

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 22, 1975

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 90 students of Grade 5 standing of the Prendergast School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kling, Mrs. Zizzy and Mrs. Benson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

We also have 35 students, Grade 5 standing of the St. Alphonsus School. These students are under the direction of Sister Patricia and Sister Loretta, Mrs. Rata, Mrs. Huzyk, and Mrs. Kreutzer. This school is located in my own constituency of Kildonan.

And we have 40 students, Grade 4, 5 and 6 standing of the Pembina Crest School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Vaszine, Miss Friesen and Miss Reddi. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here this afternoon.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS - COMMITTEE MEETINGS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that simultaneous meetings of Committees of Supply would commence tomorrow afternoon. I understand that the committee room is being prepared for Citizenship Court tomorrow afternoon. It's a short afternoon and I don't suppose there will be any great inconvenience if we do not start until Thursday, so that simultaneous meetings would start on Thursday in the event that we did get into Supply tomorrow afternoon, which is of course not certain.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Services.

HON. HARVEY BOSTROM (Minister of Co-operative Development) (Rupertsland): I wish to table, Mr. Speaker, the Annual Report of the Co-operative Loans and the Loans Guarantee Board for March 31st, 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports; the Honourable Minister of Health.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT - NEGOTIATIONS WITH DOCTORS

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement re the negotiations with the Manitoba Medical Association.

On Monday, April 21st, 1975, Dr. Lommerse, President of the Manitoba Medical Association, issued a statement on the current dispute which was carried in the Winnipeg Free Press. The concluding sentences of the Association's statement read as follows, and I quote: "The government has been given some time to face the real issue square on, recognize it as it is, and then get the side issues out of the way. The decision is in the government's hands."

It goes without saying that we already have accepted this challenge. In fact it was because we had recognized and were ready to face the real issue of this dispute that I asked to address the full membership of the MMA when it met at a Special General Meeting at the Fort Garry Hotel on April 18th.

I'm convinced that I presented the issue square on when I spoke to the doctors, however I will endeavour to do so again. First let me do as the Association would suggest, that is get the side issues out of the way, Mr. Speaker.

1. The wages: I'm happy to hear that the MMA now takes the position that wages are no longer an issue in this dispute. It is difficult for me to understand the Association's insistence that I have focussed on the subject of salaries as a principal issue.

I would go as far as to suggest that I've been waiting for the MMA to agree itself that the government's proposal for remuneration is fair and equitable. This is the point that I was

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) trying to convey to the public when I placed the advertisement in the Winnipeg newspapers on April 17th, and to the doctors of Manitoba when I asked to address the special meeting of the MMA last Friday.

At the April 18th special meeting of the MMA this is what I said to the members of the MMA, and I quote: "It is hard for me to believe that money is the real issue in this dispute. Isn't it, after all, a question of power? The MMA seeks the power to prevent the government from entering into contracting out even with part-time doctors." Therefore I accept the MMA's position that wages will not be regarded as an issue in this dispute.

Then there is - well the second point, who does the MMA represent? The MMA statement says that I, as Minister, unilaterally decided that seven of the doctors in the government service were designated as managerial staff and therefore were not in the bargaining unit. The Association states that only the Labour Relations Board has the authority to make this decision. The MMA statement in this regard is misleading and carries the impression that I have tried to assume responsibilities not my own. Accordingly I feel I must correct the impression. It has been understood by the negotiators for both sides that the Labour Relations Board would have to make a final ruling on this point.

It was recognized that where there is no agreement between the Association and the government one of the parties would have to apply to the Labour Relations Board to seek its determination of who was in and who was out of the bargaining unit. As would be expected, the MMA took the position that all doctors employed by the government should be included in the bargaining unit, even my Deputy Minister.

On the other hand our negotiators stated that some doctors must be considered as management personnel and therefore should not be considered as members of the bargaining unit. It is apparent then, that until an application is made to the Labour Relations Board and the board makes a decision, it is an open question. However, administrative necessity required some specific instruction on this point. In fact, I have been informed that some of the doctors were looking for some direction from the department on this subject, and I felt it absolutely necessary to give it when collective action was announced while realizing that I might be challenged.

My communication directed at a minimum number of key staff in the institutions and the department, was intended simply to state whom I considered to be management personnel. None of those receiving this communication objected to its issuance or its contents, although one individual expressed an opinion that the MMA might challenge it. Others expressed relief that their position has been clarified. We have been, and still are in agreement with the Association that the Labour Relations Board must rule on this point if we cannot agree. I have directed our negotiator to prepare application to the Labour Relations Board for its determination.

There also is a question of whether residents in training will be included in the collective agreement. The government does not accept the contention that these students are civil servants or employees of the government. True, they are employed by the teaching hospital, but they are not government employees. They have entered into contractual arrangements with the government whereby they promised to provide service to the department when they complete their training, and they do not now provide service to the government. In effect, they are students in receipt of conditional bursaries. We would be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to consider the possibility of referring this matter to the Labour Relations Board for determination, but we do not consider it a point to be decided by an independent arbitrator.

Shortage of Government Doctors: The MMA claims the basic issue is a shortage of qualified medical people in our public health, mental health and mental retardation programs. It was not too long ago that the Association asserted the reason for the shortage was because Manitoba salaries were not competitive with those of other provinces. Now we are assured by the Association, and as I've stated, I fully agree, wages are no longer considered an issue. I must emphasize that these programs are the government's responsibility.

I have admitted that we face a shortage of doctors, but this is the reason we have offered competitive salaries in the current negotiations and why we have supported the Career Residency Program. Because this is a continuing responsibility of government, whether or not it may be engaged in negotiations with any group, I find it difficult to see how it could be designated as an issue in this dispute especially one amenable to resolution before April 25th. The citizens of Manitoba decide whether or not its government is meeting its responsibility,

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) and this they do at the ballot box. Naturally we welcome any suggestions the MMA may have to assist us in meeting this responsibility. But let us recognize that this is not an issue in a contractual dispute.

The main issue: By process of elimination it would appear that only one point conceivably could be described as the main issue, and the Manitoba Medical Association has identified it as "contracting out."

The position taken by the Association on this point is not acceptable to the government. As I mentioned earlier, I described this issue to the members of the MMA as the real one, the one in which the MMA seeks the power to prevent the government from hiring medical staff on a contractual basis without prior consent of the MMA.

A few words of explanation are in order. Because it is a subtle point I suspect that a large segment of the population does not fully understand the significance of the MMA's position. I know for a fact that even some of the doctors attending the MMA's meeting on April 18th were confused with regard to this issue. Some doctors felt that the government was attempting to interfere with the right of physicians to opt out of the provincial Medical Plan and therefore the government was trying to introduce a new element of compulsion in the Medicare scheme by preventing doctors from working outside the Plan. Obviously this was a gross misinterpretation and indicative of the fact that some MMA members did not understand the crucial demand of their executive in this dispute.

The government maintains the right to hire doctors under contract who are not civil servants. A contract with the government can be for part-time or full-time work, and can bind the parties for various periods agreed upon. This practice is common to every provincial government as well as the Federal Government. It is a practice which is not limited to the medical profession, although it often is the preferred method of employment of many individuals, especially professional people. In fact I should add that contracts are requested by many members of the medical profession for employment with the government, with the university as part-time teachers and researchers, or with hospitals.

Legally the government can enter into such contracts. This authority is conferred under Section 3(1) of the Civil Service Act under the heading "Employment on Special Contract" and it reads as follows: "The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or an employing authority may employ a person on a special contract basis or as an independent contractor, subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed in the Order in Council, or in the special contract entered into by the person and the government."

As can be seen the hiring of medical personnel on a contractual basis is a right the government has the authority to exercise and it is not arbitrable. This right has been legislated and I believe the MMA as recently as April 21st has recognized and affirmed the government's right to legislate. Mr. Sprague, Executive Vice-President of the MMA was quoted yesterday in the Free Press as saying, and I quote: "Government has every right to pass any legislation that they see fit. This is their right to do so and fundamentally its the responsibility of the people to observe the law." It would appear that the MMA defends the government's right to pass law, but expects it to surrender the effect of the laws that it passes under the threat of a withdrawal of services. I have faith that the Legislative Assembly would object to this subversion of its responsibilities, and I'm certain that the government is absolutely opposed to this concept. For this reason I told the members of the MMA, and I quote: "That under no circumstances whatsoever will the government refer the issue of contracting out to arbitration. We're agreed to the association's request in this regard at the negotiating table. It is a matter which is at the very heart of the concept of responsible government. In short it is not a point which a government can concede and still be called the government.

"I cannot emphasize too strongly that engaging doctors on contract is not an innovation the government had chosen to adopt in order to destroy the certified bargaining unit or the MMA. In fact it is a very traditional practice which not only can be found throughout Canada, but also can be seen enshrined in Manitoba's own legislation. It should be understood that it is the MMA which insists that government surrender this right to the newly certified bargaining agent, or at least wants to compel the government to be subject to a veto over this right.

"I ask the doctors of this province, 'Are you prepared to withdraw services from your patients because your association wishes to seize the right which undoubtedly rests with the government?' Although other unions have made similar requests no government in Canada, be it federal or provincial, has been ready to acquiesce."

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)

When I spoke to the members of the MMA last Friday I assured them that the government has no intention of dismissing doctors in its employ. I am ready to give tangible proof in this regard. I asked my staff to enquire of other provinces if they have provisions in any agreements they may have on so-called contracting out, and information gathered revealed the following: The Federal Government and the Yukon Territory includes this clause in an agreement, for example, and I quote: "The employer will continue past practice in giving all reasonable consideration to continued employment in the public service of employees who would otherwise become redundant because work is contracted out." I have instructed our negotiator to explore with the MMA representative the possible inclusion of a clause in an agreement which would give similar assurances. On April 18th I went to address the MMA meeting in a spirit of conciliation, and I make this statement in the same vein. Mr. Speaker, if I may, just before entering the Chamber I was informed that the MMA has sent a communique to our negotiator, and I haven't received same. I hope it's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, and I'm sure that you'll recognize that the statement now just made by the Minister goes far beyond what was ever intended in communicating policy decisions to this House by a Minister. I read to you, sir, the pertinent rule in our book which says: "That a Minister of the Crown may make an announcement or statement of government policy at the time in the ordinary daily routine of business appointed for Ministerial Statements." What the Minister has done is not communicated outside of the last sentence, which he ad libbed, is the only information that he communicated to this House of a nature that could qualify under the rules. The rest of the statement was nothing more than a diatribe of nonsense so contrary to normal negotiating procedures that I'm surprised that honourable gentlemen opposite would even allow that sort of thing to happen on Orders of the Day. The Minister has been repeatedly doing that on several occasions in this House, not only in the House but he's done it in newspapers as well, carrying on his negotiations in this place rather than at the negotiating table. It's so contrary to the rules of this House, sir, that I protest it and ask you, sir, that the rules be applied to enforce the Minister to make what is supposed to be made on this occasion, that is a Ministerial Statement containing a statement of government policy, rather than the kind of nonsense that we've been listening to for the last 15 minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is going to be the - I don't know what the practical effect of the point of order will be. It is I presume a caveat on the future Ministers who may arise the ire of the Member for Morris if they make a statement. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Health was faced with the newspaper report that there would be a walkout of 800 doctors in the Province of Manitoba; that yesterday members of the Opposition benches required information on this subject, that the Minister has spoken 15 minutes on a matter of that concern, indicating the position with respect to the negotiations. --(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, that is a question of opinion, Mr. Speaker. May I say that the total statement was of length of less than 15 minutes, that it was a position vis-a-vis that the Minister of Health has indicated with regard to the health policy of the Province of Manitoba. That may be a subject of some disagreement to the honourable members. They have a right to respond to it, but I submit that on a point of order, which I assume at this point is completely academic, that the Minister had the right to make the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BROWN: I assure the honourable member that I will be rather brief. We are pleased on this side of the House that some progress seems to have been made in this dispute between the government and the MMA as far as wages are concerned. Maybe this was not the main issue after all as the government tried to get the people of Manitoba to believe in the ad that they had in last week's paper.

I can see nothing in the statement that the Minister just made, Mr. Speaker, that will speed up or facilitate the end of the dispute between the doctors and the government. As a matter of fact he seems to be throwing down challenge after challenge to the MMA. To me it

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

(MR. BROWN cont'd) appears, Mr. Speaker, as if the main problem in this whole issue is that there is a complete lack of confidence between the government and the MMA and vice versa. It seems to me that there is lack of communication and consultation that has produced this lack of confidence. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Minister that he should sit down personally with the MMA and iron out some of the differences that have developed over the last period of years. I would strongly urge the Minister to do this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if he can assure the House that the same energy will be put into the bargaining process with the doctors that has been put into the almost hourly press releases and statements that he's presented to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Let me suggest that the preface . . . Order please. If honourable gentlemen wish to have this Assembly conducted in a proper manner, I wish they would conduct themselves in that manner. I have requested repeatedly that prefacing or presenting argument prior to placing a question is out of order. Members are aware of it. If we're going to have some kind of rapport it has to come from all sides. Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister will confirm that as a result of his statement he's saying to the doctors that in effect the issue of no contracting out is an issue in which the government is not prepared to negotiate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, first of all members of the opposition chastise me because I took an ad in the press; they told me this was the place to give the information. I'm trying this today and they chastise me again. I think that the arbitrators are doing the negotiating, and as far as we're concerned if the MMA, if any group can bring in a press release we're certainly entitled to do the same thing. I think that the people of Manitoba are entitled to know what the score is when you have people such as some newscasters that are saying that we are trying to tie the doctors, they don't understand what the situation is at all. I think that it is time that we tell the story to the people of Manitoba.

Now to my honourable friend, I don't really know if he wants an answer to his question because yesterday he invited me to make a statement, now he's complaining, but I'll give him an answer anyway. Yes, this is a case that the government feels, and this is enshrined in the legislation, that there is no way that this government will abdicate the right to hire anybody, anybody at all. That is not done anywhere in Canada on any provincial level or in the Federal Government, but we are saying that we're ready, and I've so instructed our arbitrator who, I think, at this moment is meeting - our negotiator I should say - who has discussed another possibility of bringing in a clause, such as I mentioned in this, in the statement, that would give protection to the doctors. But the fact, Mr. Speaker, is we're certainly not trying to do away with the doctors - we need more doctors - but this is not something new like some of the people would believe, that the government is trying to prevent something, this is something that happened when you were in power, that's something that's happening everywhere else. So if you're saying we're not going to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Questions should be answered briefly in the same vein as I requested, that the questions be put, briefly, tersely and to the point. Any other questions? Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): I have a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I believe the local authority requested provincial help. Does the Minister ever report on the current flooding conditions of the Swan River?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, within all of the excitement of this afternoon, I neglected, and I ask permission of the House to distribute a statement that was requested yesterday on the spring run-off outlook. There's nothing mentioned specifically with regard to Swan River.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) I am not aware personally of a request from the local authority, although it indeed may be in our department. I'll look into it.

MR. BILTON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister as to whether or not the victims of the flood will qualify for assistance under the Flood Control Board ?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, only if there is a Flood Compensation Program brought in, which is done in certain cases, and then only if the kind of damage that they have is compensated for under the program.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if I might ask the Minister. Would he institute an enquiry in this respect ?

MR. GREEN: I'm sorry, I missed the honourable member's question.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the Minister would institute an enquiry as to the problem in Swan River as it is now.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I would take the honourable member's question as notice and see what complaints we have.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister wish to have this statement included in the Hansard, or does he wish to leave it with . . .

MR. GREEN: It's of no consequence to me, Mr. Speaker. I've distributed it, it will be available to the honourable members, I didn't make it as a Ministerial Statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I wonder if the Minister can report to the House if there's any danger of flooding in the Whiteshell, Falcon Lake, and the other lakes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs)(Springfield): I haven't had an indication to that effect, Mr. Speaker. I can certainly check it out and inform the members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question also for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Can the Minister confirm whether his department has demolished a quantity of summer cottages owned by the Provincial Government in the Brereton Lake area of the Whiteshell?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable member for giving me notice yesterday that this question would be posed on me today. Yes we have acquired 17 cottages that were constructed back in 1932. It was considered to be impossible financially, first of all, to renovate and upgrade those cabins to make them viable to be leased to the public. They were contravening sections of The Public Health Act, and considered to be against the accommodation standards currently in use. Fifteen of those 17 are being demolished, two are being retained, and they were purchased at a salvage cost by the department; and the property itself goes back to the Crown, it was leased out, and will be made available to the public in general.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister inform us whether any effort was made to offer these cottages for sale to individuals who might want to renovate them; and were there any enquiries about purchasing the cottages for purposes of renovation and use by the general public.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, that alternative was looked at, Mr. Speaker, over the last seven or eight years. Several owners as a matter of fact have attempted to repair and operate the facilities, but their efforts have not been profitable in their minds, so this was considered to be the last straw.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate what the cost, both the salvage cost and demolition cost would be, to the taxpayer of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Riel. The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to indicate to the honourable members of the House, with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, that the question of tearing down the buildings in question is done by staff of my department and considered to be part of their duties.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I wonder if he can advise the House in regard to the program that his department has set up of setting up recreational gardens or victory gardens, or whatever it is the program is called, whether in particular cases, such as the gardens being established on St. Mary's Road in the vicinity of the Floodway, whether there had been any check made with regard to the local residents of the area, and whether they are in compliance with the zoning requirements of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have been discussing the plans that we have pertaining to community gardens with the City of Winnipeg, and we have eight sites in and around the City of Winnipeg that will be ready for use by, I say, approximately May 15th. On the 1st of May there will be an advertisement out indicating to the public what has to be done to avail themselves of a garden plot, being 25 x 50, at a cost of \$15.00 per year, and there will be 1,000 such plots available by the 1st of May. There will be more put in use later on during the year, but we have a start.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder, in view of the fact that residents now living in the vicinity have a degree of concern about the weekend loading and activity of that, you know, particular area because of the influx of some 200 people into a fairly confined area, whether or not some steps could not be made to meet with the people in the local area to ensure them of controls that may be established to control weekend traffic, and so on, and activities in an area that may not normally receive that much attention from policing another point of view.

MR. TOUPIN: By all means, Mr. Speaker, we will check this out because we are attempting to make use of any available land within the City of Winnipeg, and around the City of Winnipeg as close as possible, and giving preference to those living in apartments to avail themselves of not only gardening for themselves, but a different site will be actually supplied with picnic tables, with water, where the family can have an outing.

MR. CRAIK: One final question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, has consideration been given in the selection of the sites, to moving them far enough out of the city to ensure that they aren't, you know, in relation to an existing community too close for that type of intense weekend activity.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, there will be a mixture of both. We're attempting whenever possible to make use of the Hydro's right-of-way, if we can call it such, in some cases fairly close to apartment dwellings where people can just walk to the garden plots and work. In other cases there will be plots available, say, in Headingley where we have land, and in other places close to the city. But there will be plots, gardening plots within the city, and hopefully on Hydro lines where the land is not fully utilized now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education and Universities. Can the Minister indicate or report any progress in the strike at the University of Manitoba by some 1,100 members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, negotiations are in progress.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister determined if the University of Manitoba administration or the Board of Governors have the financial capacity to settle the strike?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I have no information to the contrary.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate to the House if the Minister considers the present or the current demand by the strikers of some 21 percent . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That's asking for an opinion. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education, Colleges and University Affairs. I would like to ask the Minister whether in his capacity as Minister of University Affairs, he monitored, or had members of his department monitor, today's protest meeting on the university campus involving some six bargaining units on the campus - that's the University of Manitoba.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't see that as relevant to the procedure of this House whether the Minister monitors or doesn't monitor. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry wish to place another question?

MR. SHERMAN: With respect, Mr. Speaker, if there isn't, there should be. I'm asking if that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That's an opinion.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm asking whether the Minister, with a crippling strike of some six weeks duration on his hands, had undertaken any arrangements to have reports made to him of today's meeting on the campus involving not one, but some six bargaining units, or whether he was there in person. That's not asking for an opinion, sir, it's asking for a fact.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, there has been an ongoing demonstration ever since Day One of the strike on the approach to the campus of the University of Manitoba, and I am very well aware of that demonstration.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister undertake to have results and proceedings at today's meetings reported to him, results and proceedings involving those six bargaining units.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable, the Minister of Health. With respect to the negotiator that he mentions on Page 8 of his release, is the negotiator a member of the Department of Labour or is the negotiations being overseen by the Minister of Labour in this case?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: The negotiator is not an employee of the government. He is just retained to act for the department in this.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister mind telling us who the negotiator is?

MR. DESJARDINS: Not at all, Mr. Speaker. I thought that was well-known. It's Mr. Mitchell, Leon Mitchell.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the House Leader. I wonder if he can indicate when the next meeting of the Standing Committee on Economic Development will take place with the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I expect it will happen within the next two weeks. We intend to keep the committees meeting.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister would arrange to have the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation in February and May of 1972 present, to be examined?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I won't have the Board of Directors present. The Chairman will report for the Board of Directors.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to phrase the question again to the Minister. In view of the fact that statements have been made that are . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has asked a question. He received an answer. If he wishes to debate it he'll have to find another time. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who is in charge of the MDC, whether he has anything to cover up by not allowing the members of the Board of Directors to come to the meeting?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to cover up. Mr. Speaker, let me say this, that I was not the Minister to whom the board was responsible at that time, and the first I saw the minute that is referred to, was when it was shown to me by a member of the press who had got it from the Honourable Member for River Heights, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, on a matter personal privilege, and in order to save the Honourable the First Minister, if possible, embarrassment, I would like to correct an error in Hansard on Page 1364 entitled "Grievance" of April 16th, 1975. At the top of the page in brackets it says "Mr. Schreyer continued". Mr. Speaker, that should read "Mr. McGill continued".

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Is there any reason why negotiations is being carried on by an appointee of his rather than by the Department of Labour in this particular case?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable colleague who made the appointment would care to answer that. I don't know when he was appointed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Yes, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mitchell was appointed a number of months ago. It was done in consultation with the Department of Labour and the Minister of Labour, and it is common practice to use this approach. Someone was needed with, we felt, the necessary skills. His name was proposed, and the department accepted it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Can the Minister indicate if the Manitoba Liquor Commission has decided on a starting date for construction of a new liquor commission at the corner of River and Osborne?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Attorney-General. I'd like to ask him whether he's able to reveal any specifics yet about charges laid or pending against those Support Staff strikers who were arrested at the University of Manitoba earlier this month.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the last report that I had is that possible charges against the Support Staff were under review by officials in my department. I haven't received any report in the last several days in that connection. I will check to see if there's been further progress. But to my knowledge there has been no decision to lay charges.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for his information. Is there any time limit, time framework within such charges should or would have to be laid?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if it involves summary conviction matters, I believe there's six months' limitation. Outside of that there is no limitation.

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

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. In view of the numerous references to the possible intervention on the part of the Labour Board, I'm asking the Honourable Minister has he been using his good offices in the current dispute with the doctors in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I anticipate making a speech, a statement on going into grievances, if we get down to that, which I think will cover the point raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and also, as I understand, by a number of other members of the Assembly.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to proceed with the adjourned debates on Second Reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 13, the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

BILL NO. 13 - FATALITY INQUIRIES ACT

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Generally speaking, Bill 13 seems to be an improvement over the previous Act, and it certainly would appear to improve and clarify the manner of making enquiry and taking evidence at such enquiry.

The appointment of an administrator to administer the Act will relieve the Chief Medical Examiner of a large number of administrative problems, and will also relieve the Minister of the direct responsibility over the jurisdiction and investigative responsibilities of medical examiners.

Now additionally, the appointment of a Chief Medical Examiner for the province should facilitate the effectiveness of the administration of the Act. Now if it is the intention that the administrative responsibility be removed from the Administrator of Court Services, this should be indicated and an enquiry directed as to whether the Administrator of Court Services is presently fully occupied to the extent where he is unable to properly administer the Act. Certain additional powers re the co-ordinating of the scene of accident and the removal of exhibit are necessary and desirable. Removal of the necessity for referring the matter to a magistrate to ascertain whether or not an inquest should be called, and placing this responsibility in the hands of the administrator should render the medical examiner system more effective.

Now, the bill makes reference to where an inquest is commenced by a provincial judge who dies, or resigns his office, before the completion of the enquiry, or who, for any other reason, is unable to complete the inquest, the Minister may direct another provincial judge to complete the inquest or to conduct a new inquest.

Now, this is a desirable addition, but the question that should be asked here, Mr. Speaker, as to why a provincial judge who has the report of the medical examiner may not now, provided that he has the consent of the Minister, refer the report for action to another provincial judge. It seems appropriate that there should be some machinery for so doing, where there may be some sound reason for the provincial judge not to preside on that particular examination.

The bill refers to, that the medical examiner is authorized to take charge of money or other personal property belonging to, or found at, or near the body of the deceased person, and is required to deliver this, with the exception of any exhibits that he considers should be retained, to a representative of the police in the area who, in turn, deliver to the persons properly entitled.

Now, this does not deal with the matter of exhibits which may be personal property of the deceased, or of some other such person, which are authorized to be disposed by the provincial judge or by the administrators as the case may be, and in a manner in which they deem to be most appropriate. It would seem desirable, Mr. Speaker, that where the exhibits, having served the purpose, can be identified as the property of the deceased, or of another person, that they should clearly be required to be returned to the person or to the members of the family, whichever the case. Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, this Act is a big improvement.

QUESTION put. MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 15. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. (Stand)

Bill No. 16. The Honourable Member for Riel. Absent.

Bill No. 17. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, the Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable, the Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is necessary for me at this time to make a comment or two dealing with the negotiations that have been going on between a certain number of doctors in the employ of the Government of Manitoba, the negotiators for the Government and the Manitoba Medical Association. I think it would only be fair and proper for me to say at the offset, Mr. Speaker, that after having many long years of association in this Assembly that I feel that there has been a change in trend of negotiations and associations between government employees and the Government of Manitoba.

I'm sure we're all aware that sometime ago, as a matter of fact a couple of years ago, when there was a new agreement entered into between the Manitoba Government Employees Association and the Government of Manitoba, that agreement could not be reached between the parties concerned and in accordance with the Civil Service Act, the matters under dispute were referred to an arbitration board having three representatives, one being a representative of the employees, the other a representative of the government. And if those two individuals were not able to arrive at a third party then the Chief Justice of the Province of Manitoba was asked to choose a chairman. The net result was that a chairman was chosen by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba. Unfortunately, the first person chosen passed away and subsequently another individual was chosen.

After some six months of negotiations and deliberations, during which time representations were made by the employees and their representative and their solicitors and the Government and its representative and lawyers, a unanimous agreement was reached whereby there were certain suggestions made which were binding on both the Government and the employees.

When I as Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission received that report on December 21st of 1971, I looked at the result and I found that it was a unanimous decision, joined by the two parties concerned and the Chairman. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that when I took a look at the arbitration award I was somewhat amazed. I looked at the first page or two and I saw that there was a majority opinion. And then, as is normal, I went to the back page of the award to see what the dissenting award would be, and much to my amazement, Mr. Premier, there was none. It was a unanimous agreement between management and labour and the board itself. Subsequent to that there were many evidences of consternation by the employees of the Manitoba Government Employees Association that their Arbitration Board had let them down, that they had not received what they had hoped that they would have received by going through the course of compulsory arbitration as prescribed in the Civil Service Act of the Province of Manitoba.

And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I, too, was somewhat amazed at the Arbitration Board award. Subsequently to that, in conversation with the then representatives of the Manitoba Government Employees Association I gave them an undertaking that because of the fact that in my opinion I didn't think the award was quite fair, that I as Chairman of Joint Council of Cabinet and Labour-Management Relations, that I would take the matter to Joint Council for consideration and if the employees of the Province of Manitoba wanted consideration to be given to an expansion of the awards given, that I would be prepared, as what I thought at that particular time that I was, a fairminded individual, that I would ask my colleagues in Council in Cabinet as to whether or not Cabinet might consider some gratuitous bonus or a cost-of-living bonus in order to overcome what at that particular time appeared to be deficiencies in the unanimous award - and I must repeat, Mr. Speaker, it was a unanimous award because the employee representatives joined. But in an endeavour to be fair this was done. I want to say I appreciate very much when I raised the matter with Cabinet the Premier and my colleagues joined with me and representations of the employees of our province in agreeing upon a gratuitous extension of a mere \$25 a month, which at that time was pretty reasonable, but it was done. And at that particular time, because of that I felt, as did many others, that we had come to an amicable arrangement notwithstanding certain deficiencies felt in the unanimous award.

I thought that that was going to be the basis of a sort of a spirit of repertoire between the employees of the Government of Manitoba, myself as Minister charged with the responsibility of the Civil Service and the Government itself. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, at that particular time there arose antagonisms between certain trade union movements in the Province

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) of Manitoba who had long wanted to get their clutches, and I say that advisedly, to get their clutches into the membership of a legislative body of workers called the Manitoba Government Employees Association because the previous administration of Manitoba, the Government of Premier Roblin, had saw fit in its wisdoms or otherwise to legislate a trade union group to represent the employees of the Province of Manitoba. Not as we have it today, Mr. Speaker, where we have the rights of free self-determination of workers in Manitoba, but the previous administration decreed by legislative authority that a certain organization would be designated as the bargaining unit for the employees of Manitoba. And so that part of the story went on.

We were successful to be able to continue that for a period of time, but in the meantime an organization of labour - and I know, Mr. Speaker, when I say this I'm going to be damned and condemned by certain sectors of the trade union movement and I'm prepared to accept it - representatives of some of the unions that were on the Labour Board of Manitoba decided, in their wisdom or otherwise, that upon application of a group of employees of the Manitoba Government service who were not included in the collective agreement and under the Civil Service Act, decided that it was time to open it up.

Under the collective agreement a year or so ago, Mr. Speaker, there was a voluntary decision made that certain provincial engineers, architects, dentists and doctors would be excluded from the terms and conditions of the collective agreement between the Government of Manitoba and the employees, and I was the signer for the Government of Manitoba. But there was the exclusion of certain professional categories including Crown lawyers and otherwise.

An application was made, an application was made on behalf of the doctors of our mental institutions to the Manitoba Labour Board for exclusions of, they being contained under the Civil Service Act or rather, Mr. Speaker, under the collective agreement. So that group, that group made application to the Manitoba Labour Relation Boards for due recognition as the bargaining agent for the psychiatric doctors in our mental hospitals. A majority decision, with some absenteeism in the Labour Relations Board, decreed that the collective agreement entered into did not include the doctors in the employ of the Selkirk Mental Hospital, the Brandon Mental Hospital and the Portage Mental Hospital, and they were declared by the Manitoba Labour Board as the proper agent to be the bargaining unit for these doctors.

The Manitoba Government Employees Association, Mr. Chairman, took the Manitoba Labour Board to court because of that decision, because the Government Employees Association felt that they were the only ones competent to represent employees of the Government of Manitoba under the Civil Service Act of Manitoba. The courts rejected the Court of Appeal as I understand it, the contention of the Manitoba Government Employees Association that they were the sole bargainers.

So therefore, the Manitoba Medical Association became the prescribed bargaining unit for the doctors at Selkirk Hospital. And to me it's really a travesty, Mr. Speaker, when I find in Saturday's paper, that I believe it was, that the very organization, the Manitoba Government Employees Association who fought bitterly for the rights of the Manitoba Medical Association to be the bargaining unit for the doctors at the Selkirk Hospital, that the President of that outfit, a man by the name of Bill Ridgeway, received a standing ovation, if press releases are correct, at a meeting of 700 or 800 doctors because he was there to say to the doctors, "God bless you all. You have the right of representation." The President of the very Association that saw fit to take to the courts of Manitoba an appeal against the rights of the Manitoba Medical Association to represent the doctors at our mental hospitals. Mr. Speaker, there's a hell of a lot more to this story.

A MEMBER: Well tell it all.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll tell it all if I have the time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll tell it all if I have the time. It seems to me a travesty, Mr. Speaker, that because there is a turmoil today in labour ranks, between labour organizations and groups of individuals, that here we have this outfit called the Manitoba Medical Association standing up on Saturday and giving a standing ovation to the outfit who were their bitter foe not too damn long ago, because they fear that because of that that they would lose their prestige. I don't give a damn any longer, Mr. Speaker, I think you'll understand why I

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) can say that in a few moments providing I have the time. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that now today the heroes of the Manitoba Government Employee Association is not the Manitoba Government Employee Association, but the very doctors that they fought for. And I say this, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think that I'm the healthiest individual in this Assembly, I did spend an hour or two this morning down at a medical clinic. Lord only knows what the results will be, but that doesn't matter does it. But the fact of the matter is, I say to you my colleagues in this Assembly, I don't give a damn whether doctors like it or whether they don't, they're only using the very fact of the designation of the MMA being the designated bargaining unit for a few doctors, 70 by number, something like that, working in the employ of the Government of Manitoba.

I say to the President of the Manitoba Medical Association, the incoming President of the Manitoba Medical Association, they are trying to use an industrial dispute to enhance their own reputation. They have forgotten entirely the idealism of doctors of days gone by, the doctor that brought my children into this world, they're more mercenary than the Merchant of Venice was to extract that pound of flesh from the heart in the Merchant of Venice. They have forgotten that somewhere along the line someone should have and has to have some principle. I recognize, I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that in the medical profession, the nursing profession, and in the professions generally men and women of good honour, of high prestige, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues in this Assembly, the world has gone crazy. No longer can we use that word "idealism" it's out the ruddy window. I say it holds true of the industrialists, it holds true of the worker and yes, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it also hold true of the politician. We're living in a senseless, cold, cruel world, one that doesn't seem to give a damn or a continental about anybody except themselves.

I'm no longer a youngster, hell's bells. A couple of months ago, thanks to the fight of Woodsworth and few more, at the age of 65 I became eligible for a pension. And I guess it's a gamble, Mr. Speaker, how long you get that pension - three-score and ten, seven-score, it really doesn't matter. But isn't it fact, Mr. Speaker, that today we no longer have a sense of responsibility. I stand before you today at the present moment as the Minister of Labour, charged with the responsibility of endeavouring to bring about collective agreements, between management and labour, between man and woman, to try and lay some basis and some semblance of peace and order in the industrial field. Is any covenant worth the blasted paper it is written on today? Management and labour together they sign a collective agreement for one, two or three years; if they don't like it, they just simply walk off the job, they don't work, or management shuts the door. Things are screwy, they're crazy!

I regret very much sometimes when I reflect that I have lived to see the day of irresponsibility. As a youngster, Mr. Speaker, I came up, and I recall 1914. I can recall 1918, I can recall 1939, I can recall 1945, I can recall what has just recently apparently terminated in Vietnam. What a hell of a world we have been living in.

But may I just for a moment if I have time, Mr. Speaker, come back to home. I for a long time as an ILPer, as a CCFer, as a New Democratic, believe sincerely in the well-being of humanity, reasonableness and justice for all. Mr. Speaker, there is not member of this House I admire more than my Premier, a man that I sat across the Assembly a few wee years ago. We joined in a fight to be the government of this day. We won. When I became the Minister of Labour under his jurisdiction, my friend Eddie Schreyer said to me, "Russ, will you undertake the task of joining the Cabinet and being one of my colleagues?" I said to him at that time, I would be no greater pleased than to try and join with you in brining about as much as we could here for Manitoba, a new society, casting aside and casting behind us many of the deficiencies of years gone by. He charged me with the responsibility of my office to do what I could to bring about industrial peace here in the Province of Manitoba. A little less than a year ago, Mr. Speaker, my Premier said to me, "Buzz", as he loves to call me, "I charge you with the responsibility to do your utmost to bring about an industrial climate in Manitoba for the well-being, not only of the worker but the entrepreneur, the manager as well." I have tried - failed, yes, Mr. Speaker, I have failed in many ways. I have failed my Premier, I have failed this Assembly, fault me for my failures. But when we got into the crutch a few weeks ago with the nurses of the Province of Manitoba - and I proudly wore one of their badges which said: "1975 is the year for the nurses" - I realized that they were not being fair - "Well done by our Nell", to use that phrase. I realized that here in the Province of Manitoba there

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) were great deficiencies in the salaries and wages of our nurses by comparison with what they were receiving in other jurisdictions. I . . . them not. I didn't like in the final analysis, the methodology of reaching the salary that was arrived at, but we carried on.

The Premier asked me to join with my colleagues the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Tourism, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, to join and try and negotiate with the employees of the Province of Manitoba on a fair basis, taking into consideration the deficiencies that some of our employees have had to live with over a period of time, and we are in that process, or we were in that process and have met on numerous occasions. I say, Mr. Speaker, we have a team of negotiators in the Civil Service who are rendering many hours to try and bring about a satisfactory situation, to raise the little girl, the little clerk typist - who incidentally to my chagrin and to the chagrin as it should be to all of us in this Assembly, above a fair minimum wage, when we consider that aspect, to raise them from above \$41 - 42 hundred a year in their performance for the benefit of the taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba - and when I hear, Mr. Speaker, suggestions being made that doctors who have been damn well trained at taxpayers' expense in the Province of Manitoba and elsewhere, that will be given an annual increase twice as much as these little boys and girls who perform services for the taxpayer of Manitoba, it leaves me with no alternative, Mr. Speaker, but to indicate to my Premier, whom I dearly love, find somebody else to take my place!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, unprepared as I am to use up my only occasion that all of us individual members have to respond in whatever way we wish to on any given subject as a matter of personal grievance, I feel that we have listened to with a great deal of attention - I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it would be fair to say, with a considerable amount of sadness on the part of many of us, perhaps on all sides of the House, certainly those who have gone up and down with the voluble Minister of Labour, former Leader of the New Democratic Party, on many occasions as he scaled heights and met some of his valleys in his political life - that some response should not immediately be forthcoming from members of the Opposition.

It makes it difficult to respond to this kind of a presentation, which I think we all recognize is at first of a very personal nature; and then also recognizing that perhaps the trigger that brought about this kind of reaction from the Honourable Minister at this time shows the kind of difficulties, the kind of risks, the kind of fighting that must take place inside the Cabinet rooms of our present government. It indicates, it must indicate in a frightful way to, at least in this particular instance, those people who have to depend on successful conclusions of negotiations with this government just who they are negotiating with, and how tenuous whatever arrangements they may come to are in fact when they are negotiating with this government. If agreement can only be reached at the expense and at the price of one Minister resigning, then who's to say that the next agreement that is reached won't be abrogated for the reasons of strength or influence of a particular Minister in that collection of gentlemen opposite that calls itself a Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult not to be personally moved by the comments made by the Honourable Minister of Labour for whom I have a great deal of respect. I don't know whether it was a question of mental telepathy that it just so happened as he was making his lament, Mr. Speaker, and which I find very troubling indeed, coming from a Minister of Labour, a man who has served a great part of his life in the public service, a man who has been very proud to serve in the public service, a man who should now at this particular time be enjoying the fruits of so many of those years of public service, should be able to stand up in this Chamber, should feel compelled to stand up in this Chamber and take such a fatalistic attitude, express such a hopelessness to all of us, to all of us, at just where we're at. Not just in Manitoba, but in the world generally.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I'll read him a very short passage, which perhaps describes his and all our problems. It's taken from the noted Protestant theologian, Dean Fitch, from his book "Odyssey of the Self-Centred Self". And it says the following: "That civilization has moved through several stages and that we have recently entered upon the most acutely degenerate of them: The Age of Love of Self. For a period we loved God; then we loved rationalism; then we loved humanity; then science; now we love ourselves, and in that concupiscent love all else has ceased to exist. We are become what the philosophers called solipsists - men who recognize reality only in themselves. And when this happens, our private

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) little worlds, sustained only by our self-love are easily shattered, and as they shatter we advance the destruction of our entire civilization, and race towards the doom ever so much faster than thermonuclear bombs will ever take us there. The Greek dramatists knew that at the center of the weakness of the world is the weakness of the individual. How much have we forgotten in the 2,500 years from the time of Aeschylus to Arthur Miller. The great heresies of recent times revolved around the repudiation of a plain truth. Marx instructed us that the fault lies not in ourselves but in history, that we are underlings buffeted about by great elemental social forces which we do not dominate. Freud taught us that we should blame ourselves for our failings, that other factors over most of which we had no control traumatized and weakened us, and made us impotent as superintendents of our own fate. The development of the philosophy of total welfarism is the political translations of the abandonment of the central idea of Christian civilization; that we are each one of us, however, crippled by burdens, material and psychological, capable by the grace of God of working out a satisfactory life." I read that for the record because it struck me that that to some extent seemed to be the lament of the Honourable the Minister of Labour when he expressed such utmost doom and such a feeling of failure at a time when certainly we as his political colleagues would find it difficult to accept that he had reason to express those kinds of failings.

A man that has spent the time that he has spent in the public service, occupying various aspects of it, responsibility of party leadership, the grace of having to give us that leadership, then nonetheless the success of seeing his party successful at the polls and now serving in its sixth year as the administration, surely the goal that everyone who enters or aspires to public service hopes someday to rise to; that he should speak to us with such a heavy heart this afternoon gives rise for serious concern for all of us.

It would seem to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that certainly the solutions that honourable gentlemen opposite have, the immediate solutions of the problems of the day, the solutions that the honourable members opposite and the philosophy of the party and the group that he has spent a lifetime in labour, in a labour of love with, has brought him to a point that we witnessed this afternoon in this Chamber. Surely then, Mr. Speaker, the utopia that we are sometimes led to believe is available to us if we but give up our fights or our beliefs or our ideals and hopes for the kind of futures that we envisage and follow theirs, we've seen no leadership of that idea this afternoon in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware, and I don't know whether the resignation offered by the Honourable Minister of Labour will be accepted by the First Minister. I'm not unaware that there has been an obvious and a very deep tension existing the past little while with the Minister of Labour and his colleagues. I normally don't attempt to eavesdrop over what I hear from members opposite, particularly those occupying the front benches, but this afternoon it was not possible not to overhear the kind of vehement exchanges that took place between the First Minister and the Minister of Labour and when he walked out of this Chamber during the question period or prior to his re-entry there was certainly no doubt left in anybody's mind on this side of the House that a resignation was eminent; and we heard him say that to the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker, if they can patch up their differences it won't be the first time that a Minister has had differences with his colleagues, threatened, resigned, or indeed even did resign. But in all of us there's some well of decency despite how we attack each other in this House. There seems to be some unfairness in all of this, Mr. Speaker, that this man who gave more time, the dean, the veteran in this Chamber is so thrown to the wolves or thrown to the dogs by his colleagues who find it impossible, not only not to support him, but if indeed in not supporting him cannot do it in such a manner, in such a civilized manner that he can find it acceptable, as I'm sure that we all have to find acceptable compromises between our various positions from time to time within our own groups, within our own groups.

MR. DOERN: Crocodile tears.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, crocodile tears. The members of the opposition, the press enjoyed a great deal of speculation, Mr. Speaker, as to how we would handle ourselves in this Chamber, how the Official Opposition would be able to handle themselves as opposition because of some expressed differences within the ranks of our leadership.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared, we're showing the members opposite that whatever differences we have do not prevent us from carrying out our responsibilities in the manner and way in which we see them and the manner in which the House expects the people of Manitoba expect us to do them. The fact that we see the kind of disintegration before us, you know, the kind of disintegration before us at a time that is critical, and a time that is crucial in the affairs of Manitoba, at a time that we face probably the greatest summer of unrest in labour - that's not me saying it, that's the Minister of Labour saying that - at the time that we are currently in obviously sensitive negotiations with numerous, numerous different groups, the doctors, various other groups, the civil servants - I understand their contract's coming up - we find ourselves losing, losing a Minister of Labour with whom I've disagreed with often but certainly who has even today indicated that he has a grasp, an understanding and a respect for the kind of fundamental approach to these problems that I think all of us in this Chamber can share with him. He believes in collective bargaining and he believes that the arbitrators should be bargaining - their units should be bargaining in good faith with each other, not in this Chamber, not through newspaper ads, not through the media.

Mr. Speaker, what the Honourable Minister of Labour did indicate to me in his frustrations was that he yearned for the days gone by - and that's something coming from a New Democrat Minister of Labour - he yearned when the world was simpler. Well I suppose we all do that from time to time but, Mr. Speaker, the world doesn't get simpler, it gets more complex, we don't resolve it by quitting and by resigning. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, if I have any influence on the members opposite and on the particular Minister involved, I do urge him most sincerely to reconsider the position that he has taken this afternoon in the House. I say so on behalf of the delicate negotiations that this Government is engaged in. I see, you know, not too many diplomats opposite that can really indicate to me that have a better feeling or a better repertoire for labour than the Honourable Minister of Labour has. And I find it, as I indicated as I stood up, a kind of sad reflection on the state of affairs in the Province of Manitoba, a sad reflection on the state of affairs within the Government of Manitoba when a Minister of Labour in a highly emotional speech has to tender his resignation to his First Minister in the manner and the way in which it was done this afternoon. Thank you.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take the opportunity to participate in - well it's not a participation I would be using my opportunity to speak under a grievance - I was personally very deeply involved and moved in listening to my former Leader speak, a person for whom I have a very high regard, a person with whom I was proud to follow and with whom I was proud to share responsibility, a person who has taught me a good deal and taught many of us a good deal. And a person who was and still is a very important active member of Government and of this Legislature.

And although it was interesting to hear the Member for Lakeside at the end of his contribution appeal to the Minister of Labour to remain as Minister of Labour and to continue to conduct the negotiations which he said he did on behalf of his party, at least that's the way I understood him to say it, I support him in that. But all that went before it was almost in contradiction of that effort, because he talked about disintegration, he talked about the state of affairs in Manitoba that brings it about. And, Mr. Speaker, to me we had another of many very honest presentations made by the Minister of Labour, many that he made in the many years which he has served the people of Manitoba in this Chamber and in other elective offices.

So having had the benefit again of hearing an honest expression of opinion, one which as he himself said is bound not to endear him to many people, he still stated his feelings, his emotions and his frustration. That word was used. And his frustration as I recall it was most clearly depicted by him when he compared the negotiations that he was participating in with the MGEA where he was talking about the salaries that he was involved in negotiating at the lowest level in government, and the salaries at the lowest level in government are not that high, and comparing them with the demands of another segment of the civil service which is in the highest category, a segment which I believe today has its maximum pay higher than that of a Deputy Minister of this Government. And he had that concern of having to deal with a large number of people, on behalf of all of us and the people in Manitoba, and being faced with a group which were making these demands, and he expressed his frustration very clearly when

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) he pointed out that the President of the MGEA with whom they were bargaining at a much lower level, coming to the support of this highly paid group. That would be frustrating to anybody.

For the Member for Lakeside to attempt to point this out as being disintegration of government is completely wrong. The fact is that that's what real government is, where there are expressions of agreement and where there are occasions of disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of hearing members opposite interpret for me and for the public my reasons for resignation. Not once have any of them been prepared to accept my own statement. And for the Member for Lakeside or anybody else to start attributing to the Minister of Labour reasons, motives other than those he expressed, are of course extremely unkind to him, but who in this Chamber has learned to expect only kindness from the colleagues around the room. Not only unkind to him but dishonest, intellectually dishonest, to reject everything he said and convert it and twist it into something else.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of government for some five years, we have been involved on a number of occasions in negotiations, there have been occasions when we have had to face threat of strikes and where we had to face the fact of strike as employers either through a Crown corporation or directly. And I believe and I'm proud to say that in spite of the roots that many of us have in the labour movement, in spite of the support we have given to the principle of organized labour and fair bargaining, we have still said that we will not be capricious in bowing to all demands, because we said we had to bargain fairly and effectively. I'm proud that we did, and I am proud of the fact that the labour movement, I believe as a whole, has accepted the role of this Government as an employer and as being on the other side and has respected us for the positions we've taken. Not that they've always had to agree with us, but the fact is that I think we've dealt with it responsively in spite of the suggestions that have been made in many areas of this province, including in this Chamber, that we would just knuckle down and bow to the demands that were made because we are the servants or the slaves of labour, as has been suggested time and again by members opposite, who refer to the fact that certain labour unions actually support the New Democratic Party financially. In spite of that we've had tough decisions and we've taken tough attitudes and I think it's to our credit and that of the Minister of Labour, the most senior of us all, the man who has his roots deeply, deeply in the labour movement, to have been part of that group that said we will not bow. Mr. Speaker, when I say he said with us, "We will not bow", let me remind honourable members present that there are very few outside of the Government party who have said "Do not bow". Peculiarly enough in labour relations matters it is usually the press, the media, the conservative approach politically that says "Don't let labour have it's way!". But look at all the strikes we've been through. Flyer Industries, we went through a telephone strike as I recall it, we are now in the midst of a strike out at the University, we are in the midst of a strike of doctors, and what are we hearing from the opposite side, and to a large extent from the media. "They've got to get busy and settle. What is this? What's the Government doing? Why are they not settling?"

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that people that I think should respect the Government's position of saying there are methods whereby you negotiate, there comes a time where both sides are free to express their will and where we have given, through the Minister of Labour's legislation, all sorts of power to organized labour to withhold services and given them protection. Where our Government has done so we are being criticized, and when we attempt to report on the problems we have faced we become further criticized. And when we attempt to discuss our position we are even more criticized. And when the Minister of Labour, whom I believe we all respect and I think we all recognize his tremendous contribution over the many years, when he stands up and says publicly, "Mr. First Minister, I'm frustrated" I think we have to recognize that there's reason for it. We're all of us frustrated. I've spoken to members opposite who feel frustrated almost daily. I remember when in opposition and I was able to get two resolutions carried by the House in a year it was a great accomplishment. But the Minister of Labour, along with other members of Cabinet, have a day in day out struggle to find the time and the information required to deal with problems that are presented on a myriad of subjects and yet to deal with all as if in a glass house exposed, making decisions available for review, criticism, approval all the time, I see no support for the people who are charged with the responsibility of dealing with a situation which is delicate, and as the Member

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) for Lakeside expressed, the sensitivity involved in a situation that takes place before and during a strike situation.

I haven't the slightest doubt in my own mind that the employees of the Province of Manitoba who are today on strike in the psychiatric services, the doctors - I have no doubt they'll come back, unless they want to leave the service altogether. But I do believe, and now I have a right to express myself as did the Minister of Labour, I do believe they are being used by their representative body, by the Manitoba Medical Association, in expectation of other greater, much more serious problems. And that was shown only last week when the secretary, who is not a doctor I believe, the secretary of the MMA, is already talking about, "Well, there's nothing in the agreement between the doctors now and the MHSA as to strike. They have a right to strike." Let me make it clear, of all people, the medical profession can never strike against the government, because the medical profession is not employed by the government, nor is it tied by the government to the fees which they are receiving.

The fact that 97 or 98 or 99 percent of the doctors have chosen to opt in to the Medicare scheme is their choice, and I remember when we were in the opposition, we debated at length shall they have the right to opt in, shall they have the right to opt out, where does the right lie, and it was clearly established that they had a right to opt in without force, they had a right to opt out without pressure, and it was only a matter of a certain amount of time. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as I recall it, the Manitoba Health Services Commission has a right to opt out certain doctors. I'm under that impression, and I'm wondering whether the time hasn't come whether that shouldn't be considered. Free the doctors from what they think are their form of bondage. Tell the doctors they have that right, if we have to. They know it. But let's tell the public of Manitoba. Doctors who are practicing medicine in the Province of Manitoba, who are some 98 to 99 percent opted in, have every right individually and collectively to opt out, and if they are not satisfied with the fee schedule, which is really all that there is to talk about in a financial way with the profession, all they have to do is opt out and charge whatever they like and their patients will receive from the Health Services Commission that amount which is set aside as a recognized fee for the service provided, and then the patient pays the difference. That's the privilege of the patient in this system, where the patient has the right to take the doctor of his choice. Let's not for a moment forget that there are so many people in this province who never had the option to choose, where there were small communities throughout the province where there was one doctor, if any, and where there was only that doctor that they could choose, if at all, or where they had no doctor where they could only go beyond their own community. And it still applies in many cases.

So let us make sure that people know that doctors cannot strike against the government or against Health Services Commission. Doctors can strike against their patients, and they strike against their patients merely by taking vacations, merely by not being in the office, that's how they withhold services. That's the way they strike, and it's their patients who suffer. It is their patients against whom the doctors are making that decision, because the doctors have every right in the world to opt out of the Medicare scheme and practice direct with the patient, having that heartfelt need to have a doctor-patient relationship carried into the purse of the doctor, the pocketbook of the patient, and have the financial transaction take place in that manner. So let's make that clear: Doctors cannot strike except against their own patients. However, there are doctors on strike who do have the right and they are the persons who are full-time employees of this province.

Mr. Speaker, it's a week and maybe it's a week and a half ago that I was in Ottawa with the Premier where we were dealing with the problem of targets, we were dealing with the problem of inflation and the rising demand for people for return. And there was general agreement that there has to be some measure of restraint in all fields. And there was considerable agreement that there had to be a measure of restraint amongst the highest income people. And that the people in the low income had every right to have an adjustment to take care of what they lost for inflation and an expectation of improvement of their loss. Nowhere did I hear any Premier or any Minister of any political colour come to that meeting in Ottawa, just so short a time ago and say, "We must do proportional increases right across the board to all." Nowhere did I hear the thought that there are people, that everyone in society should just be able to demand as much as they like. But nowhere did I hear from that side, nor from the press, any support to the government in standing fast, in attempting to see to it that there is a restraint

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) placed on the rising demand and the rising expectations in the higher income groups. I think it's time we heard that kind of expression. Instead of questions, "What are you doing," there ought to be some suggestions of a positive nature. Now if they say there haven't been enough negotiations going on, there again, let there be more. But if they say, as one of the members opposite said to the Minister of Education, "Were you down there this morning listening in on what was going on in a public demonstration of some eight unions?" Surely, the proper way between employer - employee relationship is to have a direct discussion at the right time in the right place under the right circumstances, than for the Minister to send a lackey - or let's not say a lackey, say a walking tape recorder - to listen in to what is going on at a public meeting in order to report back to the Minister to tell him what's going on at that meeting. --(Interjection)--

Well, that's a suggestion. At least it's a suggestion that is a positive one. A suggestion was made that the Minister of Education should have done so. But let's hear something more about the sense that members opposite feel about restraint. Now, the Member for Roblin did speak some days ago about how much should a carpenter get, how much should a carpenter get, how much should a - he said how much should a doctor get - let's have that kind of discussion. That would be helpful. But to drive that apparent line the Member for Lakeside took, where he talked about his party's principles and the disintegration, let me tell him our principles are the same as they've always been, and our coping with them is the way we've done with some considerable success up to now. And if any one of us falters at any time, there should be an understanding that we, too, are human, and can't be perfect at all times. They don't expect us to be perfect. But that doesn't mean that we don't set levels, standards for ourselves, where we ourselves will sometimes feel that we have not measured up to our own expectations. That person who feels he has measured up to his own expectations is a person who loses the ability to serve anyone, especially himself.

When the Minister of Labour, the man who I trust will be Minister of Labour tomorrow and the next day, when he gets up and expresses, in an emotional way, a sense of frustration, then it would have been much more helpful had the Member for Lakeside started at the conclusion of what he had to say and speak more about the fact that he understood this kind of feeling that was expressed by the Minister of Labour. I believe he sympathized with it, that he understood it and that he wanted to give him the encouragement to continue, which I hope I am doing in some way through my participation now in the debate, expecting or hoping that the Minister of Labour will have an opportunity to read what I am saying.

What I am saying is something I learned long ago, long before I was even in the House, but certainly when I was in opposition. Being a Minister of the Crown is not an easy role. Being responsible at all times to have my decisions, activities, in public scrutiny, is not an enviable position and yet so many of us agree to play that role because we do honestly - and I say this for all members in this House - I believe we do honestly, all of us, believe that we are providing a service. And any time there is an effort made in this House or outside of the House, to attribute personal motives that are not of that high grade I think it's downgrading of all of us, and I will not for a moment think that the Minister of Labour has given all these years of service in order to be told what he stood for was meaningless and that he resigned - or I don't think he resigned, I think he said he didn't want to be a participant in that three-member committee of negotiators - when he did that, that is was something that we could understand, sympathize with and yet encourage him to continue to attempt to serve his people, and serve us, because as a Minister of the Crown he is as the Member for Lakeside said, the person that is largely representing us in this terribly difficult field this year, of labour relations.

I think it was he who said very early in the session, I think he said it to the press, that this year we are going to face the hardest, toughest situations ever yet, and we have evidence before us. Let us at least, when we deal with things like this, become a little less partisan and a little more anxious to see that we are able to settle matters in such a way that do not continue this spiral of inflation effort to result, where we won't be able to hold back; let us at the same time see to it that people are being adequately compensated, taking into consideration the cost of living and taking into consideration that we don't want to have unemployment on a large scale in order to attack the dangers of inflation.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

So that I believe that the Member for Lakeside, he was all ready with his quotation as he felt this was a good time to make them - and fair game - it's fair game for him to do so. But I would like to think that the reason he stood, and the reason he spoke, and the message he wanted left, was at the very end of his contribution, where he did express a recognition of the feelings of the Minister of Labour and an invitation, indeed an appeal, to stay in his position and continue to serve. I join with that sentiment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: On a point of privilege, not a very serious one, but nonetheless, I think the impression in the closing remarks that the Honourable Member for St. Johns gave, that somehow or other I was privy to the speech that the Minister of Labour just gave in the House, or else of course, I wouldn't have had ready my little book, or something like that. I mean, I read occasionally, you know, I indicated to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, and it so happens that the chapter and verse that I was reading, I thought were fitting.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I fully agree with the member. I didn't for a moment suggest that he had the book ready to deal with the Minister of Labour. I say he had the book ready to deal with any situation that would occur where it might be of some use to him, and I think he'll agree that that was the case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Motion to go into supply is agreed to? (Agreed) But since we have arrived at 4:30, the House is now in Committee of Supply and it will do so at 8 o'clock. We are at Private Members' Hour. The first item of Private Members' Hour is Bill 24. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

. continued next page

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON (Wellington) presented Bill No. 24, The University of Manitoba Students' Union Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, it's not a particularly complicated Bill and I think if I were to read the objects of the corporation that is proposed by the University of Manitoba Students' Union, that it would set out pretty much what the Bill means or seeks. The objects are:

- (a) To promote the welfare and interests of students of the university in all matters respecting their common interests.
- (b) To act as the official representative of the members of the corporation.
- (c) To promote and maintain responsible students' government at the university.
- (d) To promote and encourage student participation in cultural, athletic, intellectual and social activities.
- (e) To promote and maintain communications between the student body and the various authorities of the university and to assist in the maintaining of good conduct of the students at the university.

The Bill has been printed and distributed and the members may, of course, as they will go through the bill and find there an enlargement of the powers and the objectives of the bill,

QUESTION put. MOTION CARRIED.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Adjourned Debates on Second Reading. Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Can I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stand. Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, Bill No. 21, an Act to Amend the Horse Racing Commission Act. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

BILL NO. 21 - THE HORSE RACING COMMISSION ACT

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to speak on this bill I really don't want to hurt anybody's feelings, and in particular the people in connection with the horse racing, because I grew up on a farm myself and that was in the days of the hard times. I had a beautiful little thoroughbred mare with a white mane and tail, and I used to take part in local racing and fairs, and it was a real privilege, and was a great part of my life. I guess I developed a liking for horses and horse racing very early, and going to a Carman fair, which was our local fair at that time, was a wonderful experience and the biggest thrill we had in the whole year, because we used to go down there and these race horses would be going by in front of the grandstand with a harness on them and with a fancy decoration, with the fellows in the sulkies. It was a real experience, and it was a big day in the year. Later on in my life we built a racetrack in Manitou and I was involved and in charge of getting the racetrack built. However, I must tell you that that was an adventure that didn't turn out too successful because in the first two years we got rained out and we couldn't carry on. But I always did care for racing.

Now, this bill as I understand it, is a bill setting up a commission which would be appointed by the government to regulate the number of horse racing days and to handle other matters in relation to operations at the track. I believe myself, that it's a bill that's good. I know these people are appointed by Cabinet, but I hope that Cabinet in doing this, will be in close touch with the people in the thoroughbreds, in the standardbreds and other concerned business people, so as it will be run in a way that the horse racing people will benefit from it and the public in general. Because I believe that horse racing is becoming more and more popular every year, and that it is a good sport and it should be helped along as much as possible.

Now, the Member from Assiniboia made remarks in which he thought that possibly different types of horses should be thought of at this time, possibly what were done to some of the horses, he was mentioning drugs and that, but I believe if this is a consideration, that this very board that we're talking about appointing should be the people that should be able to handle this more capably. Certainly I think that they would be the ones that would be looking after it, and I know that really the people in the horse racing business, the conscientious ones are very concerned about all of these things.

The Member for St. Johns took some time to deal with his own personal feelings in

BILL 21

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) regard to betting at the track, and drinking - which I presume usually goes on at most places where they have horse racing. Many of us are concerned about this, and have been concerned over the years, but really this is something which was really a question of a few years ago. Now it is an accepted fact that we really do have drinking and betting, whether people like it or not. But it has turned out reasonably well, because the people that want to drink can and the people who want to bet can, and nobody is forced to. Personally, myself, I used to get a lot more thrill out of the hat pools we used to have, because when there wasn't the betting we used to have better grandstand shows in front of the stage than we have now. Now because of the fact that everybody's changing their mind and watching the horses and wants to put on a different bet, they're running up and down and we don't get quite that same performance on the grandstand. But nevertheless, we have betting nowadays, and we have drinking, and it's accepted, and there's no way that one of us speaking against it is going to change it.

I believe that if this bill has faults in it, that when it goes to committee we'll have people there to make representation either for or against it. I think that the people who look after the horses, the people who train the horses, and the people that race the horses, are really the people that'll be capable of adding to this bill and seeing that it's proper. When we hear from these people who have firsthand information about the races and how they're run and the training, we'll be getting the proper advice. In other words, as we talk about different things, if we're talking to somebody who is really knowledgeable on it, we should use the term "we'll be getting it right from the horse's mouth."

So in this case I'd say I'm very much in favour of letting it go to committee and hearing from the men who really know.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 22. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, an Act to amend the Horse Racing Regulation Act. The Honourable Member for Virden. (Stand)

Bill No. 4. (Stand)

This brings us to Private Members' Resolutions. Resolution No. 18. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

RESOLUTION NO. 18

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member from Assiniboia, that

WHEREAS there is need to control the urban sprawl on the fringe of Winnipeg through co-operation of the private and public sectors;

AND WHEREAS there must be new approaches to supplying lower cost family housing;

AND WHEREAS there must be practical demonstrations of new methods of residential design, urban transportation technology, housing construction, community planning and industrial location;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of initiating the development of an experimental new town within a 50 mile radius of Winnipeg to:

- (1) offer an alternative area of settlement to deflect growth from the City of Winnipeg,
- (2) make available lower cost housing for families and individuals through efficient use of land,
- (3) involve the building industry and architectural professions in the creation of innovative solutions to human settlement through new forms of design and planning,
- (4) illustrate means of joint private-public undertakings for the betterment of the urban environment.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, it's somewhat anticlimatic to present a resolution of this kind after today's events, but I suppose there is certainly perhaps an object lesson in some

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) of the words that have been so far expressed concerning the problems that we have been encountering in this province in the area of labour industrial relations; that if it proves nothing else, it shows that there is a serious demand for imaginative creative solutions to some of the more complex difficulties that a modern community faces, and that if there isn't along the way the intelligent application of thought and reason and a fair degree of foresight to try to solve problems, anticipating problems, then one quickly finds oneself in a situation of major difficulty and dilemma, which then provide a slow rot or erosion inside the capacity of government to manage or to cope with new conditions. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, considering that on behalf of our group, regretfully not having had the chance to respond to some of the events of this afternoon, that we can always say that many of the directions pointed in the past by the Minister of Labour have shown a fair degree of progressive and enlightened approaches in the area of labour relations. It is in that spirit that this resolution is presented this afternoon in the hope that we would be able to offer for consideration in this House an idea, or a proposal, that should be seriously explored by this government in terms of responding to the ever-growing problem of urban growth in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of new towns, of satellite towns and new cities have been spoken about with great frequency in popular media and academic circles for a long time. Discussions I have heard about it in this province have often approached the subject as if it was some futuristic, some fantasy of sort of science fiction that we should be so contemplating. And yet the practical matter, Mr. Speaker, is that most countries in the industrial world in fact have been heavily engaged in new town development for a long time. Certainly Great Britain has been building new towns for about the last 70 years, and presently has well over 100 new towns in Great Britain. There isn't a country in Europe really which is not engaged in a variety of new town developments. The United States over the past five years has committed a very high degree of resources and governmental intervention of new town development as a way of dealing with the problems of urban growth. I think even in our own country there have been many examples presented in Canada along the way, or efforts at new town, or satellite town development. There is in some ways a very inspiring example outside of the City of Ottawa with the small community of Kanata. We have, I suppose, in our own province explored the idea of a new town development in relation to resource areas. The Government of Ontario itself has now prescribed a program of six new towns over the next 15 years in that province.

So what it really represents, Mr. Speaker, is not something that's fanciful, not something that is far out, not something that is on a future wave length, it is something that is very much here and now, and something that is very much a part of the panel of possibilities that most governments are utilizing in trying to cope with the problems of urban growth. The advantages of new towns as a means of dealing with it I think are probably well known to many people in this Chamber. To begin with, it is certainly a way of providing an alternative centre for population movement, that rather than having everyone move to one large urban centre, it provides an alternative area. It provides an area where the land costs are generally much cheaper and therefore can provide a lower cost of accommodation. It provides an area where the planning, rather than having to overlay itself into older areas and try to re-do the mistakes of the past, can start up brand new and incorporate the most modern and up to date insights and developments in the planning field, so that you can start on a clean sheet of paper and do everything sort of based upon the most contemporary kind of analysis and outlooks.

It has been used, Mr. Speaker, in part, in some of the American States, as a way of providing intermediate settlement for rural migrants who are moving into urban areas in ever increasing numbers, but who find it oftentimes difficult to cope with big city life, that in places like the Appalachians, and in the areas like Kentucky and Ohio, new towns are being developed as a way providing a stopping off point, or an intermediate zone for incoming rural migrants. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that the wisdom or application of new town development has been adopted for a variety of reasons and in a variety of jurisdictions.

So the question comes down to, why should we look at something like this in Manitoba. Does it really suit? After all we're a small province, only a million people, our City of Winnipeg while it is big to us is relatively medium-sized as cities go, and isn't it possible to manage or cope with urban growth within the existing boundaries, and within the existing technology, and within the existing procedures and processes that we have in city government.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it isn't. I think that it is a recognized fact by our

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . . . Provincial Government who, according to press releases, the Minister of Municipal Affairs intends to bring in a fairly new package of land use controls, which I would only hasten to say, Mr. Speaker, if you would recall, members of this group were asking for last year, and in fact I was pleased to see that many of the proposals that apparently will be in that bill, go back to some of the suggestions and recommendations that we were making last year.

But let's point out one important fact, Mr. Speaker, that while we welcome the introduction of those new land use planning controls, that they in effect are regulatory controls, they are ways of preventing abuses and of trying to offset some of the worst kinds of conditions I see the proposal for a new town development as a complement to those new proposals in land use because it is a positive way, not only are you saying what you can't do, you are now providing an alternative as to what you should do. It is the difference really between in a sense the negatives that governments sometimes have to apply for the protection of the community, as opposed to positive initiatives that it takes in order to provide new directions and new approaches.

And I would see, Mr. Speaker, that the development of a new town program in this province would very adequately supplement or complement the proposals that we expect to have before us in a short while for land use controls in the fringe around Winnipeg.

I would see it, Mr. Speaker, in particular, because we are now experiencing within that urban fringe in effect new communities which aren't new communities because they don't encompass the kind of planning and thought and approach that should be incorporated.

I expect to have a lot more to say about this when the Minister presents his Act, but I think there is serious evidence to show that many rural municipalities on the fringe of Winnipeg are presently being gobbled up by large amounts of land development, but land development in the old fashioned kind of way of major big sub-developments, large lots, no consideration given to the servicing or the planning or the development. It's happening in a scattered, leap-frog, unplanned kind of organizational way, which will bring about increased costs and will not provide any kind of beneficial use in terms of a new community.

So what we're simply suggesting, Mr. Speaker, in presenting this proposal, is that we accompany the proposed land use controls that are being talked about by some very positive initiatives by the Provincial Government to bring about the development of a new town organization in this province, which could begin to look at the serious feasibility of instituting new town development within the urban fringe.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the benefits to the people of this city would be multiple. To begin with, it would provide a base, areas where the cost of housing would be much lower than it is now. The average cost of serviced lots in parts of Winnipeg is now reaching the area of \$15,000 per lot. That pushes the range of housing way beyond the reach of most average working people in this city. In fact, it's estimated by Central Mortgage and Housing that only about 25 percent of our present sort of family composition in this province can afford to buy a new house. If we were able to acquire, as we should be able to, large areas of land in an outer fringe, we could be putting lots on the basis of about \$3,000 to \$4,000. We could bring housing within the range of ordinary people in this community.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, when we build that housing, it won't be in the kind of scattered way that's now developing in what is called the ex-urban fringe of Winnipeg, where you have a house here and a clump there and a small subdivision there, and all of a sudden rural municipalities have to run around and find out how you can connect roads, and someone demands that a new sewer go up, someone demands that a new kind of a school be built, and before you know it . . . And that is happening, Mr. Speaker. The value is not something we're projecting, that is happening right now, and I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs has seen the studies in places like Springfield municipality, which says that the land transactions in areas like that have increased upwards of 200 to 300 percent over the last couple of years. Now that simply shows that the movement is going out already. It's already there. So the question is, is it going to be planned or is it going to be unplanned? Well right now it's being unplanned, and there is no way of bringing it together.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I see an opportunity in terms of new town developments, of providing what can only be described as an incentive to the best minds in the urban field to create, that if you speak to people in the professions of planning and architecture and what not - and

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)

oftentimes they are totally circumscribed. If they try to develop something in the City of Winnipeg, you've got thousands of regulations. You can't build. You have to build on a 50-foot lot. You must have a 20-foot side yard. You must have this size of weathering on the front of your house. You must have a 60-foot-wide street. In other words, we have so circumscribed and straitjacketed planning that the professions of people who are thinking creatively can't work; they can't express the kind of things that should be done. We can't explore the possibilities and potentialities in fields of urban transportation, in fields of urban land use. And I would only point out for members of this House, Mr. Speaker, the kinds of things that we have seen in new towns where I have visited and done some work; where in the new town of Kanata, outside of Ottawa, it's possible for a child, a young child, to walk to school, to go to the grocery store, to visit the swimming pool, without ever having to cross a road - totally free of that kind of encumbrance. It's possible for women to take their children for walks without having to sort of be confused with traffic or other kinds of encumbrances. It's possible to bring together human resource centres where you've got the school and the community centre and the churches and the recreation areas combined into a town centre, so there's a place for people to meet, places for people to communicate. And if you go into some of the sterile subdivisions of the City of Winnipeg, where I can recall speaking to a school, a group of school children about two weeks ago in one of our subdivisions, which had been built by the old rules, and we asked them, what did they do with themselves, and they said: "All we do is we race up and down sort of a large road because there is no place to go." The only meeting place in a subdivision of 800 houses is a Mac's milk store.

Well, that's not planning. That's not providing for an interesting and vibrant urban environment. So we have to provide kind of an incentive for the best minds in our community to come to work and do something, to give them the ability and possibilities of bringing their training and their skills for the betterment of this community. And I think, Mr. Speaker, to give full credit, that that was tried in the Leaf Rapids project, where this government did invite some of its best architects in this country, to say: "Build us a community in the North that really is different." And I think that they did come up with some very interesting solutions to that. But the same opportunity should be given to half the province which lives in the City of Winnipeg. And while I agree fully with the kind of investments we make in Northern Manitoba, I'm simply saying, why don't we make the same investment where half the population of this province lives? Why don't we give them the same kind of options and the same kind of possibilities?

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, as a benefit, I would see this as an opportunity of bringing together the private and public resources of this community. One of the great tragedies that we have witnessed is the real breakdown that appears in the communication and consultation between housebuilders and developers and architects and professions, and this government. We all talk in many cases about the impending crisis in the housing field, and on several occasions I have asked the Minister responsible for housing, the First Minister, and others: "Have you sat down and talked to these people? Have you got together to find solutions?" And the answer comes back: "No." And I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we can solve problems in urban areas if we're not trying to recruit the private sector in some ways that I realize that there are some differences of opinion about, approaches and some differences of opinion about the way things should happen. But you need these people to build for you, and you should be giving them also the invitation to join you. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the option is there. It doesn't mean the government gives up its control because we have presently the opportunity for government to acquire the land, to assemble it, to set out the kind of planning that should be done, to incorporate the kind of people that I'm talking about, the social community organizations, the professional people, and then to lease back or to sell back or whatever arrangement it wants to make, to say to this private developer, "Let's see what you can do in this cluster of housing." And say to that other kind of builder: "Let's see what kind of arrangement you can come with here." In other words, let's provide for some kind of partnership for the solution of our urban problems rather than a division and antagonism.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me address myself to one important question that I'm sure will be raised, and that is the question of cost. And I can hear someone standing up and saying, "Hey, wait a minute. Boy, new towns; very expensive." Well, I think that certainly the Minister of Municipal Affairs would know this and perhaps other members in this House, but

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) it really wouldn't cost the Provincial Government anything more than what it's spending now for its Land Assembly Program, in fact probably cost it less, because under Section 45 of the new National Housing Act, the Federal Government is prepared to offer either a 75 percent cost-sharing or 90 percent loan structure for new community development. It's prepared to buy the transportation corridor. It's prepared to share the cost in the planning and development of any such proposal. In other words, the Federal Government is saying, "Look, we think new towns are a solution. We're prepared to fully share the cost of it and to give you the loans that you need. Go ahead and do it." And that option hasn't been picked up. It's on the table and it hasn't been exercised.

So frankly, Mr. Speaker, it appears that all the things are there, all the elements are there. All that is lacking at this point is someone to take the initiative. And I know, I've heard or at least read where the First Minister has indicated in a seminar to municipal leaders, I believe it was five or six months ago, that he thinks that maybe we should be in the new town business. And all we're simply doing is saying okay, let's pin it to the map. Let's make a commitment. Let's really look at the possibility. And I would suggest finally, Mr. Speaker, that the way to do it, if this government wants to look at the feasibility, would be to set up a new town corporation. On that corporation, look at the model that was set up in the development of the Centennial Centre when we developed the Concert Hall and so on down there on Main Street, where on the board are government representatives of local and provincial governments, where there are representatives of the private community, and where there are citizens at large. And they could develop the feasibility of such a study. They could come out and say, "Here's where it should go. Here's the kind of cost that it would engage in. Here are the kinds of things we'd like to do with it." They could present, Mr. Speaker, to this community some model for the future, some way of handling our urban problems in a way that gets us out of the mundane and gets us out of the kind of day to day sort of grind of trying to solve the . . . and put out fire. A new town, I think, Mr. Speaker, could stimulate this province and stimulate the people in this city to focussing their minds and their energies for looking for new solutions, solutions which are both practical and imaginative at the same time. That, Mr. Speaker, is really what this province cries out for at this time and what the city cries out for. It is not simply to sort of repeat the old mistakes or to keep going around the same track at the same speed; what we are crying out for is to say: Look. The problems of our nervous society are beginning to grow large and are beginning to engulf us. What we require now is someone to strike out and say, "Here's a new direction that will work."

I think, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest to members of this Assembly, that the establishment in this province of the opportunity to set up a new town, of getting the public and private sectors working at its possibilities together, would be just that kind of stimulus that we need so that we can provide an effective and exciting option for the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've listened with interest to the comments by the Member for Fort Rouge and would like to add some comments in connection with the resolution before us.

During the past year, one of the most fascinating areas of experience that I have had the opportunity to participate in as Minister of Municipal Affairs has been involvement with what is known as the Winnipeg Regional Study, participated in by municipalities in and around the City of Winnipeg, including representation from the City of Winnipeg and the department, as well as myself as Minister of Municipal Affairs. During the course of this past year, meetings took place sometimes on a twice-monthly basis in which a very detailed analysis was done of the area surrounding the City of Winnipeg for in fact a 50-mile radius and involving some 27 municipalities, including villages and towns in that area. Studies were made of the existing transportation systems, the various soils that make up the area around the City of Winnipeg in order to ascertain their potential for absorption of septic tank leakage, etc. Studies were made of existing infrastructure, of gravel pit and mineral deposits in the area surrounding the City of Winnipeg, what areas still remain that have some treed existence; and also a very thorough analysis was made of the existing planning authority that serves the area surrounding the city.

The committee - which, by the way, was a committee which consisted of one Councillor, or Reeve, elected by their own municipal council to serve on this committee, and during the

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) study process only really represented themselves but they were there on behalf of their individual municipalities - came down with a series of recommendations about two weeks ago and, as we proceed further along this Session, I hope to have opportunity to refer to their recommendations which were numerous in detail.

One of the areas of concern expressed by the committee was certainly that the present development, which is often of a tacky, unplanned, unstructured way, should be properly structured and channelled in a sensible way around the City of Winnipeg.

Secondly, there was certainly a conviction expressed that the present planning authority that exists, and exists under the provisions of the present Planning Act, is weak and ineffective, and that we should proceed to correct that situation.

I'm not quite sure here whether the Member for Fort Rouge and myself really are in agreement or not, and I suppose it depends a great deal upon definition of what is meant by a new town. One of the recommendations that flowed from the committee meetings was that further residential development should be encouraged to attach itself to existing settlements. Thus, I want to say that in basic nature I'm in accord with the encouragement of development outside the City of Winnipeg in an area some distance from the City of Winnipeg as to provide an alternative to Winnipeg living. And I agree that what we should do is to try to create many innovative methods of providing a new type of development of that nature.

The only area of possible disagreement that exists between the Member for Fort Rouge and myself here, and I'm not sure whether the Member for Fort Rouge is really in disagreement or not here with what I'm going to say, is that it is my view that any future new town development of the nature proposed in the resolution should be part and parcel of an existing settlement. It should grow out from an existing settlement. It could, for instance, grow out from whether it be Portage, Stonewall, naturally, with some bias, Selkirk, for we do have very serious problems now insofar as our transportation links between the City of Winnipeg and these centres. For example, No. 7 and No. 9 highways are now becoming heavily congested with traffic of commuters travelling back and forth between those centres and the City of Winnipeg with a very inadequate transportation corridor system, to the extent that speed zones are going up constantly reducing speed and increasing the time required in order to travel back and forth from place of residence to work. In addition, both Stonewall and Selkirk, for instance, are heavily involved in very very expensive infrastructure development at the present time: a sewer treatment plant, water and sewer development, that it's going to require a great deal of financial strain on behalf of those communities to meet the cost of those developments. And I know that Portage la Prairie is, for example, also looking at a water treatment plant, I believe, right at the present moment.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to see is a new town development but that it not be started some distance from existing settlement, but be part and parcel of an existing community with existing infrastructure within the radius area around the City of Winnipeg. And I agree that there is great potential in various centres around the City of Winnipeg to acquire land at a reasonable cost, and hopefully this could be done through the auspices of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation.

I know, for instance, that within the Town of Selkirk there is in the neighbourhood of 1, 100 or 1,200 acres of publicly-owned land at the present time, and that's probably a little known fact but there is that amount of publicly-owned land at the present time that is open to future residential development of the very nature that is described. I know in the Stonewall area that land can still be obtained at a minimal cost as compared to the cost that would be involved in purchase of land in the City of Winnipeg. I suspect the very same type of situation is true in Portage. I believe, in fact, in Portage that a large block of land was acquired a year or two years ago through the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, with consultation involving the City of Winnipeg, and the Honourable Member for Morris could probably relate the cost of land in the Morris area, and I'm sure the same thing holds true there.

Though land is cheaper, the transportation corridors that exist at the present time in many instances need to be improved or alternative transportation corridors are required to replace already long since over-congested corridors. There's no doubt in my mind, for instance, that a new 4-lane highway in the not too distant future will have to be constructed between the City of Winnipeg and the Town of Selkirk. We're now faced, as I travel in in the morning from Selkirk, speed zones of 50 to 40 to 60 to 40 to 45, and then into the City of Winnipeg, all in a

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). space of 25 minutes. And it's going to be worse with the passage of time, because the number of ingresses and egresses that are continuing to occur, and the continued residential . . . of an unplanned nature which is taking place between Winnipeg and, for instance, Selkirk, is increasing the congestion in many respects. So transportation corridors, there will have to be new ones linking existing settlements. The very costly and expensive infrastructure that presently is being installed in some of the communities that I've mentioned can and certainly do require greatly expanded residential and commercial and industrial development in order to pay the costs of that development. Thirdly, the very availability of land that exists, either already publicly-owned or at a very low cost in comparison with that in the City of Winnipeg, all invites an activity of this nature.

I regret very much that we are faced with a problem this year of severe cutbacks on the part of the Federal Government insofar as the supplying of moneys under Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I understand from the Minister of Urban Affairs that the cutback this year in moneys that are being made available for housing construction is the lowest that we've apparently faced, I believe since 1970, or '69. Is of the lowest. --(Interjection)-- Well it affects senior citizen housing as well, from my understanding. So that I am concerned as to the nature of the availability of funds. I concur that funds are certainly available here for servicing of infrastructure, and we should certainly attempt to take advantage of that.

So in principle, there's support for the intent of this resolution, if in fact we are speaking in terms of the same terminology that when we relate to new town developments we're not thinking of the present emergence of a brand new town in the middle of some quarter section, in the middle of some municipality around the City of Winnipeg, but that in fact we're speaking of the development of a new community which would fit in and be adjacent to an existing settlement that already requires additional development in order to bear the very pressing costs of infrastructure development that exists there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very interesting resolution. I've listened to the Member from Fort Rouge and the Attorney-General, very interested, and although I might have been in conversation with a couple of my colleagues while I was listening, I was still gathering some information. I would hesitate to say that the servicing of a piece of property in Winnipeg at the present time is \$15,000 a lot. I remember, in fact, checking with my colleagues; they were working at \$65.00 a foot not more than two years ago, and if we were generous at \$100.00 a foot, I think you'll find your planners, such as the Underwood McLellan and those people, would say that the servicing of an average lot in Winnipeg at the present time would be closer to \$5,000 or \$6,000.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge have a point of order?

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order. I don't wish to interrupt the member, but I didn't say the servicing; I said the total cost of a lot is about \$15,000 including servicing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'm certainly glad the member cleared that up because at his figure of \$15,000 for total cost it would be in the ballpark.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many things involved in talking about building satellite towns, and I'm kind of smiling to myself at something the Minister of Health said the other day, and I don't really like to listen to him at any time but he did say that the Member from Assiniboia sometimes gets a feeling of what's going to happen and maybe brings it into the House, and I would think that maybe the Member from Fort Rouge has a feeling of some of the things the government are going to do and possibly bringing it into the House, because we do know that the government northeast of Winnipeg, or we have heard rumours that they have been purchasing fairly large amounts of land out in that area for probably expansion or satellite towns or something of that nature; and I'm not being too close to what the government is actually doing. I won't comment any more on that, but possibly the Member for Fort Rouge has heard a little bit more than we have about the purchases of land northeast of town.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing you have to continually take into mind when you're talking satellite cities is, really I think we should start thinking back just a little bit as to what was happening in the City of Winnipeg before we were put into the mess by the government. We did have a Metro government. We did have six different areas and we did have a Metro government

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) that said, "You know, we don't want you going outside the perimeter too fast because, you know, we don't want you to start taking up this surrounding land around Winnipeg any further than is necessary until we have a much better planning arrangement around the city." And I can remember clearly the City of St. James contracting with Underwood McLellan to give us a plan on the west side of St. James-Assiniboia, outside the perimeter. It was a plan that we would . . . Basically all the water runs to the Assiniboine, and when you get up not too far north you get the water running the other way, so we had a plan that had a storm sewer system which was a ditch system, which was rolling grass with your concrete down the centre for your rainwater, storm sewer system. The roads would be in front of the houses and then a park-like effect between each block. As a matter of fact, I could go to my file at home and present that plan and show it to anybody. And that was, I remember clearly Bernie Wolfe at the time, saying that we were very very - in fact we were upstarts to even think of trying to present a plan such as that when the Metro was not yet filled in. And as a matter of fact, I think the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was on Metro at that time when we presented the plan. I'm not sure, but I think he was.

So the development around Winnipeg has got to be, as the Minister says, a very well-done plan which, you know, as has been said by the Minister - and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was at a seminar all morning with the Minister approaching this subject with the Chamber of Commerce - the planning has to be done by the people in the area and according to land use. There's no sense taking good productive land out of production when there is land available that should have a town built on it. And this is more the way we have to go. You know, to say to build all of a sudden 50 miles away a satellite town, there's water problems. I don't know whether the member knows that there's an international water agreement, you know, regarding Shoal Lake, which may have to be considered before we start taking more water out of that. There is the size of the duct that comes from Shoal Lake. There's only one of them. There probably will have to be two some day. Who owns it is another argument that could be brought up. But water supply is something you have to look at. Now you may just be lucky and build a town the same as Steinbach is, that has a tremendous water supply which is an overflow of the Lake of the Woods shed, but that doesn't happen all the time in this province.

The other thing is, you know, we do have some towns within a 50-mile radius of Winnipeg that could be developed. We could have a very good development in these towns. These towns may have a lot of farm land around them that shouldn't be taken out of production, but at the same point they may have an area, a mile or so, or half a mile or so from town, where a definitely good development of housing could be put on marginal farm land. We have to take a look at that rather than just say we're going to build a new town.

The building of a new town is not easy. We have problems at the present time with the towns that are there, with the cost of sewer, water, everything. Increase of population means police, fire, all of that. You have to end up with a very large tax base that will be placed upon you. So really, the concept that the Member from Fort Rouge is speaking of, you know, wanting to get rid of this I think urban sprawl and try and have it more organized, is a good one, but I don't think going out and just building a new town is the answer. I think we've got better answers than that in Manitoba.

I might say that the Minister mentioned this morning that - we were talking about Garson and that was brought up - the Minister didn't mention it, but you know, Garson is built on a quarry and that is very productive material, or very valuable material. Maybe the Town of Garson, if it expands, should certainly not be built over a quarry but built somewhere else other than that area.

And of course, the planning. I'm repeating myself and the Minister has continually mentioned the planning of the area. The land use, as I'm repeating myself again, is important, and we're going to find this out. We're going to have the bill that the Minister is planning to bring in. We're going to have discussion on it and I'm sure there will be many questions on it. I'm sure that both sides of the House will talk with people that they know that it will affect, and we may be able to come up with something that is right for the expansion of this area.

I'd like to say that I have in my file in the caucus room the 1975 plans for Saskatoon. It calls for a regional government. It calls for Saskatoon not to grow to more than 182,000 people and then we work to six areas around Saskatoon that are completely autonomous, of about 50,000 people each, but not on the basis, not on the basis of just letting Saskatoon grow, but

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) it's going to grow in a planned area on land that is marginal for that basis.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the position of agreeing with the Member from Fort Rouge on the basis that we have to look at the conglomeration and the costs of the urban area, and the costs of people living in it - which, by the way, would be better in Winnipeg if we didn't have the mess we were given a few years ago; but I don't think that I can agree with the Member from Fort Rouge that just building a new town 50 miles away is the answer. I think there's a better way of doing it and I think the Minister's approach towards the planning of land use - and hopefully it's done with the assistance of all the elected members in the area - I think that that is a better approach. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution that is brought before the House at this time is a very interesting one, and without attempting in any way to detract from the importance of the subject matter before us, I want to say for a start that I'm not too sure that the suggestion that is made by the Member for Fort Rouge as contained in this Resolution is one that I can accept. At the same time, I don't want to create the impression that I am not unaware of the problem that exists and one that we're going to have to be dealing with sooner and later - and I would think preferably sooner. It raises the first question of all, as to whether or not this government should place themselves in the position of determining where towns will be located and in what locations, and how they're going to be constructed.

It could well be argued that this can be and should be a function of government, that kind of planning, and I find myself in the position of not entirely disagreeing with that concept; that although I may disagree very violently with government planning in many areas, the planning of growth and the planning of towns and cities is a responsibility, or should be a responsibility of elected officials. And whether that's a combination of locally elected officials and provincially elected officials as well as federal, is a question that I don't think that we need to get into at this point because I believe that is somewhat academic.

But, you know, the construction of a new town implies a great deal more than just simply finding a chunk of land and going out there and start putting some buildings on it. It involves and implies that if it's going to be a satellite city, that the main area of work for the people who live in that town are going to still be in the City of Winnipeg. And if that's the case, if it isn't going to be accompanied by the moving of industries out in that area as well, then it implies considerable costs in additional transportation facilities to ensure that the movement of people to and from any satellite town that may be developed are sufficient to take care of the numbers of people that will be being transported. It also implies, in the context of the ever-rising costs of energy, that it could well be that public transportation is the method whereby people will be transported. And that again involves another consideration. That could be very costly.

The Member for Fort Rouge mentioned development of a city, Kanata, just outside the City of Ottawa, and I have some knowledge of the initial stages of development of that particular project, and it might be interesting to note that it was originally conceived and planned by one man, who is now the Chairman of the Housing and Renewal Corporation, and that's Mr. William Teron (?) who incidentally is a Manitoban who came from a small little community that was in my constituency at that time, of Provencher, the Community of Gardenton; and it might be also interesting to know that Mr. Teron had no formal training as an architect, and yet I think it is generally agreed is one of the finest people in that particular field that you could possibly imagine. The whole idea of the City of Kanata was his idea, and to a large extent the planning that went into the construction of that city was his, even to the extent of the building of an artificial lake.

And I remember talking to Mr. Teron some time before the city actually began construction. He was explaining to me some of the concepts that he had in a totally planned city such as Kanata. And I'm not too sure that the noble ideas that he had for the construction of that city . . . and I agreed at that time with the concept because I felt it was one of the ways that we could demonstrate that a planned city would have very many advantages over the kinds of architectural or planning that went on in the City of Winnipeg which initially was laid out by a bunch of meandering cows, whether or not that concept was finally realized there is a great deal of doubt, because the noble ideas, as I say, that Mr. Teron had in connection with the City of Kanata, were difficult to achieve in the setting up of a brand new community because there

RESOLUTION 18

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) were so many difficulties involved in that construction.

I wonder, sir, if at this time, because of tremendous costs that are involved in the development of a brand new city with all of the services that are required, if some thought, in the initial stages at least, if there is a desire on the part of the government to impose some restrictions with respect to land use - and I believe that they are inevitable - to think in terms of, if I may use the expression, killing two birds with one stone in attempting to revitalize some of the communities that have been suffering from a certain degree of depopulation, those that have to a large extent remained static. And I can think of several communities who do have the necessary services installed; indeed in many cases the services are along many of the streets that at the present time do not have houses on them. The assisting of the development of existing communities who already have serviced land and have designated areas, would help those communities in financing the services that already exist rather than the development of entirely new services in new communities, which I believe would be extremely costly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, the honourable member will have an opportunity the next time in Private Members' Hour.

I am now leaving the Chair and the House will go into Committee of Supply at 8:00 p. m.