of administration they have. They can also do the reverse. They can decide that they want to centralize the entire administration of any particular service. And if my honourable friend says that the way government works is that it will always centralize, then I say to you, Mr. Speaker, again my honourable friend is putting his idea into the minds of politicians on this side, because, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, one thing that the Member for Lakeside and I and the Member for River Heights differ with is whether we here in this Legislature also represent citizens of Greater Winnipeg and have a right to do things for Greater Winnipeg in the Manitoba Legislature; because I don't feel that when I was elected as representative from Inkster constituency that I was thereby disqualified from being an urban representative. And if the members on that side are saying that the members who were elected by the city people to this House do not have the responsibility to legislate for those people of Winnipeg then can he tell me how come they have done it in the past hundred years, how come the rules change when a New Democratic Party comes to power? Because, Mr. Speaker, every single move for Greater Winnipeg, every single charter that was created, every single change in those charters, ultimately was legislated by the people of Greater Winnipeg, through their elected representatives in this Chamber, not at the local level; and if the honourable members, if they can't get that through their heads, if the Member for Fort Garry really believes that - if he really believes that he doesn't represent the citizens of Fort Garry and can't make any decisions on their behalf, if the Member for Sturgeon Creek thought that when he came into this Chamber he lost all right to speak for the people of Sturgeon Creek, well, Mr. Speaker, I feel sorry for him, because if that's the attitude that you take, then the people in Sturgeon Creek, the people of Fort Garry are going to say, well if that man can't represent me, I'm going to have to get somebody else who will agree that these things are representative of the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, this is really the basis of the program of urban reorganization that has been presented; the Minister of Finance has certainly shown how this province intends to answer all of the so-called fears, and I don't think that they are really that serious. With regard to the

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . loss of local identity, with regard to the loss of local identity, I believe that the system that we have set up has a better opportunity for all local identities, and most particularly the type of local identity that the people of St. Boniface are talking about, than they have under the existing system. And Mr. Speaker, the fact is that that is debatable. I welcome debate on those questions, but if the honourable member -- (Interjection) -- the honourable member says ask the people. When we . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister's time is up. And while I'm on my feet I should like to indicate that I intend to adhere to Rule 40 and honourable members who intend to disobey Rule 40 will do so at their own risk. I do not intend to have a shouting match in this Chamber. I intend to hear debate on both sides of the House and I think the . . . that's exactly what I do not require. I do intend that both sides shall have the opportunity to have their debate in courtesy and that the decorum of the House will be maintained. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources may finish his sentence.

MR. GREEN: I would just like to finish my sentence, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the New Democratic Party indicated in one of the areas, which, if my honourable friend was right, would be one of the most difficult areas in which to accomplish municipal reorganization. We indicated that we would not back away from an election on that question. We went into the election and it was the Conservative party who were dissident about whether they would let the people decide. We had that election, the people did decide, and I think that was a very good indication.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works and Highways, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . (1) The Minister of Public Works and Highways.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, with your permission . . . . couple more hours, and before I do so I would like to refer to the ridiculous charges made by the Member for Morris that I was in here deliberately wasting time yesterday. After watching the schizophrenic performance of the Leader of the Opposition I think there is no question in anybody's mind who's wasting the time of this House when he took almost two hours to give us his version of what democracy is and how a one-city concept should be dealt with here. I hope that today we'll have some more rational thinking and conduct in this House as compared to what we had yesterday when the Member for Morris got hung up on television and radio commercials and the posing that he has been carrying on in this House and before I could answer any of his questions which he asked pointedly, in fact demanded answers for, he didn't give me an opportunity, he simply ran out of the House to the news media to make further ridiculous statements. It's strange to see the contrast, the undisciplined, patched-up old windbags on that side, Mr. Chairman. You know, on one side you hear him say one thing, on the other side you hear something else. The Member for Morris has one point of view, the Leader of the Opposition has another one, a couple of other members are almost - I notice, there's no children in the House, I can use the word, almost pimping for the insurance industry in this House, constantly defending them, arguing on their behalf.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, the honourable member here is - I want to rise on a point of privilege here. I don't mind the honourable member rising and talking about highways, chastizing me, but I'll chastize him plenty then, when he refers to me and the word he presently used, and charged, I want you to either sit him down, if he's going to say the words or I'll sit him down from now on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it's a matter of debate there are some means open to any member of the Committee in which they can challenge the rules of the Chair once they have been made. I have said before that I don't intend to debate with any member in this House rulings of the Chair. I would ask the Minister of Transportation to direct his remarks to the matter under consideration.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: You rule his remarks in order?

A MEMBER: Make him withdraw.

MR. BOROWSKI: I find it very difficult to understand the position taken by the members opposite, they are accusing me of neglecting highways, of not talking about highways. I don't know if they are just plain stupid or not intelligent or refuse to acknowledge that I have more than one department - the Motor Transport Board, the Taxicab Board and the other Boards and the other safety problems fall under my jurisdiction and are they suggesting, are they suggesting that I shouldn't talk about these things, are they so selfish that they just want to know how much gravel, how much blacktop they're getting in their constituency? Right now, we are talking about the implementation of Part 3 of the National Transportation Act. This is probably one of the most important things for the trucking industry that has happened in the last fifty years. Reciprocity is another important item. Do you think they care about it? Maybe they cut off the funds for their election pot, so they don't give a damn about them now. They want to talk about the roads, how much blacktop am I getting. Well there is the measure of democracy when a donkey from Sturgeon Creek tells me to shut up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Once again I would solicit the cooperation of all members. Well, debate can proceed, or debate cannot proceed, the choice is up to the House. The Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think the best policy to follow is what I started following a few days ago, simply to read my remarks. It may put them to sleep, and I don't think there would be much difference if they were awake or asleep, it won't penetrate their thick skulls. So with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to further deal with the effects of the implementation of Part 3 of the National Transportation Act. I believe I left off, I spoke about the fact that we have put one person on that committee and we have had two meetings with the Federal Government and I would like to briefly for the benefit of the public - and, oh, incidentally the opposition - brief them on just what's been going on and the effect of Part 3 of the National Transportation Act.

Three of the items that they have to deal with is to resolve the difference existing between provinces on the one hand and certain provinces and the federal government on the other. 2. Identify the areas of agreement and disagreement; and 3. Begin the drafting of regulations under Section 35 of the National Transportation Act.

While the federal government had clear jurisdiction over extra-provincial motor carriers, its failure to exercise its powers in this field resulted in a vacuum which was filled by provincial government through the Motor Carrier Board which regulated both intra and extra provincial traffic. This ad hoc arrangement led to two results: Firstly, the province, or at least certain of them came to believe that they acquired certain prerogatives from the federal authority, which in fact was never theirs. They could exercise that prerogative only if the federal authority allowed them to do so. Now that the federal government wishes to reassert its legal authority to regulate extra provincial traffic, the provinces, at least some of them, feel themselves being evicted from a field in which they formerly exercised, and still do, authority. It should be understood that both the extra and intra traffic developed and grew to its present important status in the transportation field under the supervisory direction of provincial government. The re-occupation by the federal authorities of this area of jurisdiction is understandably resented and looked upon with some degree of apprehension.

Secondly, the absence of a clearly enunciated federal policy in national transportation for all modes of transportation, each province proceeded to regulate both intra and extra provincial traffic according to different sets of principles and in a manner that would best meet the needs of the province. This approach has led to and resulted in a tangled web of regulation which in some important areas differ from one province to the other. Because motor transport has taken on an increasingly important role in both provincial and national field of transportation, the provinces understandably are reluctant to vacate this field to the federal authority for fear it may harm the economic life of a particular province. Should the federal government decide to pursue a policy in the field of national transportation that may be harmful to the viability of

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . . a trucking industry of a particular province. The attitudes of the provinces are understandable when one considers the discriminatory policy pursued by the federal government on other modes of transportation, The railways being the . . .

MR. ENNS: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . most notable example of this insofar as western provinces are concerned. If the federal government follows strictly and scrupulously the principles enunciated in Section One of the National Transportation Act . . .

MR. ENNS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . and administer Part 3 of the Act fairly and equitably between the provinces in the national interest, the provinces have little cause for apprehension from federal government's intention to reassert its authority in the extra provincial trucking industry. Unfortunately past experience in the field of transportation are not conducive to a sudden upsurge of complete faith and trust that the federal government through its regulatory powers will not do grievous harm to the trucking industry of a particular province.

Those matters in essence constituted as they still do the major obstacle which lies in the way of the implementation of Part 3 of the National Transportation Act, and which would be acceptable to all provinces. There remains yet another reason which to date has frustrated every attempt to reconcile differences to make progress and stage implementation of Part 3 of the Act. This stems from Ontario's twin proposal which, stripped down to essentials, would have given provincial authorities a dominant role in regulating extra provincial traffic.

The Ontario proposal provided that each province would be represented at a Motor Vehicle Transportation Committee of the Canadian Transportation Commission. This approach would have given the provinces jointly the balance of the voting power on any issue that came before the committee and would effectively prostrate and nullify any federal attempt to rationalize the Motor Transport Industry and bring into force the principles enunciated . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question? Mr. Chairman, then I rise on a point of privilege. I understood the Minister to accuse . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage on a point of privilege.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I understood the Minister of Transport to accuse members on this side of the House as pimping for the insurance industry; and if he did say this, then I question your partiality in running this committee, and I'm going to raise the same question that was raised last week if you allow this to pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know what question the member is alluding to that he raised last week because there was no question of the impartiality of the Chair raised last week. I personally did not hear that particular remark. I'm not questioning the member's veracity in saying that this was said; I said that I did not hear that remark, and before I would ask him to withdraw I would have to ask some cooperation in this matter.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I heard the statement made by the Minister and I ask him to retract. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask that you call in the Speaker, I have a motion to present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I don't know that the Minister has acknowledged having made a remark such as my honourable friend has referred to and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I don't know that the honourable member has any question to raise. Perhaps the matter can be cleared up when we determine whether such a remark was made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is what the Chair is attempting to do. I had offered a moment's silence as I said I would need some assistance in it because I did not hear the remark. I wasn't questioning the Member from Portage's veracity when he made the statement. The Member for Lakeside to the point of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, if it's a question of substantiating the statements made by the Honourable Member for Portage, certainly most members on this side of the House heard those remarks and some additional remarks made. I believe the word "prostitute" was also entered into the debate, as tomorrow's Hansard will show.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would have no other alternative but to ask the Minister if in fact the words were used that the Minister withdraw the remark.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to put you in a position. Obviously the Member for Portage is trying to grab more headlines, it's the only way the Liberals can do it, so I withdraw making that statement, and if I may I'd like to substitute the word



(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . . . "soliciting" which is the same thing. But if it'll make him feel happy, I withdraw it. Mr. Chairman, he won't get the headlines he's begging for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I had asked for withdrawal of the remarks and of course implicit in asking for the withdrawal of the remark were the intent of the remarks. So in my view the withdrawal of the remarks with qualifications would in fact not constitute a withdrawal of the remarks. So I would ask the Minister to withdraw his remarks without qualification.

MR. BOROWSKI: I withdraw them, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . to rationalize the motor transport industry and bring into force the principles enunciated in the Transportation Act between the various modes of transportation. Since parliament has conferred a duty on the Canadian Transportation Commission to implement the various provisions relating to the several transportation modes, and has enunciated . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister permit a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Honourable Member for Portage to withdraw his remarks as to the partiality of the Chair that he made today, because he said that since that remark was made and the Chairman didn't challenge it, he questioned the partiality of the Chairman. The Chairman has indicated that he didn't hear the remarks. I would ask the Member for Portage to withdraw the remarks questioning the partiality of the Chair. — (Interjection) — He did so. Well, I heard it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. The impartiality of the Chair can only be questioned by substantive motion so that without a substantive motion questioning the impartiality of the Chair, it would be the Chair's ruling that no question of the impartiality of the Chair had been raised.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. You're quite right. The only way that one can properly challenge the partiality of the Chair is to move a substantive motion. But if a member without moving a substantive motion accuses the Chair of not being impartial, then I suggest that that is a breach of the privileges of the House and the member should be asked to withdraw that remark.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside to the point of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, because it appears that only on a point of order can I get a question in. Can the Minister of Transport tell me when Provincial Road No. 518 will be scheduled for regravelling?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry to the point of order pertaining to the impartiality of the Chair.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, on the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think the record will show that what the Member for Portage did was question the hearing capacity of the Chair, not the impartiality of the Chair but the hearing capacity of the Chair, that was the intent of his question, that was the intent of his question just as the Chair ruled a moment or two ago upon the intent and the motives behind the ministerial statements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House Leader to the point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Portage la Prairie clearly stated that the Honourable Minister should be asked to withdraw and he questioned the impartiality of the Chair because you had not asked the honourable member to withdraw a remark which you had not heard. That was what he said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order raised by the Honourable House Leader. It's true that I did point a question to you about a remark made by the Minister of Transport, and I'm satisfied with your ruling when you require him to retract.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that's not satisfactory. The member — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order. The member questioned the partiality of the Chair because you had not asked the member to withdraw a remark which you claimed you hadn't heard, and therefore I would ask the honourable member — having received the explanation that you did not hear the remark, the honourable member should be good enough to withdraw his suggestion that you were not acting in an impartial manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside to the point of order.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. Surely, Mr. Chairman, it's your impartiality that's being questioned. You are in control of the committee and it's for you to make your ruling, your judgment on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House Leader to the point of order.

MR. GREEN: The fact is that it is the privileges of the House which are challenged when a member, without putting a substantive motion to put a vote, suggests that the Speaker is impartial, that is a matter of the privileges of the House and I think is not partial - is not impartial. I got mixed up with this word last week, too. If a member chooses to make a motion challenging impartiality of the Chair he may do so.

The Member for Portage la Prairie said that he challenged the Chair's impartiality because he had not asked a remark to be withdrawn. The Chairman indicated he didn't hear the remarks. I think the Member for Portage la Prairie should be good enough to withdraw his question as to the partiality of the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, in order to satisfy my legalistic friend, if it will make him feel any better, because I did question you on allowing a remark to pass, which I considered to be unparliamentary, insulting, and casting improper motives on certain members of this House. When this was drawn to your attention, you called on the Minister to retract and he retracted. Now if it will make my honourable friend any happier to say that I withdraw the remarks I made to you, I'm willing to withdraw them. I'm certainly glad that I made them because the Minister of Transport did withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Member for Portage la Prairie has withdrawn the remark to my satisfaction. May I once again point out to the members as I did in the meeting subsequent to what transpired in this House last week. I read a Citation from Beauchesne that it is not only the responsibility of the Chair, it is the responsibility of all members to see that debate proceeds in some semblance of order. That if a remark is missed by the Chair, and I would suggest there's nothing the matter with the hearing of the Chair, then it is the responsibility of the members to draw this to the Chair's attention, which is in fact what just took place. The Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I believe we only have a couple of minutes. I wonder if you could call it 5:30 rather than me leave off in the middle of a paragraph.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 5:30. I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.