

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, May 2, 1974

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 70 students of Grade 9 standing of the Isaac Newton School, a school I once attended. These students are under the direction of Mr. McLean and Mr. Rosen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows, the Minister of Colleges and Universities and Education.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet) introduced Bill No. 25, an Act to validate an Agreement between the Provincial Exhibition of Manitoba, The City of Brandon and the Government of Manitoba. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. I wonder if he can confirm that his department is investigating and has under investigation certain matters relating to the Department of Northern Affairs and its work around and in and at Southern Indian Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I had difficulty hearing the last few words of the Leader of the Opposition's question. I wonder if he would repeat it.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the Attorney-General can confirm that his department is investigating certain matters of the Department of Northern Affairs relating to the operation of Northern Affairs at Southern Indian Lake.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, without further particulars I'm not aware of any such investigation. I would not want to indicate, there may be some investigations outside of my knowledge, but I am unaware of any investigations pertaining to the Department of Northern Affairs in South Indian Lake whatsoever.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if he can confirm whether his Department is investigating matters with respect to Northern Manpower, and I believe the Corps program, at Southern Indian Lake.

MR. PAWLEY: No, I'm not, Mr. Speaker. I would appreciate if the honourable member has some information of giving me specifics or particulars of this information but I'm not aware of the type of investigations that he is referring to. Unless the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has some supplementary questions, I would like to make an announcement, looking forward to making, of a purely non-political nature.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed)

MR. PAWLEY: After the success of the Selkirk Steelers in defeating the West Kildonan North Stars then proceeding from West Kildonan to defeat Prince Albert Raiders I was, and I'm sure all Manitobans were pleasantly pleased with the victory last night 5 - 2 of the Selkirk Steelers over the Kelowna Buckaroos.

A MEMBER: 5 - 3.

MR. PAWLEY: Well let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the news broadcasts are incorrect and I think that on a matter of privilege I would like to correct the news broadcast which I

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . heard this morning, I believe it was CJOB. The victory was 5 - 2 and not 5 - 3 last night. But anyway Selkirk has now proceeded as the winners of the Abbott Cup series and now will be representing Western Canada in the Centennial Cup series against Smith Falls in Ontario, the winner of which will be the Canadian Junior A Second Tier Champs, and I think that all of us in this Chamber on behalf of the people of Manitoba would wish to congratulate the Selkirk Steelers, their coach George Dorman, and extend to them our wishes for a very successful series against Smith Falls.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can indicate in view of what appears to be the almost imminent announcement to be made with respect to the Boeing overhaul facility and its location either in Dorval in Montreal or in Winnipeg, whether he can indicate what action the Provincial Government is taking in this matter, that is immediate action it is taking in this matter to see to it that a decision will be made in favour of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. I hope it will be brief.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, as members may know the Premier and myself were in Ottawa about, I guess it's a couple of weeks ago, and this matter was discussed at some depths with responsible Ministers, including the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Defence, the Honourable James Richardson. I also spent the next day with the Chairman of the Board of Air Canada personally to discuss the matter. A plan of action is being formulated and will be announced by the Premier in a very short period of time.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would indicate whether it would not support Manitoba's position to have the Air Policy Committee which is a non-partisan group meet immediately for a report and to support the government in its request that the location be in Winnipeg and not in Dorval.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the government is working on a plan of action which we hope will be more effective than any approach that we've made in the past.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate his last communication with Mr. Richardson on this matter - the time of his last communication.

MR. EVANS: I spoke to the Honourable Minister a matter of - well within the last week over the telephone to Ottawa. That is to the Honourable James Richardson.

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

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether Mr. Richardson appeared confident that the overhaul base would in fact be located in Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is asking for an opinion.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder if Mr. Richardson indicated whether a Cabinet decision had been made for the overhaul base to be taken and placed in Dorval in Montreal.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I'm, you know, at liberty to disclose all the details of the conversation but it's my understanding that the matter is still under consideration. That's my understanding.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to just relate back to the questions asked earlier by the Leader of the Opposition. My answer was that I am not aware of any investigation by the Department of the Attorney-General of any matters pertaining to the Department of Northern Affairs re South Indian Lake, but in order to be completely candid I would want to indicate that the Minister of Northern Affairs did discuss with me certain allegations that he had heard in respect to a certain employee and that I indicated to the Minister of Northern Affairs that prior to any investigation there would have to be written statements and material submitted - now that material has not been submitted - before the Department would investigate or inquire into rumours or allegations.

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

MR. I. H. ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member will have another opportunity.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Mines. Pursuant to a question I raised on Monday can he advise whether he now has made arrangements to obtain a copy of the most recent report by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation which is reported to outline even more serious environmental impact on Manitoba waters by the Garrison Diversion, and will he table that in the House as he indicated he would if he got it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm unaware that we're further ahead but I did indicate if it's obtained it will be made public if I'm at liberty to do so. The question of the Canadian position is now being co-ordinated with the Government of Canada and a meeting is being arranged relative to these matters and part of the discussion will relate to the alleged report that the honourable member is referring to.

MR. ASPER: Can the Minister indicate, Mr. Speaker, whether his government now intends to take initiative to have prior discussion with the federal authorities so that they can strategize their position prior to meeting with the U.S. authorities?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that has been our position throughout, and may I advise the honourable member, which I advised the House, that the last meeting that was held in Winnipeg, last Friday, was co-ordinated and a strategy meeting was held with the federal officials.

MR. ASPER: Has the Minister, Mr. Speaker, been advised of the existence of a new U.S. proposal which is being offered to Canada and Manitoba which will reduce the impact, the salinity impact from 60 percent in the Souris River down to 10 percent - resulting from the Diversion?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order Please. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, not specifically, but I have read accounts of various things and I can't even place at the moment where each of them have occurred in the newspapers and letters, etc. relating to different things that are being suggested. May I advise the honourable member that the Canadian position, which stems I believe from Manitoba initiative, is to try to hold the United States Government to their state department note which says, "that there will be no construction in Manitoba which will cause injury to persons or property through pollution of waters flowing from the United States into Canada"

MR. ASPER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary. Is it now the Minister's view then that a new conciliatory posture has been adopted by the United States with respect to the Garrison Diversion making it acceptable to Manitoba, and does he believe now that a compromise can be reached whereby the project can proceed without serious damage to Manitoba?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of no proposal which permits the project to proceed without damage to injury or property in Manitoba. Certain phases of it yes but the phase that was to deal with Manitoba which is to come in in 1979, which the United States Government has indicated will not proceed, I know of no way of which that phase can be completed without causing injury. I would not describe the United States position as a new conciliatory position. The dealings that the Canadian Government has had with them have at all times indicated, and we hope that that will continue to be the position, that the United States has no intention of violating its responsibilities under the Boundary Waters Treaty Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General and relates to the answer that he gave just a few moments ago. I wonder if he can indicate whether at this point he is waiting for information to be supplied by the Minister or by the people affected or by the people who have alleged to have made statements with respect to the department and its officials?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: No. The Minister of Northern Affairs spoke to me in connection with this matter so that I would anticipate if there is any further material or complaints or written statements, signed written statements, with any evidence of wrongdoings that they would be produced through that department through to myself. At the present time there is nothing short of rumor.

MR. SPIVAK: Then I take it that the representations by Minister in your opinion does not warrant action and investigation by the Attorney-General's department.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. PAWLEY: The Minister, Mr. Speaker, made no representation for investigation per se. He repeated what had been rumors of certain misconduct, how to deal with that sort of thing when it occurs, and as I indicated I believe just the other day that it's not enough for someone to simply shout "he is a thief". More than that is necessary in a society such as ours that some material, some basic material has to be presented, probable and reasonable evidence of any wrongdoings, in order to permit investigation to ensue, and when that is obtained, if it is obtained, then we would certainly look at that material at that time.

MR. SPIVAK: I'd like to ask the Attorney-General if in fact he's not going to investigate this matter where are they going to obtain the material? If the matter was brought to him by the Minister of Northern Affairs, even if a rumor, is it not an obligation on his part to investigate the matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is argumentative. Order please. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. In view of the report from the Parks Branch there will be heavy flooding in the Whiteshell, can the Minister indicate to the House what resorts will be flooded and what lakes will have unusually high water so that the people can protect their property?

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Well, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the honourable member did not give me notice of the question and I'm not able to answer the honourable member in detail, apart from having been in the Whiteshell myself last evening and having taken notice of some of the problems locally. I'm hoping to give more details to the House shortly.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have another question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Can the Minister indicate to the House if the WesCan Sports Lottery organization met in Winnipeg yesterday or today? Are they meeting in Winnipeg at the present time?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the provisional committee of WesCan met yesterday; I'm informed adjourned their meeting approximately at 4:45, and will be submitting their report to the next meeting of Ministers.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate who represented Manitoba at this meeting? Was the Minister present himself or somebody else represented Manitoba at this meeting?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I had at the meeting the Director of the Sports Directorate, Mr. Guy Simonis, I had two provisional members equally at the meeting, Mr. Laurent Desjardins and Al Mackling.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary. I don't know why the ex-Ministers were present but, Mr. Speaker, has the Minister met with any of the agencies prior to his meeting with WesCan representatives yesterday?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I myself was not present at the meeting yesterday. The three that I mentioned were and possibly others. I did meet with some of the agencies involved in the selling of tickets prior to the meeting in Regina and following the meeting in Regina. I'm in constant dialogue with some of the people involved in the selling of tickets or acting as agents for the Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can indicate if the government has established a policy regarding the pricing of gasoline and other petroleum products in relation to the subsidy program announced several weeks ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Premier has been asked that question in various forms a number of times and an answer has been supplied to the members of the House.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think three or four weeks ago it was referred that a report would be presented by the government regarding this. Is there a report available that can be distributed to the House?

MR. EVANS: I'm not sure which report the honourable member is referring to. I did

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . indicate that we were going to table a report on the general energy situation in Manitoba. This report is now nearing the completion stages. This is the one report that comes to mind. I don't know if there is another report, I'm not sure what the honourable member is referring to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Consumer Affairs, Corporate Affairs and Communication Affairs. Has the Minister or his department investigated the situation whereby over 1,000 subscribers monthly to the cable services in the City of Winnipeg have those services cancelled without notice because of late payment and are then charged \$10 for reconnecting that service; and do you plan to do something about it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the situation that the Member for Fort Rouge alludes to, although I am not informed of it, would seem to be a matter between the cable company and the subscriber, and as the Minister responsible for the Telephone System I would not be involved in attempting to have the cable company continue its service to subscribers. However as the Minister of Consumer Affairs, if what he says is correct, and I'll investigate it, then of course I would have to decide what action might be necessary.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Considering that the cable companies utilize Manitoba Telephone System lines, does the government plan to establish basic policy and regulatory guidelines to aid and assist the consumer of the cable service considering that they do have a monopoly?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I thought I was pointing out to the Member for Fort Rouge that there is a contractual obligation between the MTS and the cable operator and the terms of that contract of course I could have reviewed. When the contract is up for renewal in '79 would be the time when, if desirable, if considered to be desirable, new contract provisions could be written in. Right now, MTS is bound by the existing contract.

MR. AXWORTHY: Another supplementary. Does the Minister propose in his representations or position paper to the CRTC that the Provincial Government will take over greater regulatory responsibility for cable systems in the province so that it can establish basic guidelines and working orders to regulate this monopoly service or public utility, as it should be considered?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, that matter is certainly one of policy and I ask the Member for Fort Rouge to await the release of the discussion paper and then he can peruse it and see if that matter is covered in the paper.

MR. AXWORTHY: One more supplementary then. From the Minister's answer then, can we take it that when the position paper arrives - and we'd like to know when it is - that we can expect a statement on cable systems and the government's position in relation to them?

MR. TURNBULL: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that the position paper will be released on the 8th, 9th or 10th of this month. Secondly, there will be statements in the discussion paper relating to cable but not necessarily statements relating to the previous questions of the Member for Fort Rouge.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Mines, and it relates to the answers he gave to my earlier question. In the light of his statement that there are several reports or indications of new proposals relative to Garrison diversion or differences in valuation of damage, would he indicate whether he is now prepared to conduct either on the part of the Government of Manitoba or in conjunction with the Federal Government, a special Canadian study to provide an independent assessment of the Garrison diversion as it is revised under the proposals he expects to receive?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that I was pretty vague about the proposals, I'm not aware of the specific ones that the honourable member is referring to. I also indicated that given the facts that the American studies thus far indicate that the program in our opinion would violate the Boundaries Waters Treaty at this point and that the American

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . Government says that they will not do this, at this point there is no necessity for the Canadian Government to do more than what they are doing. If that point should arrive then, Mr. Speaker, we will deal with it at the time.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is: Does the Government of Manitoba intend to continue relying, as he indicates in his answer, on U.S. studies or will it have its own studies which are independent and prepared for our use rather than those of the American Government which may have different objectives in those studies?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, without answering in the negative, I've answered that question on at least three previous occasions and I believe I answered it again today.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. In view of the Minister's reluctance to establish a general study on the Garrison diversion by Manitoba, in view of the statement he just made, will he make a study on the potential flooding problem for the Souris River if the Americans impose the solution to the pollution problem by adding more water to the river?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the question that the honourable member asks would certainly cause me to debate very strongly the premise upon which it was based. There has been no indication that the Canadian and Manitoba Government will not conduct such studies as are necessary. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the procedure that we have adopted thus far has worked out very satisfactorily from the point of view of protecting Canadian and Manitoba interests.

With regard to a study of flooding, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether one has to engage in a great deal of study to know how much the Souris River will be increased by the number of cubic feet per second which will be added by the water which would come from that diversion, if it were proceeded with in 1979, which the United States Government has indicated that no construction will take place on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can the Minister tell this House whether this government will review their position on the construction of the Pembilier Dam so that this dam could be used for flood control and the prevention of floods in Southern Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to honourable members that there are many programs which could reduce flooding in various parts of the province; the basis upon which we proceed is whether there is a cost benefit involved. The latest that I understand on the Pembilier is that our department has forwarded to the American Corps of Engineers - I can't remember the proper name - recent information that they are going to be studying it and then they are going to advise us what they intend to do as a result of this, after which cost benefits could possibly again be studied from the Manitoba point of view. They were studied no more recently than within the last twelve months and they were found to be not satisfactory to justify the construction of that project.

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Will the Minister of Labour advise if the newly appointed Industrial Relations Commissioner will be investigating the conflict that is apparent at the Brandon General Hospital between the employees and management there?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all may I indicate to my honourable friend, the Member for St. Boniface that the Industrial Relations Officer was appointed by the previous administration some considerable period of time ago and on that note I want to indicate happily he's going a very good job for the present administration despite the fact that he was elected by the previous administration. It was one of the times that they had a lapse of knowledgeability.

But apart from that, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is referring to the Industrial Inquiry Commission then his specific references are directed toward the situation prevailing at the Health Services Centre in the City of Winnipeg and has no direct relationship with possible occurrences at Brandon.

MR. MARION: Well, Mr. Speaker, understanding that he is presently preoccupied the

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MARION cont'd) . . . . question is: will he once his efforts are terminated at the Health Sciences Centre be turning his attention to the Brandon dispute which is apparent?

MR. PAULLEY: The only answer I can give to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that on the termination of his assignment here in Winnipeg and if in the wisdom, or otherwise, of the Minister of Labour some other dispute requires an individual to be named as an industrial inquiry commission, the Minister of Labour will take into consideration as to whether or not Mr. Steward Martin will be appointed to such a commission.

MR. MARION: A final supplementary to the same Minister. Will the Minister be reporting on the progress realized at the Health Sciences Centre when it is appropriate to do so?

MR. PAULLEY: Most assuredly, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Management. I would like to ask the Minister if the letter that was recently gone out to the fishermen regarding the extra poundage caught above quota and the suggestion that it be confiscated by the department, if the Minister would reconsider that letter in light of the fact that the quotas have not as a rule been met in the last few years?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how there would be confiscation of a quota which was not met. The honourable member is saying that quotas have not been met. I'm aware that there was a recent prosecution for taking 8,000 pounds I believe over quota. But the fishermen and the department have been equally persistent that the quota regulations be strictly enforced, and they will be, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Highways. Can he inform us whether he or the government have yet received a request from the City of Winnipeg for 50 percent cost-sharing of the Grant-Carriere extension freeway system on the south part of the city, and has the government acceded as yet to that request?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any such request. If there has been a request of that type perhaps it had been requested of the Department of Urban Affairs.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would then like to address the question to whoever is acting as the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The question can be taken as notice.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well if the question is taken as notice then I would like to add to it the following question: Was an Impact Study received in combination with that request outlining the potential consequences or damage that would result in the surrounding area, in the Brandon Street area where the Grant-Carriere extension is to be built. And thirdly, is there any program for special compensation or remedial payment for those who will lose their homes and suffer damage in the immediate environment?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: On behalf of the First Minister I'll take as notice the question raised by my honourable friend.

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

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would we now proceed to the Order Paper, the debates on second readings in the order in which they appear.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS - SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 43. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Stand? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 44. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. Absent. Bill No. --The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I in respect to Bill 44. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry indicated to me yesterday that he definitely would be proceeding with the bill today. I note that he is not present. I'm wondering if it would be agreeable to the House for any other member who may desire to make a contribution to Bill 44 that they be given the opportunity so to do. The bill has been on the Order Paper for a considerable period of time, Sir. There is some urgency as to its being processed and I wonder whether or not we might have some accommodation in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 46. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I stood this for the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

BILL NO. 46

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There have been, Mr. Speaker, some comment and press releases on Bill 46 already. Much of the concern on Bill 46 has been expressed by some of the honourable members and also a concern on Bill 46 has been expressed by our Leader in respect that the Cabinet continues to try to take control in the Cabinet room of many things that happen in Manitoba. I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. I just want to be able to hear the honourable member, that's why I'm asking for order.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's regrettable that the First Minister is not in his chair, the Minister of Urban Affairs, but unlike the Minister of Labour I realize that the First Minister has many duties and he probably is very busy at the present time. I also realize that leaders of opposition parties are busy people so I would hope and I'm sure the Minister of Urban Affairs, the First Minister will read my comments in Hansard, and I do understand, unlike others in the Legislature, why people are out from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a letter that is addressed to the First Minister from Councillor Galanchuk but he writes it on behalf of the Lord Selkirk Community Councillors, Councillor Fuga, Hudson, Galanchuk, Zuken; and also, Mr. Speaker, the letter is addressed to the Minister of Education, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Urban Affairs, the Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management, the Minister of Health and Social Development. These Ministers are all involved very much in these communities, or in the Lord Selkirk Community. It is a request, Mr. Speaker, to have a meeting with the Lord Selkirk Community Committee to discuss the recommendations of the City of Winnipeg Boundaries Review Commission, Bill 46, differences of municipal boards on Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, delay and decision of Manitoba Hospital Services Commission for the construction of Seven Oaks Hospital. And they're asking that they have an answer pretty soon because according to Section 25 of the Act they have to give a certain amount of notice to hold a meeting.

Mr. Speaker, on further investigation of this letter I find that in Lord Selkirk we have a group of people who are councillors and on the community committee of that council the citizen representatives who are people that most of us in this room would think would never agree or would ever come to agreement fully with one another especially on the City of Winnipeg Act. And from time to time they have had a lot of confrontation in their committee meetings. But on further investigation of the letter I find that they are unanimous, they are unanimous in the respect that they do not want the decision to change the councillors, the number of councillors, the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg, they do not want that decision made in the Cabinet room, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have also found in further investigation that there will be representation at Law Amendments to the First Minister and Minister of Urban Affairs most likely from many many people who are citizen members of committees, many people who were given the idea or the impression that they would have something to say about the operation of the City of Winnipeg and now find that the decisions will be made in the Cabinet room. There will be people there



## BILL 46

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . from many of the members opposite community committees that are involved in their constituencies and probably there will be people there from Rossmere as well, and there will be people probably there from my constituency to say to the government who presented the Winnipeg Act, on the basis that the people would have more to say about their lot and to ask why have you changed your mind now.

Mr. Speaker, I can say this very truthfully, that we on the other side, or the Opposition as we're called, get very surprised when honourable members on the government side get up and keep telling us that the people will have their say. First of all, the structure of Winnipeg, the structure of the City of Winnipeg is designed so that the people can't have their say and then we have also this bill that says there will be decisions made in the Cabinet room as to how many councillors there will be. We have in this bill a small section that has the duties of the Deputy Mayor. You know I don't ever recall seeing a government having to pass legislation regarding the duties of a Deputy Mayor. Why on earth wouldn't the Deputy Mayor have the duties that the Deputy Mayor of Winnipeg had five years ago or the Deputy Mayor of St. James-Assiniboia had that would represent the mayor when necessary, be in the Chair when the Mayor wasn't there. Why in heaven's name do we have a piece of legislation that says certain councillors can't be at certain meetings.

I remember the published report of the - or in the paper that there was some confrontation as to whether the Deputy Mayor could be at a meeting or not. Well let me ask, let me ask the members opposite what they would do if the Economic Development Committee was meeting down the hall here and one of them were not allowed to go to the meeting? Now they can't vote if they're not on the committee but as always has been a practice in government, in city government--(Interjection)--yes, and a privilege, that any member or councillor or elected member has the right to attend any committee meeting he so desires to sit in and listen. And apparently that's not the case in Winnipeg, and apparently we're going to legislate what the duties of the Deputy Mayor are.

A MEMBER: And who shall stand.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I'm rather surprised that this has to be done. This takes away a basic freedom, this takes away from a person who elected a councillor that person's right to be represented on any meetings that go on within that council. And this is people legislation. Mr. Speaker, the Member from Radisson never did ever give a damn about the City of Winnipeg and it's probably obvious he doesn't now.

Mr. Speaker, the decision for the Cabinet to make the decisions, I can remember back in 1971 when they went from meeting to meeting presenting Bill 36 that would amalgamate the City of Winnipeg on the basis that the city people would have more representation. And as I said it is now being taken away from them in this bill. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, somebody had to set up the basic structure to begin with. It's a lousy structure they set up but somebody had to set it up. But after you have set it up and given those people the rights that you gave them and then turn around and take it away from them two years later it doesn't seem like the right thing to do. Everybody agrees that it had to be set up the same as Metro had to be set up but from then on, then on those community committees and those community councillors and the people who are elected as citizen members should have some rights rather than having to try and knock down those big Cabinet room doors to see what the decisions are going to be that are going on behind them.

Mr. Speaker, we have also in this bill a situation where the commissioners, or it would seem that the commissioners will not be as accountable to the elected members as they have been. And right at the present time the commissioners of the City of Winnipeg have too much power. The legislation that is presently before us gives them too much power and now we're intending to give more power to the commissioners in the city or at least we're intending to pass legislation that will make them less accountable to the elected members.

Mr. Speaker, it was rather amazing, and of course the Member from Radisson doesn't read the paper if it's about Winnipeg, but there was in the paper or on a news broadcast one morning that the Chief Commissioner had refused a report to a Committee. Now in all my years in public life as an alderman if a committee required a report from a commissioner, a treasurer or a clerk, whoever it may be, to help make a decision and the commissioner said,

## BILL 46

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . No, you can't have the report because I haven't taken out of it the things that I don't think you should see or not see, it would be just amazing and intolerable. In fact it's rather hard to believe that that type of thing is happening. And now we have a situation by taking out or deleting a section of the bill, of Bill 36, which would seem to make the commissioners less accountable, less accountable to the elected member. And it also means them being less accountable, means a complete change to the structure of the City of Winnipeg Bill.

Mr. Speaker, the structure is such that the people will never have any say in what goes on in the City of Winnipeg. Some areas in your community committees are struggling trying to be successful but not quite making it. You have other areas where they're not even trying. And until you have a situation where the community committees have more autonomy, until you have a situation where a citizen member can attend and give advice to his elected member and know that when it is unanimously accepted by that community committee and it has effect on them in their immediate areas that it will take place, those people are not going to ever be interested in attending too long. Because what happens now, they go down to their community committee, recommendations are accepted, they go from there to the Public Works Committee or whatever it may be, then to the Executive Council Committee, and from the Executive Council Committee, if the commissioners desire it to get through or it's worth talking about, it might end up in Council where there are 50 men voting on it on a basis of no real concern about that particular area. Now that is not a system that is for people. And, Mr. Speaker, the local government is the people government.

A MEMBER: They destroyed that a long time ago . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker if this government has any idea or any misconception that an area government such as Metro or a regional government such as Metro is not necessary to be concerned with the major roads, the major transportation system, welfare problems, zoning, buildings that we all use and even public housing, urban renewal, all of these things that are encompassed in a big city. If they're living under the misconception that there is not required a group of men to be concerned about that particular area they're wrong because there has to be. Just as much as there has to be, Mr. Speaker, a group of men, elected men, who are interested in the people coming to them and they say my garbage wasn't picked up, we need another recreational area, the sidewalks have not been cleaned this winter, there's long grass growing along such and such an avenue that is unsightly. In other words, Mr. Speaker, they're people who are concerned about their own areas, their own streets. They're certainly concerned about urban transportation. But can you really expect a councillor to have concern for the people, about the things that involve the people every day and in the next breath or the next night he's down worrying about whether we're going to have railway abandonment or whether we're going to put an urban transit system in.

Mr. Speaker, you have to have a regional or metro government for those overall things in a city. We had under Metro. We destroyed it after ten years of experience, after ten years of learning how to make it work better, and this government always prefers to talk about Toronto. Toronto stuck with it, is making it work and work better. You're always comparing to Ontario and here we had a structure that was working. Certainly there was confliction between the councils and Metro and so there should be. If Metro is doing something that is going to be harmful to the people in your area your local member should be there to fight for them with Metro or anybody else. Now, Mr. Speaker, it's impossible for your local member to fight for the people with the present structure. Mr. Speaker, the Boundaries Report was tossed aside for a 52 page report that was written by I believe, Mr. Brownstone or something, that man from Ontario, a man from Ontario who put in the Moscow Borough setup for Winnipeg, is basically what it is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we could also read the Members of the Boundaries Commission and they certainly were not all of one party, if you want the names read out I'll get it and do it for you tomorrow for the honourable members. But, Mr. Speaker, we now have a system where the people can't get anything done. They're depressed because they go and give their ideas and they're buried before they even get to the main council meetings. Mr. Speaker, it's really depressing and now we turn around and we say we are going to take further powers away, we're going to take further freedoms away is really what the word is. We are going to take the fact that a councillor from, no matter where he can be, could be eliminated

## BILL 46

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . just by the fellows sitting around the Cabinet room with their feet up having a chat some day and exterminate the councillors as they see fit at any time.

Mr. Speaker, the regional government and the two-tier system as they so-call it, but it's not really two tier, you could have representation from local councils to have your regional government. And I'm quite aware of why the government seems to want to have a commissioner system because they believe that the council's there to make policy, not really to get too excited about where an apartment block goes or where anything else goes. I kind of believe that and I would hope that I'm - in fact I know I'm not betraying any confidences, I just hope the Minister of Mines' memory is as good as mine. I remember one day the St. James Council attended to Metro, a meeting, Mr. Huband was the Chairman, Councillor Huband at that time, in fact he was a little late for that meeting, he was coming from a curling game as I recall. There's nothing wrong with that, he told the people where he was. We were discussing at the time a zoning change which I believe, and I'm very sure which would have allowed an ice cream store in a spot that the City Council of St. James didn't really want to have it. Now it might have been vice versa but we were discussing that particular change of zoning. And I remember after the meeting and a discussion during the meeting the Minister said to me, he said, you know I don't know what we're doing sitting here discussing where an ice cream store should go or where it shouldn't go. I was elected here to make policy.

A MEMBER: Ice cream policy.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I was elected here to make policy. Now that particular situation is really what we have in Winnipeg today. They want the Aldermen up there making policies on great big roads, big transportation, things that we all use over the metro system.

A MEMBER: Anything but ice cream.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Anything but ice cream. It's ironic, but isn't that really what the local aldermen should be interested in. Whether the people have an ice cream store on the corner they want or don't want. Whether they have an apartment block on the corner they want or don't want. Whether their recreation area should be bigger. Whether their playground should be bigger and whether their garbage should be picked up twice or three times a week. That's what the local aldermen should be involved with and you should have the other tier to take care of the metro area. And until you have that you are not going to have proper citizen participation in this city and there's no kidding around it.

It's a bit of a recommendation as to the change they have made. You know the Minister of Public Works he often says "what's your alternative". The only thing I would say to the Minister of Public Works on that is you don't take a rotten apple out of a barrel to replace it with another apple. You take it out of a barrel to save the rest of the apples. And the system that you've got in Winnipeg at the present time has to be saved, it has to be changed, because the people are being overtaxed, they're not being heard and they're not being listened to. And when they go down and try they become an isolated group of people whose talk just fades away in all the bureaucracy getting it through from a local council to the main council. It takes about four or five steps.

So, Mr. Speaker, this particular piece of legislation although it does I must say have some good points in it, but it's like all the legislation of this government they try to sort of sneak in these things with recommendations from the city or recommendations from the Law Reform Commission. I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the election of Mayor is something that the First Minister promised us and he's kept his word, it's going to be done. But I might comment again and say that I have never in my life seen legislation put through a provincial legislature to govern the duties of a deputy mayor. That's just inconceivable to me. The duties of the deputy mayor are decided by the councillors but now we have the duties of the deputy mayor, at least some of his duties, laid out in legislation.

Mr. Speaker, again I say if any councillor can't attend any meeting at any time and if the legislation for the City of Winnipeg prohibits that, members of this Legislature who are not members of Committees should not be allowed in that room in there, because that's exactly what you're doing. But this government you know says what's right for me is not right for the other guy. So therefore this city legislation that eliminates councillors from meetings or allows commissioners to withhold reports so that the councillors can make decisions, Mr. Speaker, it's hypocritical of the government to even consider passing legislation of that kind. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

## BILL 46

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to reply at length to the honourable member's remarks. I recognize that he's been taking some pot shots on the suggestions that I made the other day relative to people attending the Legislature or attending Committee. I would concede, Mr. Speaker, that that is not normally something that I would do. I want him to recall that members of the Opposition had said that we reluctantly appeared before committee and I indicated that what had occurred is that we waited an hour, five government members there and one opposition there, that we waited an hour in order to get the meeting started and that showed no reluctance on our part. I've never bothered raising such things, the fact is that it was raised in the other way. However, that's not a debate that I think is worthwhile carrying on with my honourable friend.

The honourable member raised some other matters with respect to the City of Winnipeg and before I deal with them I want to talk about memory which he referred to earlier in the day. I want to tell the honourable member that I believe that his memory is not correct, and I want to try to recall to him what happened at the meeting that he is referring to and how we got to talking about ice cream parlors. Because the ice cream parlor was used as an example, it wasn't used as a matter of specific discussion. As a matter of fact as difficult as government was in the period before - city government was in the period before the act was changed, it was not the case, Mr. Speaker, that the members of Metro Council and the members of the Council of St. James would sit down and have a meeting to discuss where an ice cream parlor should go. That as difficult, Mr. Speaker, as the form of government was, that was not the purpose of our meeting, and I will try to recall to the honourable member by telling him what happened at the meeting, what the purpose of our meeting was.

We were discussing, Mr. Speaker, whether Metro would make certain repairs on streets in St. James which were declared arterial routes and Ness Avenue was one of them. It was a question of whether we were going to do some immediate work on Ness Avenue, because although Ness was situated in St. James - I believe it was Ness, it may have been another Avenue but I believe it was Ness. The honourable member is nodding his head, so we were not discussing ice cream parlors we were discussing streets. Mr. Speaker, that was years ago. But we were discussing Ness and I want to tell the honourable member what happened at the meeting. He said, the Member for Sturgeon Creek said, that if you will take Ness Avenue out of the Metro street system we would be able to do it ourselves and we could forget about you. And I said "granted we will take Ness Avenue out of the Metro Street system and instead of having Ness paid for by all of the citizens of Greater Winnipeg it will be paid for by the citizens of St. James." And Mr. Mackling said "Not on your life. Do not take it out of the Metro Street system".

So, Mr. Speaker, that is what occurred at the meeting, And that really is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we went to one city government. Because although, Mr. Speaker, people from St. James--(Interjection)--Oh now I'll explain, now I will explain what happened about the ice cream store because, Mr. Speaker, what happened about the ice cream store . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is it relevant to this bill?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yes, definitely.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: It is very relevant to the debate. Because what we started to talk about, Mr. Speaker, is the authority of a municipal council, and when I recall to the honourable member what was said I am sure that he will agree with my position because I believe that he has a respect for liberty and a respect for freedom, and a hate of bureaucracy and a fear of bureaucracy which is similar to my own. And what I said was that once council agreed as to zoning of a particular area, which was the policy, that it was dictatorial, it was wrong, it was heinous, it was a crime for councillors to then say that a person who had property which was zoned for the purpose for which it could be purchased would be prevented by council from doing so. Because what had occurred, and I want to remind the honourable member that this is what happened. In Charleswood a man bought a lot that was zoned for a service station. It was zoned for a service station. He bought it and wanted to build a service station. He was given a building permit by the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. The Mayor of Charleswood prior to the member--(Interjection)--No it wasn't, it was Mayor Hilgenga. He appeared before Council because a group of citizens didn't want the service station, which is always possible. Here's a man who bought property for a service station, for use as a service

## BILL 46

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . station, zoned for a service station. The Mayor of Charleswood - Hilgenga - came to Metro Council and says if you let that service station go there we will not supply water to that service station, we will not give municipal services to that service station.

In Assiniboia, the councillor - and I'll name him - Mort Nemy, after land was zoned for the construction of an apartment building, after the man got a building permit for an apartment building, the councillor said that's okay, he had the right to build there, he had the right zoning but then he has to come to us for certain things and even though he is complying with all the laws we are going to tell him that we want a certain type of frontage on that apartment building; we are going to tell him that he has to build that apartment building in a certain way. And what I said, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member would agree with me, that it is wrong for a bureaucrat to interfere with a man who is complying with the law and that once you set up where ice cream parlors should go it is not for the municipal councillors to argue about whether a particular ice cream parlor should be built. And, Mr. Speaker, that--(Interjection)--Well, Mr. Speaker, does the honourable member, does the honourable member really say that after you have zoned property and I said - and now we're having the same argument - I said that you make the plans, that you set up the zoning, that you declare the policy and then whether an individual has the right or not to build should not depend on the whim of a municipal councillor. The council should be there, Mr. Speaker, to set the zoning program. And you know I believe, I believe that the honourable member believes what I say even more than I believe it myself, that if I--so what he's saying . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, you know, he's saying we're very close to agreement, but the question I would have for him is, do you not believe that the elected local councillor should represent his people to a senior government to express their thoughts on any matter?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that that should be the case. I would question the sincerity of a councillor who defended a group of people or took the position of a group of people - it might even be a small group - against a citizen who bought property zoned for a particular purpose, previously zoned by that same council or if not by that same council by municipal representatives, and in most cases the zoning plans followed the same council zoning, who would take their position as against the right of the individual - because this is what I think that the honourable member respects - take their position, a group of maybe dissatisfied people in the area against a man who has bought property zoned for a particular purpose and then wanted to use that property for that purpose, I would question the person making an appearance on behalf of those citizens, because I tend, Mr. Speaker, and have done it, taken the appearance on behalf of the other person. I have told those people that just as you have a right to build a home in compliance with building restrictions, that man has a right to build on the property for which it was purchased. And I told Hilgenga that if he tried to cut the water out to a person who was building a service station on area zoned for a service station that we would do everything despite the kind of local support he may get against that service station, to protect the man who bought the land for the service station. That's what I told Hilgenga, that's what I told the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Now when he says, does a person have a right to present these things, I say that there are certain things that can be validly presented. If he wants to present that case that's why I told him, that was the only reason where I said that I would not want to argue about whether an individual ice cream store goes in one place or another, I would like to zone the property and then say that the individuals have the right to proceed in accordance with law. And if the honourable member takes that - first of all I want the honourable member to concede with me that we were not talking about an ice cream store, that we were talking about streets, to concede with me that my memory is correct, that I did not specifically say that I don't want to argue about the placing of an ice cream store, that I wanted to talk about zoning generally and that once zoning was done that the people who bought property had a right to use it for the purpose for which it was zoned, and, Mr. Speaker--(Interjection)--Well, on that basis, Mr. Speaker, the argument comes out entirely different because he said that--the honourable member says that he was elected just to set policy. I said, Mr. Speaker, that I was elected to set a zoning policy that I was not elected as a bureaucrat to decide in every case what a man can do with that property, because that is the worst form of government. You know that's the kind

## BILL 46

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . of thing that you are now arguing about in connection with this bill. It is absolutely the worst form of government for a citizen to have to go to government to get permission to do everything that he wants to do in every individual case.

A citizen should know that if he wants to build a parking lot or if he wants to build a service station, or if he wants to build an ice cream parlor, he should look at the zoning map, pick an area which he thinks is zoned for an ice cream parlor, and if it is so zoned he should have the right to build. Now if that is in substance and I say it is - the honourable member I think will concede now that my memory is correct - that I have absolutely no apology for that and I question whether the honourable member would really want to pursue the position that Hilgenga's position was right, that Mort Nemy's position was right. I found it the most reprehensible type of politics that I had ever heard of. That council because they could cut off water, could require, by some sort of leverage could crowbar a citizen into doing something which the law did not require him to do. Now doesn't the honourable member agree with me. Should a council because it has certain leverage require a citizen to do something which the law does not require him to do. Because I say, Mr. Speaker, that it shouldn't, I say that it shouldn't, and that's what we were arguing about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member referred to certain - the honourable member had the message which he would like to ask the question cause I'm dying to answer the Leader of the Opposition's question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister and ask him if he means what he says, what about the City of Winnipeg and the Department of Public Works building the washroom?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg did exactly in that case what no municipal council has the right to do; they tried to do exactly that type of thing. It was zoned for that use, the building complied in all respects with their building restrictions and they said because it's the Provincial Government and because we want to start some trouble, we're not going to let them build. Because the last thing that happened, Mr. Speaker, was we sent them a letter which said as follows, I will repeat the letter in my memory. Some day you can get it on an Order for Return and see if it's correct. "That we understand that the Provincial Government wishes to build a washroom facility on its own property. We understand that the zoning of that property does not preclude that building. We understand that the building complies in all respects with city building restrictions. We understand that despite the foregoing you are refusing a building permit. Kindly advise whether you think that the legislation permits you to refuse a building permit where the zoning is correct and the building complies with restrictions, because if you think that's what the legislation does, we will have to reconsider the legislation." That's the letter we sent, in my memory. Some day you can move for an Order and compare that memory with what I have just said. The City of Winnipeg then granted the building permit. They had no right to refuse it, and they knew that they had no right to refuse it, and that is what I'm saying is the worst type of government, is when councillors on the spot take the position that they are bigger than the law. And you know the City Council takes an entirely different position vis-a-vis, or members of the City Council, with respect to the Clean Environment Commission which we all agree should be the one to set the regulation. They have said, if the Clean Environment Commission says things that we don't like, we should just ignore the Clean Environment Commission. And this is something. Now certain councillors, I don't say that the City of Winnipeg has done that, but certainly that has been the thrust of much of their position.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that the City of Winnipeg Act is not working. I'm paraphrasing him, I'm sorry, I didn't hear all of his remarks but he had various complaints about the City of Winnipeg Act. Well, Mr. Speaker, all of the things that I have said were things that caused a problem with the previous City of Winnipeg Act, and when I say the previous City of Winnipeg Act I am talking about that Act plus the other legislation which saw that Winnipeg was governed by twelve municipal councils plus another government. You know I should admit that there are problems with what we are doing, but the honourable member would have you believe that there were no problems before; that the previous system worked well. Well, Mr. Speaker, the previous system did not work well. There were much more complaints, if we are going to measure complaints, and there were increases in taxation, and

## BILL 46

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . taxes went up every year, and the honourable member would have you believe that the fact that we have now made planning one responsibility for the area and we have not permitted the type of thing that went on before, that we have now said that all citizens of Winnipeg will share an equal assessment responsibility for what goes on in the city . . .

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

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question, the Honourable Minister. He analyzed by saying that certainly the previous form of government did not work well. Because of his analytical powers I wonder if he could delve into the reasons, the basic reasons why it did not work well in his opinion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did that . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the honourable gentlemen would give me a moment to introduce a group of students, 45 in number, Grade 12 standing from Grant-Deuvel, South Dakota. They're under the direction of Mr. Les Hellevang.

The Honourable Minister.

BILL 46 Cont'd

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome the students from South Dakota, they're just south of North Dakota, and we are much much happier welcoming their shining student faces than we would the water problems that are being suggested from North Dakota. I welcome them here today.

Somebody has given me a note, I don't understand the note so I am not going to speak on it. Obviously it was to help me in debate but I'm sorry I don't . . .

The honourable member says should I analyze what was wrong with the previous government. Mr. Speaker, I did it, I'm not going to repeat it. It is available for the honourable member in Hansard of 1968 and Hansard of 1969, which I did it on two occasions. I did it on Metro Council, that unfortunately is not recorded. It would be wrong to go back into that debate. It is available to the honourable member, he can look it up.

There were serious problems under the previous form of government and I know that whenever government does something that they have to accept responsibility for what they did, and if what we did was not strong enough to withstand the kind of criticism that is being pursued by the Member for Sturgeon Creek and which is being carried on by - well okay the Member for St. Boniface although I didn't hear him yet, some of the municipal councillors . . . I believe that we are strong enough to withstand it. I believe that the citizens of Greater Winnipeg will accurately judge our progress in this regard and that we have to know that that type of criticism will be forthcoming. You know that once you do something new that everything that goes wrong with it can be attributed to you. We know that the public sometimes forgets that problems did not start with the new system, and you hope that you're able to convince the people of Manitoba through the political and electoral process that you have done things in their interest, and if you have not been able to convince them then it's possible that your program did not solve the problem. But everytime you do something like that you expect that type of criticism and therefore I do not in any way sort of complain about the speech that the honourable member has made, I am trying to answer it, and I am trying on the basis of the position as it existed.

The honourable members have talked about the tax problem. Well, Mr. Speaker, they talked about it before and my recollection is that I went to the cities which did not have one city government and we demonstrated that the taxes went up in those cities at least as much as they went up in the City of Winnipeg. And therefore how credible is it to say that the municipal tax problems that you have relate to the fact that you have created a new form of government. I mean if there are arguments, let us have the arguments on the basis of something that is credible. Toronto still has a metro form of government; Toronto still has one metro form of government with a whole series of municipalities. The newspapers in Toronto are saying - I cut some out and then I leave them alone, but if I have to retrieve them for the honourable member, I'll get them - that there should be an amalgamated government in the City of Toronto, because of the taxes, because of the problems that they are having with city government. The last thing that I read relative to the Toronto mill rate was that they were going up, Mr. Speaker, by over seven mills without including the school levies. That they were going up by rates which

## BILL 46

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . were very comparable to those in the City of Winnipeg. Would the honourable member not agree that some of the increase in the City of Winnipeg relates to the fact of inflation, to increased costs, to things of that nature? Does he say, Mr. Speaker, he really say that had there been no city government that the tax rates in the City of Winnipeg would have stayed the same over the past three years? Well of course he doesn't say that. So that really, Mr. Speaker, is not the problem. And the problem is whether it is more effective to govern the city through a unified municipal council or whether it is more effective to govern it in the way which it was before. And I will concede to the honourable member that we have not yet reached the most effective system. Nobody has claimed that the millennium has arrived.

What we said were the two basic things to be achieved with the advent of a new municipal form of government was (1) that every citizen in Winnipeg would bear an equal share, equalized in terms of assessment, to the costs of running Greater Winnipeg. That the people in Tuxedo would not have an advantage over the people in St. Vital, that the people in St. James would not have an advantage over the people in North Winnipeg, that everybody would share equally the responsibility of running what was one social and economic unit, that the tax disparity that existed previously often existed in the most inequitable way, in that some of the more wealthy municipalities had an advantage over some of the less wealthy municipalities, and that what we said is that we don't know what will happen in the future, we don't know what development is needed, but what we do know is that there should be one tax rate and that all of the citizens of Winnipeg should bear an equal responsibility for it. That has been accomplished. That was Number One.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, that the municipalities would be able to operate within an effective development plan. Because what was the situation prior to the existence of one unified city? The situation, Mr. Speaker, was that each municipality retain for itself a greater than equal share of its industrial assessment, which meant, Mr. Speaker, that because the cement works was in Tuxedo the greatest portion of the cement works' taxation went to the City of Tuxedo. Because the packinghouses were in St. Boniface there was a lure used to get them there many years ago in order that the industrial revenue from packinghouses would stay in the Province of St. Boniface. So what did you have, Mr. Speaker? You had a very peculiar situation. Where you had a dormitory municipality such as St. Vital, such as West Kildonan, they were penalized two ways. They had high municipal costs because they had a great number of residences. They had high school costs; they had high recreational costs and they had no industrial revenue. And in order to be on a par with somebody else they were in the schizophrenic position of feeling that we had to lure some industrial revenue to the municipality of St. Vital or to the Municipality of West Kildonan in order to get a fair tax shake, and you had competition between various municipal governments in Greater Winnipeg - well the honourable member is nodding his head and he knows it's a fact - asking for the most unusual things in their constituency.

I mean, for instance, I think that Transcona was looking for a fish plant. Mr. Speaker, I'm not saying we don't need fish plants, and fish plants can be run in a very clean and economic method now. But if you had to choose as to whether you wanted one next door or you didn't want one next door I would think that the average residential property owner would say, if it's all the same, if it's all the same I would rather that it was not next door. And that --(Interjection)--What's that? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba suggested that it should be put at Selkirk and of course the reason that Selkirk wanted it was for industrial revenue and so that it would be closer to people who traditionally worked in the plant. Perhaps it should have gone to Selkirk but the Federal Government in their wisdom decided that it would go in the Town of Transcona.

What I am trying to stay with and the Leader of the Opposition obviously doesn't wish me to deal with the subject, is that you had dormitory municipalities looking for industrial plants thereby upsetting the kind of balance that existed in the municipality. What is the situation now? The situation now is that no matter where an industrial plant takes place in Greater Winnipeg, no matter where an apartment block is built, no matter where a kind of heavy assessment industry is located, it accrues to the city as a whole. It doesn't accrue to that area. What has been the result? The area now plans industrial complexes and you do not get parts of the city saying we would like the abattoir situated next to us or we would like the



## BILL 46

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . oil refinery situated in our backyard. Because that's what happened. East St. Paul pushed very hard for an oil refinery. The oil refinery is not going to be there much longer, or at least they indicated that they were leaving, I don't know what their immediate situation is. But they gave a huge tax concession to get that oil refinery. In three years or several years after it was there, and I am personally acquainted with it, there was an oil spill, Mr. Speaker, which had a devastating effect on market gardeners in the area. People's plants were destroyed. The leaves on the trees went. It was something apparently that they were willing to accept, or which they were at least willing to run the risk of in order to get the industrial assessment. Apparently they made a bad deal. I'm not aware of the full particulars of it but the Minister of Health is aware of it, and eventually they didn't even realize what they thought would be the industrial revenues that they were entitled to. But the fact is that that's what occurred. You did not have planning; you did not have industrial planning. Metro Council could destroy - and we were in that position. We could destroy a group of citizens in terms of their taxation integrity by saying there will be no industrial revenue in St. Vital or in West Kildonan; and by all reasonable planning standards it should have been said, because it was not the proper area to have industrial revenue encroach upon. But we were in the difficult position, Mr. Speaker, of saying that if we did that we were denying these municipalities a share of industrial revenue which they wanted to ease their taxation burden.

So those, Mr. Speaker, were priorities No. 1 and priorities No. 2 of the reorganization of Greater Winnipeg, and both those things have been accomplished. Both those problems have been solved. They have been solved to - I'm not saying that there isn't still things that can be done, but in great measure--(Interjection)--Well the member says they could have solved them as Metro. Certainly they could have been solved in other ways. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, you know I respect his opinion, he believes that the best form of government for Greater Winnipeg would be some form of government to look after over-all services and municipal governments, 13 of them, to look after what he would call incidental problems like police, fire, local parks, recreation--oh, he doesn't say it. All right. Well take out police and fire, Mr. Speaker, take out the police and--oh he wants to take out the police and fire. All right. Put the police and fire under the Metro Government - because I wanted him to say that. Mr. Speaker, do you know what that leaves in adjustable expenses for the municipalities before Metro? It would leave, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to be conservative in my argument, it would leave not more than five percent of adjustable expenses to a municipal council. And the honourable member seems to think that even though they would have almost no fiscal elbow room or fiscal responsibility, because if you take out police and fire out of their budgets, out of the municipal budgets, there would be almost nothing left. It was police, fire, education - yes, public works which each of them, Mr. Speaker, public works - let's recall what happened. They wanted Ness Avenue included. St. Boniface wanted Tache included. West Kildonan wanted Salter Street included. What did these people want? They wanted over-all Winnipeg to pay for their streets; they wanted Metro to pay for their streets. I know it. They came to us and asked for it. They went to Walter Weir. The City of Winnipeg was the only council that acted in my opinion insanely in this respect.

The outlying municipalities came to Mr. Weir, and I was there, and they said please make our streets Metro streets. That way they will be our streets but everybody will pay for them. --(Interjection)--One man, Mr. Speaker. Well I'm sorry I used the word "insane" because I don't attribute that adjective to the honourable member. I'll have to figure out a different word. A peculiar position, this total council would never have asked for Ness to go back into St. James, because if Ness Avenue had to be paid for by St. James then, Mr. Speaker, that cost would be borne by the citizens of St. James. If Ness was paid for by Metro it was paid for by all of Winnipeg. And, Mr. Speaker, all of the outlying municipalities, including St. James, despite the fact that the honourable member may have been a dissident, including St. James, kept pushing roads on to Metro. --(Interjection)--The honourable member says it was a game. I know it was a game. I know it was a game. And the City of Winnipeg of which I was a taxpayer and I raised hell, they said these are our streets. They belong to Winnipeg. We don't want them in the Metro system. So they took the entire central core out of Greater Winnipeg and I was left paying the load instead of you. And I believe it's better for you to pay than for me to pay. And that's what the suburbs said and they were right. They were absolutely right.

So we said, Mr. Speaker, that there should be a street system, and you cannot try to

## BILL 46

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . figure out whether Salter Street which runs - Salter Street is probably the longest street in Winnipeg. It goes all the way to the north and then if you follow it through Isabel, Balmoral, Osborne, it goes all the way to the southern extremity. You can actually follow it right through Highway No. 1 all the way. How does one say that Salter Street north of Mountain ceases to be an arterial highway; or how does one know whether Mountain as it intersects with Salter is arterial or not arterial? And we said look, we have one transportation system, one street system and it should be paid for by all of the citizens of Greater Winnipeg. And we should not have this game. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface will agree it was a game, should not have this game of municipal councils throwing in arterial streets so that everybody pays and the City of Winnipeg taking out so the people of Winnipeg pay. I mean that's a bad game. I'm losing in that game, Mr. Speaker. And I do not like to lose. I have always believed that it is better to receive than to give, I'm with the municipal councillors.

Mr. Speaker, we had a game - the Member for - do you know what happened, Mr. Speaker? Metro put up a reservoir in Greater Winnipeg. It was in Fort Garry. And it went a considerable distance, probably a couple of city blocks, and on the other side of the street there were two or three or - well I'm now maybe exaggerating in my favour - there were a few residences. The City of Fort Garry immediately conducted a public improvement petition to find out whether those residents wanted their street paved. Well the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, the honourable member will know exactly why they did it immediately. Because if the streets were paved Metro Winnipeg had assessed them for two blocks steady which they would be assessed on by Fort Garry, which I would pay as a citizen of Winnipeg, and you as a citizen of St. Boniface, and you as a citizen of Sturgeon Creek to have a street paved for the City of Fort Garry, to raise the value of that street for the City of Fort Garry who would then sell the lots and get the revenue for the Municipality of Fort Garry, at the expense of the rest of the cities of Winnipeg. And, Mr. Speaker, for ten years the object of municipal councils was to sit down and figure out with a pencil how they could undo the people in the other areas. Mr. Speaker, it was a game. Oh well, Mr. Speaker, I know that that is what they did. The municipal councils--if they didn't do that, Mr. Speaker, if they didn't do that they wouldn't be doing their job. Because if I was a member of a municipal council I would want to see how much of the budget could be payable by the entire City of Winnipeg and how much I could relieve my taxpayers. And that was the game, and the Member for St. Boniface knows damn well that that was the game and every other municipal councillor who is here knows damn well that that was the game. And we have not--(Interjection)--What's fair to whom? To whom? To me. That's right. Now, Mr. Speaker, what we did was we said that we're going to change that and there was a third objective. I know I've only got a few minutes left but there was a third objective.

And that third objective was to say we now have 13 administrations. It is impossible to move from 13 to 1 without a mechanism whereby the administration continues, and we devised a system of community committees coterminous with the previous boundaries in order that the administration would continue and in order to provide for what many municipal councils claimed was necessary, and that was a vehicle to deal with local participation which they said was being lost by the new city. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was never my major consideration with the community committees. My major consideration - that's my person - my major consideration was that from December 31st to January 1st the administration continues, that people do not suffer. And I say, Mr. Speaker, and in this I will be what I'm trying not to be, I will try to commend what we did in terms which are more self-serving than I normally use, that I believe that the transition from the 13 to the 1 was done in miraculous fashion; that there was no disturbance on the part of the delivery of services to the people of the City of Winnipeg. And I consider that to be a major accomplishment. That was really done very well. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have three minutes?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member have leave to proceed for three more minutes? (Agreed) The honourable member.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that was my major reason and the other major reason was to make sure that there was a provision, a vehicle for local participation, and that was one of the things that was discussed in the bill at the time and every time I spoke on it I indicated that it was an attempt, it wasn't the major point of the bill. The major point of the bill was in my opinion the first two things that I mentioned but that this was an attempt and if it worked it would

## BILL 46

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . be a plus, and if it didn't work it would not be a detraction from the other reasons for the bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the municipal councils spoke about this participation. I appeared as either lawyer or representative in another way in most municipal councils in Greater Winnipeg at their council meetings. And they were no different than our council meetings. If a man had an immediate interest in the problem that was on the agenda he was there. And if he didn't have immediate interest in the problem he was watching television or playing golf or doing something else. And who wouldn't - I mean of these people who are here today probably have nothing else to do, that very few of them are actually very interested in what is going on. I'm not being critical, I think that most of the time - with rare exceptions - you do something other than participate in the process of municipal government. You elect councillors and you hope that they will do a job. And that was my experience. I was in Old Kildonan; I was at Transcona; I was at St. James; I was at St. Boniface; I was at all of them. And the fact is you did not have a whole group of citizens revving it up at every one of these council meetings. But the municipal councillor said that this participation was being destroyed, and therefore in order not to destroy, Mr. Speaker, because nobody likes to destroy, this concept was part of the plan. And in the plan it was indicated that in five years' time, - I can't remember the exact number of years but it would certainly be before the next Metro election - having accomplished the major program we will look at the plan, we will see where it is working, we will see where it is not working, and where it is not working we will try to improve it still more. The things that I stand here confident in, Mr. Speaker, is that municipal government makes more sense in 1974 than it made in 1968, and to that extent, Mr. Speaker, this government has accomplished a great deal for municipal government in Greater Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I have one or two comments I want to make. I was pleased to see the Minister come out and state his piece on community committees because I feel that . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to apologize to the honourable member. I do have to leave and I'll have to read what he says.

MR. MOUG: . . . but I know that at the time Bill 36 was brought in this seemed to be one of the highlights, the community committee and the people participation. And you ask the councillors now through the several community committees and they'll tell you that the people were coming out and participating, that when they took their wants downtown they were just thrust aside by bureaucracy, as the Minister mentioned, and he said that's the worst possible thing that you can have in a community or for people to be faced with day in and day out.

A good example is the bureaucracy in the new city: I have been in the sewer construction for about 15 years; never needed a licence in Charleswood because I was paying business tax there. When this city came in, I needed a licence. It took me from January 1, 1971 to sometime in April 1974 to buy a licence. So there was two full years, plus two months, that I wandered in and out of offices, and I think I hit every one, where there was a public employee, I must have hit it in the City of Winnipeg, that was employed by the City of Winnipeg.

Now the taxes have gone up, and sure they were going to go up anyway, but how far they were going to go up nobody knows, and the Minister uses that for an argument. Who can argue whether the taxes are higher now than they would have been if we had stayed where we were or are they lower. Well I know in District 6 that we're involved in, Charleswood, Tuxedo and Fort Garry, I'll guarantee you there's 30 foremen in that area, and I'll guarantee you previous to that there wasn't ten. And everybody's got a new half ton. There's trucks and equipment running around like you wouldn't believe. You can't get the trucks on the road to pick up the snow because the graders are in the road, and the graders can't get down the street properly because the loaders are in the road. Well we didn't need that in Charleswood before and the streets were cleaned up in a day or two after a storm. But it's just the bureaucracy that's built up the very thing that the Minister of Mines says that they were trying to get away from, the thing he doesn't like. But this is what we're trapped with now.

And the zoning - I wish I'd caught the Minister before he left, there was one thing I wanted to ask him. When he was making reference to Mayor Hilgenga that was in office there previously to myself, I was hoping that he wouldn't keep pointing over towards this chair here because if anybody in the gallery thought I was Mayor Hilgenga, I sure wouldn't want that to

## BILL 46

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . stick. But Mayor Hilgenga had a justified fight when he went down to Metro and tried to stop that service station from being built because that zoning was put through by Metro, and we didn't always agree with the zoning that they brought in and certain parts of the government. But as the Member for Sturgeon Creek says just when Metro was starting to gel together and realized the responsibilities they had to municipalities, and the municipalities realizing the responsibility they had to them, this is when Metro disappeared. It was finally starting to function and now we've gone back into a gray area between people and City Council and nobody knows where they're at again.

But this is exactly what the Mayor of Charleswood at that time was fighting, was the zoning that Metro had put in and they were opposed to. There's some zoning in Charleswood there that's commercial property: it's been zoned commercial for 30 years. Now that doesn't mean just because somebody chopped the bush off it, after unbeknown to a lot of people they build residential homes and all there and invested their lifesavings, that they should chop the trees off the commercial lot and slap up a service station. This is when the city should say, sorry we're going to rezone that back to residential because it's just long-standing unbeknown to us type zoning. And we have lots of that zoning. As a matter of fact now that zoning dates back to 1914 on the original survey so if you start using that zoning as up-to-date, I don't think it's the right thing to do.

And even if you use updated zoning in the industrial area that my business outlet is - Bill 1800 came out in December of 1971, and that regulates the zoning in Tuxedo, Fort Garry and Charleswood in District 6. The ink wasn't dry on the bill that came out of Metro before the people were down asking for change in zoning. Because the regulations were different in the new bill than they had been for certain zonings in other bills and that's the very reason you can't regulate zoning such as the Minister was mentioning and hope it's going to stay there.

The big problem with the city now, and why bureaucrats have a better chance to operate is the size of it. It's the same as the Provincial Government, the bigger it gets in its departments the more trouble an individual taxpayer has of getting through and getting what they want. And that's happened with the City of Winnipeg now where you had a possibility to hit Charleswood or St. James and do something, whether it was an ice cream stand, whether it was a service station, or whatever, you had a chance to get there. But certainly not any more.

I was wondering what the Minister--I noticed he didn't mention anything about the regulatory powers that Cabinet is going to have - what he thinks about that from a bureaucratic level. Does he think that the people in the City of Winnipeg are going to really appreciate to know that 10 or 15 men in the Treasury Bench are going to sit behind closed Cabinet doors and regulate the lives of the people in Winnipeg. They don't have any representation there, they don't have a councillor, they don't have a MLA, or anybody, to debate what the government's going to be doing.

His theory on what you do with the City of Winnipeg, I say you could take the entire province and work it the way he says the City of Winnipeg is supposed to work. You could wipe out Brandon; there's no reason for a council in Dauphin; there's no reason for a council in the City of Winnipeg. You absolutely regulate the whole thing by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and all you need is 15 men. Not that's a waste of money. If you're going to take 15 men from the Province of Manitoba, there's a cheaper way. You get rid of 14 of them and you run it with one man - dictatorship. Now that is what the end result I think the Minister of Mines' argument would be. You cut it right down to one person, and we know that doesn't work.

--(Interjection)--No, but he said that the City of Winnipeg is better by being under one governing council rather than under the 12 it was at before, because you cut out this and you cut out that and everybody has an equal chance at it. Well I say if that's the argument, then the whole province can be run . . .

A MEMBER: By one government.

MR. MOUG: By one government. Then you simply take that by Section 20, subsection 5, and you know the amendment gives the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council power to change the number, etc. etc. And there's two or three of those in that Act. And that's the explanation the Premier give us. Now if it's all going to be handled by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council we're down to 15 men, and it's got to be cheaper than what we're doing now throughout the Province of Manitoba running with several local councils. Now if that works that way with 15, you cut 14 of those and run it with one, and that's economy, and that's exactly what this

BILL 46

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . government is heading this province into, very very slowly. If they get elected twice more it will give them another eight years, that they haven't had now, and give them 16, you'll find out most of what I said in the last five minutes is right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate on this bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 52

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 52. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 52, an Act to Amend The Credit Unions Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is merely to tidy it up somewhat in terms of the legal language that is used to determine the fact that all moneys deposited in credit unions are indeed secure. There has been some expression of doubt in recent times on the part of some lawyers who would like to use the credit union system for the depositing of trust funds but found that the legal terminology in the present Act is such that there was some question as to the security of those deposits. So it's really a housekeeping bill, there's really no matter of principle involved.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I recommend the bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, that Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider 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 St. Vital in the Chair.

SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Highways, Resolution 64--pass. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): We would have no serious objection to that except that I believe that the Minister had just started his remarks in response to the questions that have been posed on this side of the House, and I am sure that the Minister would not want to let this opportunity go by without fully informing the House as to the activities of his department, and replying to the questions that have been posed by members on this side of the House concerning all of the roads in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, we only had a few minutes last night and I intend to take just a little bit more than a couple of minutes to deal with some of the questions and ideas and opinions put forth in the comments that were made by the various members that have spoken on this particular department.

First of all before I say anything more I must thank the members for being so very kind and extended their compliments to me for a job well done I understood. There have been a number of - and I thank them for it - but there have been a number of items that were mentioned which I think I should deal with briefly and I hope that I can follow some of the notes that I've scribbled on the pages that I had before me as the Members were making their comments and I'd like to give the proper answers I hope. The staff will be here very shortly.

Now the first member that spoke on the Department of Highways Estimates was the Honourable Member for Virden, and he made a number of comments that I should deal with at this time. First of all I think he did make a statement whereby he stated that insofar as our

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) . . . . PR maintenance is concerned that in his opinion the maintenance program on our PRs is falling apart. I recall during this session on a number of occasions the Member for Arthur - who is not in his seat at the present time - but he also has made this statement on a couple of occasions, and I certainly don't agree with that statement because really this is not the case.

I'd just like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that prior to this government taking office, and the members of the Official Opposition will recall that even at that time they were looking into the program called "Maintenance Management", which we have tried to follow, and perhaps it is not the best idea because it's pretty well computerized. By having it computerized I think the computers will feed out what you feed into them, and this is strictly based on normal conditions. But if you do have abnormal conditions then you can forget about your computerization, and I've always said over the last three years, or almost three years since I've been in the department, I've instructed the various district engineers to use their better judgment and to grade roads--(Interjection)--the which?--(Interjection)--Oh, well I'm not sure, it might have been. But anyway I have stated to the district engineers in the various districts in the province where we have twelve of them, that if and when you see that the maintenance management as such does not work to the best interests of all concerned then we, as a Department of Highways and the engineers in their particular districts, should use their better judgment, which they assure me they have done. Therefore when someone says that our PRs have not been maintained to the same degree as before, this is not true. I'll tell you why.

First of all, if you recall when the Provincial Government took over some of these roads as PRs at that time, the load weights on those roads were 44,000 lbs., I believe, and then after a period of a few years that was increased to 48. Today, and for a number of years now, we have increased it to 72 or 74, with 2,000 lbs. tolerance we've made it 74. So that in itself does make quite a difference in the wear and tear of the roads because of the increased weights, and also we must remember too that as years go by there is more traffic, loadwise, and just normal traffic, that travels these roads because of the increased numbers of vehicles that people in Manitoba have.

Well, I'm just wondering, Mr. Chairman, if I could just carry on and perhaps later on I would concede to a question.

So be that as it may, I would like to just quote some figures here to substantiate what I'm trying to put across. If you look on our PRs, and this I'm dealing with summer maintenance alone, never mind the winter maintenance, I have those figures here, but winter maintenance is usually snow plowing and the likes, but summer maintenance is a little different. If you go back to 1966-67, at that time we had 7,326.3 miles of road, and in 66-67 for summer maintenance we spent, the government of the day spent \$3,532,275, and of course every year it's been increasing until we get to 1972-73, we have 7,539 miles, just a little bit over 200 miles more, where we have spent \$6,367,260 on maintenance, and this is only summer maintenance. I have the figures for winter maintenance as well. But however the winter maintenance really is not all that important for the simple reason that it all depends usually on the amounts of snow you have. That's what winter maintenance is all about.

So therefore, as I said before, I certainly don't agree, that some members have made some comments that perhaps the rural municipalities when they had these roads before they were turned over to the government that they looked after them better than the government of the day. As a matter of fact there have been one or two complaints that we've been told about and we've gone to the local municipality, we've even asked some of the councillors to go with us on these roads and they find out that really the complaints are uncalled for. So that this is one of the items that I wanted to mention insofar as our PR maintenance is concerned.

The question of access roads off of PRs where there is pavement. There is a policy, as I'm sure that some of the honourable members opposite know, that access roads off of PTHs up to five miles, access roads were built and paved. That was the policy, and that policy still is in existence. The Honourable Member for Virden mentioned the fact that perhaps this should be looked into and perhaps we should have paved access roads off of PRs. This is something I might say, Mr. Chairman, that we have been discussing this in the last few months with our departmental people and we are hoping that we can proceed with this kind of program next year, hopefully, if not sooner.

There have been quite a number of statements made by the various members who have

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd). . . . spoken in regard to, and I really agree that this is of great concern to most of the rural members like myself, in regard to what the Department of Highways is planning or doing, planning to do, because of the possible abandonment of some of our branch lines in the Province of Manitoba. And I can assure you that I am very concerned about it because in my home town we have the same kind of situation where we are situated on a branch line which is due to be abandoned as well. As I said before in answer to a question some time ago I hope that the abandonment does not take place to the same extent that is being proposed. We'll try and do everything we can to try and stop it; however this is something that we don't know for sure.

But in regard to the branch line abandonment and what the department is doing, or trying to do, in regard to upgrading of the roads, I believe, Mr. Chairman, and I've said so to our federal people, that this is not only the responsibility of the provincial governments, whether it's Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta, I believe that this is also a responsibility of the Federal Government as well. By responsibility I mean that if there is any money to be put in to upgrade the roads in order that they may be able to withstand the larger loads of grain, and what have you, if that ever comes about, that it is also the responsibility of the Federal Government to have some input, financial input, along with the provinces for the upgrading of these particular roads that will then be used for hauling greater loads. At the present time we are dealing with not only Manitoba but also the two other western provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta, where we are trying to reach an agreement to have some financial input which each province will match that amount to try and do just that very thing. The only problem is we have not been able to have an agreement because there have been some discrepancies here, there have been some disagreements between the other provinces, and as far as I understand that unless all the three provinces sign, then this will not go forward. We have been asking for a fair share of the money from the Federal Government which we feel will be necessary to upgrade these roads for these particular loads in the future.

I am also quite proud of the fact--as I mentioned in my opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, that we have had a number of problems with the increase in our road program insofar as the contractors are concerned - well not really as far as the contractors, I think it's really our problem, because when we decided to expand our program in the various areas, we have run into a problem whereby we were not able to purchase land for right of way, as one of the major problems in our whole construction program. If we're dealing with the highways program on a year to year basis this is the kind of problem that we'll always run into because the minute you go into expropriation, which at times this happens, then it simply means that by the time that is resolved it usually takes several months, and we only have several months a year to construct the roads; that means that by the time this particular problem is settled the year is over. So we are now in the process of planning on a three year program in order to, specifically to alleviate this problem of land purchases for right of way.

Now on some of the other points that were made by, I believe, the Honourable Member for Portage, and he pointed out - he was asking about the road east of Lake Winnipeg. Well, you know, we have a lot of roads in the Province of Manitoba, PTHs and PRs but there are always other roads that no doubt are necessary, and I can state to the Honourable Member for Portage that at the present time we are looking at this possibility. However, when this will come about I'm not prepared to say because I really don't know. I don't think the department is really in the position to proceed with this particular road construction on the east side of Lake Winnipeg. But it seems to me that some time in the near future the time will come when we might have to consider this very seriously.

The Honourable Member for Portage also mentioned the road from Whitemouth to Rennie and he stated it was sort of a disgrace the condition that the road is in. Well I sort of agree with him that it is, but there is a reason for it. Don't forget, I might say to the honourable member that this road was originally paved probably in 1932 and there were no major repairs done to this road until 1953, or something like 21 years later before any major repairs were done to it. And you know there were some other, some of the other honourable members of the Liberal party have suggested that roads ought to be constructed in such a way that they would be able to carry heavier loads, and so that we won't have to repair them that often. And I know something about the program that the Liberal Government at that time had insofar as road construction was concerned because I have a very good recollection of Highway No. 20

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) . . . . from Dauphin north to Winnipegosis. The way that road was constructed that no more than a year after it was constructed it was breaking up, it was nothing but potholes, and I would tend to guess that over the years until, well just until two years ago, before that road was reconstructed, that I would venture a guess that perhaps the amounts of money that was spent in fixing, in patching and repatching over and over again probably cost the taxpayers of Manitoba just as much money as the original road that was built. These are the kind of things that we are facing from time to time on the various roads.

But getting back to this particular road, I think the honourable member mentioned Whitemouth to Rennie. I believe he meant Whitemouth to Seddons Corner. However, I would like to point out that although there were no major repairs until 1953 this portion of the program on this road was in our program last year but we ran into other problems. First of all, as I mentioned earlier, the purchase of right-of-way, and then there was another problem with the Hydro and Telephone because of the fact that they could not get - there was a shortage of materials and poles and what have you - they were not able to move and get new materials and poles and wire, and what have you, and therefore we were stymied, we couldn't move because of this particular situation. So that is another reason why nothing was done on that particular road last year although we said we had it on our program. But we run into these kind of snags and therefore you could realize, I'm sure the members can realize the value of a three year planning program such as we are implementing at the present time.

The honourable member also inquired about the Sign Committee. He asked if we have received a report. I'm glad to report, Mr. Chairman, and to the Members of the House, that the report from the Signing Committee has been received and was presented to me, as a matter of fact there were two reports, interim report and then the final report, and what we are trying to do here is - we realize that from time to time we get requests, and this I suppose has been happening over the years that a lot of people in various organizations would like to see all kinds of advertising on our highways, putting up all kinds of signs. And sometimes it's very difficult to say no, but I think that really what our highways are meant to be is not an advertising map. We have signs on our highways dealing with the kind of signs that should be on the highway but not telling the travellers perhaps when you're reaching Park and Regent development or Westman, or when you're out of it, and all these kind of things. So that we have not agreed to that. We'll try to keep our signs to a minimum.

But there are other signs dealing with advertising. There are all kinds of advertising signs. If you travel the highway and the byways in the Province of Manitoba you'll find all kinds of signs that are erected. Some very close to the roads, some further up, and some are very deplorable. Those kind of signs really should not be there, and this committee that we've appointed has gone out to have a survey and they have their reports in today. I don't think that it is one of the things that I might say, I don't think it is important if the Honourable Member, for example, from Morris was selling fertilizer for example - I just use it as an example - in Morris and I'm travelling from Dauphin, I don't care if the honourable member is selling fertilizer in Morris. If he has the business there the local people will know and I don't think that we should have these kind of signs on our highways, unless they are really beneficial to the travelling public from all over. So this is what the Sign Committee is looking at and we hope that we will be able to clean up some of those eyesores that we have on our highways as far as signs are concerned.

There have been a number of comments made by the members opposite insofar as the taxicab business in the City of Winnipeg is concerned, and I realize that sometimes it is a problem. We've had meetings with the drivers, the owners and the drivers, not too long ago when they sort of demonstrated here on a very short notice, and I think really that they had a real good cause. They were telling us at that time that because of the rates, and what have you, they were not able to hire the kind of drivers because they weren't getting enough money and therefore no one was really - not too many people were really interested in driving a taxicab. Well all right, we talked it over and we did give them certain increases, and we said we want to have of all things, most important of all, we wanted to see better service. Since we gave them these certain increases they were satisfied at the time, and we said to them very very emphatically, very clearly, that if that's your problem then this is what we'll do, and we certainly hope that you can give us better service because we will have another look at the situation if service is not improved. Now the taxicab board is keeping a very close tab on this thing,



## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) . . . . and I know it is a little too early to assess the situation but I'm sure in the next few months we'll have another look at it and if taxi service in the City of Winnipeg is not improved, then of course we'll have no choice but to give out more licences for taxis in the City of Winnipeg. But we have to be fair with the owners and the drivers to make sure that we agree, and we are in full agreement, that we know that there is a great shortage, if there is a great shortage - and I'm told if there still is - if the service is not improving, then of course we'll have to do something about it.

I'm just trying to get my notes straight here. The Member for Assiniboia had a number of questions, and I certainly cannot disagree with one of the questions that the honourable member asked. It was in regard to professional drivers, and I would like to inform the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that we are going to be dealing with this very shortly. I have a number of amendments, I believe it is under The Highway Traffic Act, where we are proposing class licences. This will involve a number of different people in different classes whether they're driving school buses, taxis, trucks, and what have you. So in other words there will be different kinds of courses that they'll have to take in order to qualify, driving courses that they'll have to take in order to qualify for that particular class of licence. And I think that the honourable member will be satisfied that this is a step in the right direction.

As far as the seat belts are concerned we have had a lot of discussion. I might point out that as a matter of fact last fall, Mr. Chairman, the Ministers responsible for the Motor Vehicles Branches all across Canada were present in Charlottetown and many items were discussed, including the question of seat belts, compulsory use of seat belts in our automobiles. After a lengthy discussion it was decided that perhaps this is something which is a good idea but nevertheless it is hard to police. By saying this, I'm not saying that we are going to drop the whole idea but I think that what we should do - and this was agreed upon by all the various Ministers at that time - that perhaps we should pass out some sort of information, literature, and what have you, asking, requesting the general public to use seat belts at all times, but before we legislate we should educate first to see how it turns out by asking them on a voluntary basis. We certainly hope that they will use it. You know there are a number of cases, too, where it has been brought to my attention where a person who had been using their seat belt was not able to get out of the car because of an accident. Perhaps rolled into a ditch which was full of water. So therefore we're looking at all kinds of information we can possibly get, you know, just how much safer are seat belts as such. And maybe there are certain cases where they could be a hindrance rather than a safety.

But before we bring in legislation - I think the other provinces, as I have said, have the same view on it as we have - we're trying to pass out all kinds of information and pamphlets on the use of seat belts before we bring in the kind of legislation . . . I would ask the Honourable Member for Assiniboia at this time though that insofar as safety I do recall, and I'm sure all honourable members recall, three years ago I believe it was when the former Minister of Highways tried to bring in legislation dealing with the compulsory use of helmets for people who use motorcycles. I think the members will recall the kind of demonstration that took place here and of course the presentations that were made by some of these people to the Law Amendments Committee, I believe, and it was decided to drop the whole thing at that time. I might inform the House right now that in the hopper as it were that there is this legislation coming up again and --(Interjection)-- Beg your pardon? Well perhaps, but I certainly would like to hear some comments from the other members on the other side if we will be able to get support. I think I've got support from the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and - well not verbally, but I'm sure that the Liberal group in this House will give support on that, and I certainly would like to hear what the Official Opposition would have to say on this. I think that it is a good piece of legislation. I really don't believe that it should have been dropped at that time because, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the House that Manitoba is the only province that does not have this compulsory legislation for the use of safety helmets for motorcycle users; all the other provinces have. I don't think that we should shy away from it; I think we should go along with the other provinces because I think it's a good piece of legislation.

The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell intrigued me somewhat by some of the comments that he made in connection with the how cheaply I can build roads. And I was quite surprised that the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell who at one time I understand was a

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. BURTNIAK Cont'd) . . . . contractor - I don't know why he gave up but apparently things weren't going too well. But you know he made some statements insofar as the costs. If I get my books straight here I would just like to refer to this. The honourable member opened up the 1972-73 report, and I also have the 1971-72 Highways Report, and these kind of reports, Mr. Chairman, have been --(Interjection)-- Do we have a limited time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thirty minutes.

MR. BURTNIAK: To answer questions?

A MEMBER: Yes.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well that's something new. I didn't know that. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell referred to the Highways Report for 1972-73, I believe, and he took out the work order No. N-99 and he said, here it is. The project was 26 miles and the project was completion of base coarse and bituminous surfacing north of William River and Hargrave River, unorganized territory. He says I can't understand how the Minister can build 26 miles for \$244.93.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I did not take out his report. I referred to his \$10 million Capital Supply report. Not his Highways Report at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's fine. I don't really care what report he's compared it to but nevertheless there are the figures he used, and I don't think that the honourable member can deny the fact - Well that's fine - but the honourable member cannot deny the fact that he used the work order N-99, and this is what it says, and the figure is \$244.93, and then the work order N-103, 27 miles, \$136.38, and I think there was another one something about Burntwood Bridge approaches, and what have you. And then he says, you know it amazes me - and I might say to the press too that they picked it up very very quickly, and I would just hope, Mr. Chairman, that the press picks this up when it's corrected. Because I think it's utter garbage when a member who has been in this House for so long and been a contractor, and all that, doesn't know how this thing works. And, you know, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, he said, it's odd that when you total this up it comes to exactly \$10 million. Well of course it does. That's what it was, \$10 million. Now then he also went ahead . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Time has expired. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to interrupt the Honourable Minister just at the time that he was defining garbage for us but nonetheless I appreciate the fact that he has been waiting for a long time to occupy the front bench with his staff to tell us all the good news about highways. I really haven't a great deal to say on highways, although it's not because my love isn't with highways or the Department of Highways. It is also because I happen to live on one of the poorest provincial roads in the Province of Manitoba and I see nothing in this yellow sheet to change that condition.

I would ask a few questions about the format, and particularly it seems to be spread out in such a way that it's very difficult for us to surmise just where the work is being done and to put it together in such a fashion that we know exactly where how much work is being done. I think particularly this government has of course indicated all along its dedication to work in the north and I see scattered throughout the pages references to particular work in the north. I would ask one question of - by way of notice, perhaps the staff could take that notice - could the Minister, could the Department give us some indication in dollar amounts of the amount of work they're doing in the north, proposing to do in the north? It's difficult of course, we have no dollar amount figures on the schedule before us at all and I don't expect it to be to the cent, even as my honourable friend from Birtle-Russell, I won't even make comment if it comes out to be exactly \$10 million or \$15 million, but I would like to know a ballpark figure of what is being done in the north.

You have on Page 10 roads listed for the north; you have on Page 11, you have on Page 12, you have on Pages 17, then again on Pages 19, then again on Pages 23. I'm wondering whether there's some reason why you wouldn't for instance group all your work in the north in one section so that it could be followed a little more clearly. And attendant to that question I would like to know, for instance, how much of the work that is being done up north is being done for the CFI complex. I see that you have a considerable amount of road work listed for CFI - I'm just trying to find the correct places - as well as for the Hydro project at Jenpeg. Mr. Minister, those are the three specific areas that some time during response I would

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. ENNS Cont'd) . . . . appreciate knowing the rough estimate of the total amount of dollars being spent on roads construction in the north generally. Then I would like the division if I can for the amounts being spent relative to the CFI project, and the amounts being spent relative to the Hydro project, Jenpeg. Those three things.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me just deal very briefly though in a general way with what really distresses me about this department's performance under this Minister. It's something of course which doesn't surprise me because while there is a limited increase, a very small increase in the total budget, we really have to put that relative to the costs of today. I'm referring to the two specific items, the major items, Resolution No. 3 which deals with the highway maintenance and construction, aids to cities, towns and villages, which is one of the major items which last year we spent an estimated \$25,700,000. This year we're proposing to spend \$27 million on; and then in terms of new construction Resolution No. 5, construction of provincial trunk highways, provincial roads and related projects, we had an amount of twenty-five and a half million dollars last year, we have twenty-six and a half million dollars this year. Now, Mr. Chairman, that represents - let's take the last item first, Resolution 4 - an increase of four percent. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Minister will agree that that does not cover the increase of the staff of the Department of Highways, never mind taking into account the increased inflationary spiralled costs of building material, that surely the construction industry and this Department of Highways is not immune to, is subject to as all of us in this province, you recognize that that is in effect a net decrease in highway construction activity for cities, towns, provincial roads and highways throughout the Province of Manitoba. They're budgeting a four percent increase. Mr. Speaker, I think if I'm not mistaken that the Civil Service pay arrangement calls for something in the neighbourhood of seven percent this year and seven percent next year, or whatever. But it seems to me that seven to eight percent is the increase for staff alone.

Now if we take inflation costs and we take the country, we take the national inflation figures of being roughly between nine and ten percent then, Mr. Speaker, you can see that in this item alone we're talking about a net decrease of something in the order of ten percent in terms of this department, this government's dedication to the maintenance of our roads and building of the necessary roads that we still think we need in this province.

Even more important and more apparent to the general public is the similar situation in the moneys set aside for the maintenance of our present road system. Mr. Chairman, that maintenance doesn't come cheap in a province such as ours. We do have peculiar difficulties, environmental climate difficulties to contend with when we try to maintain our roads in the shape they should be maintained. Mr. Speaker, when he is budgeting no increase but simply sufficient to cover increase in staff costs in that item, Resolution 3, and discounts completely the idea that there is such a thing as inflation in this country, in this province, then as a matter of fact he is budgeting for a ten percent decrease in the maintenance of our roads and our highway systems in our cities, towns, villages, provincial roads and trunk highways.

Mr. Chairman, I think that's something that this Minister should be concerned about. I know that many many people throughout, particularly rural Manitoba, are vitally concerned about it. I think it's small comfort to those many areas who, even if their roads weren't totally washed out or wrecked where perhaps through a special program there will be some flood assistance given, but nonetheless because of so many of the highways and provincial roads that were washed out or inoperative for a goodly period of the time during this past few weeks has put so much extra pressure and strain and wear on other roads, that they can hardly be expected to be maintained to any acceptable standards when this department is willfully budgeting 10 percent less for the maintenance of these roads.

Mr. Chairman, this Minister has had his share of people, delegations coming into his office complaining about conditions of roads. I think this Minister is no different than any other Minister. It's always been the plight of every Minister of Highways to receive honourable gentlemen whether they're councillors, reeves, or individual citizens, or groups, complaining about the shape of their roads. We always want better roads. But, Mr. Chairman, this Minister really can't get off the hook, and can't tell the people of Manitoba what a wonderful job he is doing with respect to roads when he is prepared to let his colleagues, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Education, take away from already his relatively minor amounts when you consider that

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. ENNS Cont'd) . . . . we're talking about dedicating \$27 million out of \$800 million that this government takes in as current revenue, where we're talking about dedicating \$26 million out of \$800 million that this government takes in in forms of revenue. Mr. Chairman, if you would place that figure, and I haven't done my homework to do so, and if you relate that to previous amounts of money set aside for road building, then the sad fact emerges that the Department of Highways, highways priorities generally, is fast fading into insignificance under the leadership of this government and this Minister. The other Minister at least he could divert us with diversionary tactics - I'm referring to one Honourable Joe Borowski - who used to entertain us and revel this House at great length. I think he had most highway engineers concerned for awhile that really abortions were of greater problems to them than road building. While that may have beclouded the issue to some extent, the fact of the matter is that if you drive the thousands of miles of gravel roads as I do, if you live on one as I do, and if you recognize that our children have to be transported to schools on those same roads, and if you recognize that our elderly and our sick have to be driven to hospitals on those roads, then the simple maintenance of a gravel road doesn't become something that you just offhandedly, you know, put to the bottom list of your priorities. I know it is there with this government.

Somehow building a road, you know, building a road doesn't really have that ring of social reform, or improving the quality of life that these gentlemen opposite feel is deserving to such other worthy causes as worrying about welfare assistance, worrying about civil liberties, worrying about supply and management in agriculture, worrying about when a farmer can sell a hog and when he can't, worrying about what kind of professors can teach, and what kind of university courses, and who they have to please before they can do that. I know these are the things that preoccupy members opposite most when they deal with these matters in caucus. But I want to tell this Minister that in a province such as ours the network of roads is of vital importance. The network of roads it is underrated, underestimated by most people in this province because most people in this province happen to live in one large urban centre and they're, aside from worrying about the traffic congestion at particular hours of the day, they really are not aware constantly of how important a road network is. --(Interjection)--

The Minister of Agriculture says we're putting him on. I want to tell him that if he is satisfied as the Minister of Agriculture, and I think the subject was raised by other members opposite, when farmers are being asked to truck their produce and their grain greater and greater distances, and the only way they can do that is by buying bigger trucks that have heavier carrying capacity, his Minister, his government has this year decided to spend 10 percent less on the maintenance of those roads. This government has decided, his government has decided to spend some 14 percent, or 15 percent less in the building, in the construction of roads.

. . . . continued on next page

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that my constituents aren't going to be very happy, and most constituents throughout rural Manitoba aren't going to be very happy. Moreover I think particularly when you find out that major portions of this road budget, for instance in the north, are dedicated to such Crown agency causes as CFI, the Jenpeg Hydro construction site, then we take out of that the dedication to whatever commitment the Minister has made for the urban area in terms of over or underpasses along the perimeter, or support for bridge construction in the City of Winnipeg itself, it leaves precious little, Mr. Chairman, precious little for the thousands and thousands miles of roads that service the many communities, small communities throughout Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, he says he knows what we did. I would ask him at any time to compare relative to the revenues of the province of the day and take a fair appraisal of the moneys spent, five years ago, six years ago, seven years ago.

All I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is I find it's really incomprehensible that the Minister would be prepared to come into the Chamber at this time and be satisfied with a budget that spells only depreciating roads for most Manitobans. I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that he might have even solicited our support on this side, that he might have talked to us individually, privately, and said, look it, you know really I'm having a heck of a time with some of my colleagues. There's the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who keeps wanting money for his mine up north; he wants to find another dry hole somewhere. I'm having a heck of a time with the Minister of Tourist and Recreation who's throwing away a million dollars of revenue and going into the WesCan Lottery business. And so he wants a bigger bite for his parks and recreation. I've always had problems with the Minister of Health and Social Welfare because that's a never ending - because as the song goes, I have a never-ending love for you, you know, I have a never-ending call on money there. We have like the Member from St. Matthews who wants more public housing built. That's fine. And you have of course the requirements for the major capital projects such as Hydro and Autopac, you know, that make demands on the subject. So I would have suspected that the Minister of . . .

MR. USKIW: It should not be left on the record, Mr. Chairman, that Autopac is imposing or infringing on the taxpayers of this province.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, up until the point comes where I can get some of the kind of auditing that I would like in Autopac, the Autopac administration, which could single out precisely what is being done in the Motor Vehicles Branch and is being charged to the general public, and what isn't, and what kind of provisional grants remain, and what else, then I would have to reject the Honourable Minister of Agriculture's interjection. But however that's not the point. I'm really putting a position forward . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: It was alluded to that there was some \$10 million of Autopac deficits that are going to be paid for by the taxpayers of this province. And that is not an accurate statement of fact, Mr. Chairman, and on the point of order I don't think that we can allow that to be stated when everyone in the House knows that it is not a matter of fact that those funds or losses are recovered by premiums not by taxes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, really let me explain - it's always amusing to me. See, I can recall them fellows talking to us about medicare premiums as being an unjust tax. You see when we the Conservatives put on a premium then it's a tax. When they put on a premium, it's not a tax. So let that be on the record, let that be on the record.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to argue the figure, the position any longer. I just want to correct the Honourable Minister, a figure was never mentioned, \$10 million was never mentioned by me. It may have been mentioned by some of my exuberant supporters in the second row. I made no such figure as the Hansard will show tomorrow. And besides, Mr. Chairman, the tale has yet to be told as to just what involvement the general taxpayer paying public will have in, at some future date, bailing out that welfare program of fixing fenders that the Minister of Agriculture likes to refer to as not being a deficit but simply fixing more and more fenders. You know we don't know to what extent you know my implication could be correct or could not be correct, so we leave it at that.

But, Mr. Chairman, I'm being diverted, and I don't like to be diverted by the Minister

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . of Agriculture when I'm dealing with the Minister of Highways estimates. Because really you know there was the opportunity I think, and this is not so strange, it happens from time to time that a Minister has a particular difficulty with a bill for instance, or he has difficulty in a particular area of his estimates, and difficulty that is with his own government colleagues, and he solicits support from members opposite. The gentle hint is dropped, you know, if you fellows would really start to bear down on this and this program; or if you would come in support of this and this bill, it would make it a lot easier for me to get the necessary funds to do that through my Cabinet and through my caucus. -- (Interjection) -- Certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I would ask him, Mr. Chairman, while he was Minister some few years ago, whether he ever indulged the members opposite for support for his program prior to when the program was adopted by the government.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I can answer that with one word - constantly. I can recall, I can recall standing up in this House and appealing to the members opposite at that time all the time for support for my programs. Constantly is truly the right word to answer the Honourable Minister of Agriculture in that way.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Highways who is an affable chap, in fact I can recall much to my dismay him not being home one day when I called upon him in his home town of Fort River. It was at the height of an election but that didn't stop me from paying a courtesy call and maybe having had an opportunity of enjoying some of his courtesy which unfortunately I didn't. However he should have, he knows the kind of fellows we are on this side, particularly on a subject such as highways. He could have called upon us to help him out so at least he would have had enough dollars in here to cover the inflationary factor. At least he could have had enough dollars in here to cover the pay raise and the inflationary factor in the construction of new roads. So if, at least, he couldn't tell us that he was going to build any more roads, and keep our roads in the same shape, he could, you know, he would have at least money to do that. No, he has to come into this House defending a situation which in effect means that about 10 to 15 percent less maintenance will be done on our provincial roads and highways, and 10 to 15 percent less new roads where construction will be undertaken in this province. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, the figures don't lie. He asked for \$25,500,000 last year - I know that that may not have been exactly what was spent but I'm speaking of his intent, and that's all I can speak about. His intent last year was to spend \$25,500,000 for new construction. This year he's going to spend \$26,500,000 for new construction. That's an increase of four percent. Mr. Speaker. He has to pay his staff seven percent more this year, and there's at least ten percent, if not higher, inflationary factor in the construction industry. So that amounts up to 14 percent, which he would need more money to do the same as last year and he's only asking for four percent more. To me that means a ten percent slowdown. -- (Interjection) -- No, no that means a ten percent slowdown. Now the Honourable Minister of Agriculture knows that these straightforward figures are too straightforward that he can refute and that he can jumble up.

The same thing, Mr. Speaker, applies to the maintenance, and that is even more critical, Mr. Speaker. All he has allowed himself for, Mr. Speaker, is the maintenance of our roads and these roads were going downhill. All he's allowed himself on the maintenance of roads is to cover the increase that his staff will require for pay, roughly a seven percent increase in the maintenance. So again, Mr. Speaker, in the maintenance of our roads he is shy ten percent to cover the inflationary factor unless government agencies start keeping in mind that inflationary factor, this service dropping in the level of service is upon us. Mr. Speaker, a seven percent increase for the maintenance and roads means in my simple arithmetic a ten percent drop for funds available for doing the actual work. A four percent in construction means an even greater drop in terms of highway activity. Mr. Chairman, I don't think that's good enough for the kind of roadwork, for the kind of problems that we have in maintaining our roads in the Province of Manitoba. I don't particularly think it's good enough to do the kind of job that is going to be necessary in a year such as we've just experienced and a spring such as we've just experienced, where we have so many roads in weakened and poor condition as a result of the flood, and I think that by the end of this summer if the Minister has had some difficulties in fending off delegations concerned about the conditions of the roads, it's going to become much more difficult in the summer months that are upon us. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

MR. BURTNIAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will reply to the Honourable Member for Lakeside a little later. Unfortunately I don't blame him for it, I suppose he was tied up with some other problems in the last couple of days or so, he wasn't in the House, but this was mentioned and I will get to that later to explain to the honourable member that he is very very incorrect in what he's saying.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to finish off where I started in regard to the comments that were made by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell in his comments, and I thought when he first started to speak, I thought he was, you know, just joking but then I realized he was serious and unfortunately he didn't know what the score was. After listening to the Honourable Member for Lakeside I was going to suggest, and now I have more of a reason to suggest this, because I understand that the Honourable Member for Lakeside was a Minister of Highways for a few days at one time not so long ago, and anyway if the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell would have cared to take the time I'm sure the Honourable Member for Lakeside as a former Minister of Highways could have explained this to him because it is very simple.

I'm not going to repeat what I said before. Some of the figures that he mentioned, and as a matter of fact he said that the present Minister is going from the ridiculous to the sublime, and I think based on the remarks I think the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell is getting from the ridiculous to the sublime because he should have known that these are only leftovers from the previous year and I can tell you what these roads cost.

Getting back to Work Order N-99, 26 miles of base coarse and bituminous surfacing with an expenditure of \$340,465.69, and if he would care to go back to the report from the year previous he would have found this statement. And the only thing that was left as a result of that year's operation for the following year was \$244.93, and it shows there. The same thing applies to the other program of 27 miles, also base coarse and bituminous surfacing, this was 71-72, expenditure, was \$387,238.54, was completed in 72-73, so therefore it shows \$136.38 of the amount which was left over. It's as simple as that.

Then he went on to say how ridiculous this can be because here you've got 27 miles for \$136.00, you had 26 miles for \$244.00, and then he says Rose Island Road a project of 1.1 mile and there was a figure of \$73,711.00. You know, and as a former contractor, you know, he should have known better. And alongside with that that this particular Rose Island Road the whole project also included rip-rapping along Saskatchewan Avenue which required a lot of rock, and so on, and therefore it's not all ridiculous as the honourable member was trying to put across to the members of this House. And I would like the press to correct this.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I think when the correction is made that it will be the Minister that has the red face and not the Member for Birtle-Russell. Mr. Chairman, the point that I was trying to make the other night was the fact that we had estimates in front of us which had specific amounts allocated for the coming year, had specific amounts for the previous year, but over on the other side of the ledger, away over here in Capital Supply, which does not come under this budget, these estimates at all, is the sum of \$10 million in Capital Supply which to my mind, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more than a slush fund of the Department of Highways. If they run over a little bit on a project they'll say, well we'll put some of it in Capital and the rest will go in the main estimates that we have the privilege of discussing in this House. We do not have the privilege of discussing the capital that is allocated to Highways when it comes up under this department. We have to discuss it in the House under a Capital Supply Bill. So what the Minister has, and he has just verified it to the House, he has a \$10 million slush fund where he has lots of room to manoeuvre. He can put a certain amount of money into a project and it will appear in his report as so much money for this road. But really, Mr. Chairman, it's not that amount because you find over here in Capital Supply there's another \$176.00 or 10,000 or whatever the figure is, is hidden under Capital Supply. So he is giving us the impression that the figures that we see in his regular report for that particular project are the correct ones, when you have to really go over again and look in Capital Supply to see if there's any hidden money over there to cover the project as well.

Mr. Chairman, the remarks that I made the other night in this House was that it is under this department that we are to scrutinize the spending program of the department. This is our opportunity to discuss and have the Minister explain the spending programs that he intends to

## SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . . . implement, and these are the appropriations that we are asked to approve at this time. And what do we find, we find the \$10 million slush fund hidden in Capital Supply, which he can use any place he wants to, any place he wants to, Mr. Chairman. He can transfer, latterly transfer from one project to the Capital Supply under the same project number, and then you have to put the two together to find out really what the true cost was. And this was all I was trying to point out the other night, Mr. Chairman, when I rose and brought this matter to the attention of the House.

Now there is something else I would like to bring to the Minister's attention. He talked about his maintenance management program, the computer program that has been in effect for several years. He himself has some doubts about the operation of it. Members from this side have year after year reported to him that they are concerned about the operation of it but he still goes ahead and carries that program on. Even when he by his own admission says that the program has some difficulties. Well if it's that bad why doesn't he scrap it. -- (Interjection) - - Well some of the members on this side are saying it's that bad that it should be scrapped.

Mr. Chairman, we have had members in the Department of Highways who have had the ability to use their common sense and prudently spend the money of this province for many years. The district engineers, and the assistant district engineers, and the maintenance engineers throughout the province know very well when a road should be maintained. And the computer just confuses the . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The time being 5:30 I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.