



FOURTH SESSION — THIRTIETH LEGISLATURE

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

26 Elizabeth II

Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Peter Fox
Speaker



Vol. XXIV No. 61A

10:00 a.m., Monday, May 16, 1977

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have some 30 principals, teachers and administrators from the Japanese Educational Institute, plus three interpreters. These people are the guests of our Department of Education.

On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly we welcome you.

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

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN, Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management (Inkster) on behalf of the Honourable Attorney-General, introduced **Bill (No. 80) — An Act to amend The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Act**

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING R. LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister in charge of Emergency Measures. Can the First Minister confirm that the evacuation of Nelson House, which took place over the week-end because of the forest fire threat, was conducted almost entirely by officials of the Town of Thompson, the International Nickel Company and a large number of voluntary people from the Town of Thompson, without too much help or assistance, if any at all, from Emergency Measures Organization?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): I cannot confirm that, Mr. Speaker. That may be the case. I'll have to check with another Mr. Miller to ascertain the facts. I would think much depended upon whom was contacted in the initial instance but I shall check that out.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on another matter. Can the First Minister advise what the position of his Ministry will be with respect to the call by the Premier of Ontario for a meeting of First Ministers to discuss the energy crisis with the Prime Minister?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there has been a meeting of Energy Ministers across Canada only a matter of recent days ago. On the other hand, if there is a consensus with respect to yet another meeting to discuss energy pricing in broad principle or in specifics, I should think that Manitoba's position would be to attend. However, we cannot help but feel that it is perhaps likely to be non-productive coming so soon after the recent full-fledged Dominion-Provincial Conference on the same matter.

MR. LYON: On the same point, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could advise if he has received a copy of the communication from Premier Davis to the Prime Minister asking for the conference and soliciting his support for such a conference.

MR. SCHREYER: That has not been brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, but that is not to say that it may not be today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. Premier Davis has written a letter to the Ontario municipalities asking them to refrain from advertising for Quebec industry. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate whether any policy position has been determined by his government with respect to luring industry from Quebec to Manitoba during this period of time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the matter has not arisen as a problem or as an issue. In the event that it does, we will have to strike a position. My own personal view is that we would not want to exacerbate difficulties that already exist insofar as Canadian Confederation is concerned.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister is prepared at this time to indicate that as a policy of the government with respect to the activities of the appropriate departments within this government.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend knows that policy is not arrived at by means of confirming or denying or uttering positions in the question period.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to undertake to determine whether in fact the appropriate officials from his department are not in fact following a policy which would be contrary to what appears to be his expressed position in answer to the first question.

MR. SCHREYER: No, I don't agree to that, Mr. Speaker. I just finished saying that I do not believe that the matter has arisen in a specific issue or as a specific case.

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

Monday, May 16, 1977

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge inquired about the CBC in Churchill. Although we have not been formally told of the CBC plans at Churchill, I understand that the CBC has informed the town council that it intends to close down its radio studio at Churchill. Churchill and area will, however, continue to receive radio and television network service from Winnipeg.

We did, in the Department of Communication here, contact the CBC and were informed that the CBC plans have not been approved by the Commission. Any change in the Churchill operation of the CBC will require an amendment to the licence which was granted by the CRTC. Therefore, when the CBC formal application to amend the Churchill licence is received by the CRTC, that body will issue a public notice and ask for public response. Thus, Mr. Speaker, there will be an opportunity for the public and any member of this House who is so inclined to make their views known at that time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce, prior to the Orders of the Day, that on Thursday evening — I've announced Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday — but on Thursday evening there will be a meeting of the Economic Development Committee to consider the report of the Communities Economic Development Fund. And on Monday next, a meeting of the same committee to consider the report of the Manitoba Development Corporation. —(Interjection)— Monday next, a week from today.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the House Leader referring to Monday, the 23rd, which is a statutory holiday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my dates are a problem. I thought that we were still two weeks away. But I did arrange for Monday next, I'll have to cancel the arrangements and make it Tuesday, Tuesday night.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West on the same matter of procedure.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the House Leader. In view of the meeting called tonight to consider the report of McKenzie Seeds, I wonder if it is the intention of the Minister to distribute or to table the report in advance so that the members of the committee may have some idea of the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rather doubt that. I think that what will occur is that the Chairman will deliver the report to the meeting. There have been some difficulties with tabling reports in advance and then having comments on them before the Chairman has given an indication as to what the problem is. Members of the committee will have an opportunity, should they desire, to consider it and then we can call the Chairman back. But he will be making his report tonight. If there is time necessary, the honourable member will be given the time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Just on that procedural point, Mr. Speaker. Is the House Leader saying that the printed report which deals with the affairs of the company, as at March 31, 1976, is not capable of being tabled?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: No, I didn't say that, Mr. Speaker. I said that the Chairman of the Corporation would be delivering his report tonight and if honourable members feel that they haven't had enough opportunity to consider it, or want to have further time, then they will be able to do so at a further meeting. But in the meantime, the Chairman's report will be delivered tonight. —(Interjection)— That's right. If necessary I'll adjourn the meeting, Mr. Speaker, that's right.

Can we proceed now to second readings?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 5. The Honourable Minister for Public Works. (Stand)

Bill No. 39. The Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs. (Stand)

Bill No. 51. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 56. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 59. The Honourable Member for Swan River. (Stand)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 61. The Honourable Member for Gladstone. (Stand)

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 62, I would say the most important thing about that bill at the present time, or let us say that the most important thing that the people of the province or the city know about, is the fact that there is a reduction of councillors in the City of Winnipeg. Now we all know, Mr. Speaker, that it is probably desirable to have a reduction of councillors in the City of Winnipeg at the present time, and certainly the people of the city believe that there should be a reduction of councillors. This is probably a very good move from the point of view that the less councillors there are discussing the overall policy of the city is good, because they will be able to sit down at the main council meetings and do what really the council should be doing as far as policy-making is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, it is a little bit worrisome though, the reduction of councillors, because of the amount of service that the local councillor has to give to his constituents that he represents. Local government is a service government, Mr. Speaker. Local government is the place where people complain about their immediate problems and the problems closest to them, and they know for one thing that the times when they want to call up and complain about where their money is being spent, in other words, the taxes that they pay, the people, they don't just want to know how it is being spent overall, they want to know how it is being spent to benefit them in their house or in their immediate area. And the local councillor is the person that they have to be able to get to.

Mr. Speaker, just let me read to you from a White Paper that was put out, "Proposals for Urban Reorganization in the Greater Winnipeg Area." This came out in 1972, I believe, or 1971 — pardon me, 1970. It says under the new concept of government, "We wish to make it completely clear, however, that it is the absolute conviction of this government that no attempt at urban reform can succeed unless it succeeds in strengthening the sense of identification and intensifying the communication between the citizens and the local government. If Greater Winnipeg is in fact to become a better community, a better place in which to live and work and play, it is essential that every effort be made, not merely to improve the quality of the local government, but to see to it that at any government forum the citizens of Greater Winnipeg in truth can and do have an effective say in the policies and programs which affect them."

Mr. Speaker, I don't really know how the present government is going to accomplish that statement, which was presented all over this city by the Member for St. Johns, by making a reduction in councillors such as they have, unless there is a change in the structure, the way the City of Winnipeg government is forced to work under the legislation made by this province.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no place in this bill that gives the councillors more opportunity to service the people they represent. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is less, because they haven't changed the structure of The City of Winnipeg Act to make the operation much more efficient, which I will speak to in a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this bill that is going to save the people of Winnipeg money in any way, shape or form. If the people of Winnipeg believe that the reduction of councillors — and this seems to be the concept — everybody believes that if you are going to reduce the councillors, you are going to save a lot of money. Well, Mr. Speaker, the cost of the councillors in the City of Winnipeg is one-half of one percent of the overall budget, so we can expect to save, with the reduction of councillors, a quarter of one percent or thereabouts and if the people of Winnipeg expect to see that reduction reflected in their tax bills they're very very wrong because it won't happen.

Mr. Speaker, before amalgamation there were 112 councillors in the City of Winnipeg, the Greater City of Winnipeg, with a reduction to 50. And the day we had the reduction to 50, the 50 cost us more than the 112. When we got to having extra moneys for being on committees, etc., our Council automatically cost us more money than the 112 did and the people did have less representation.

Mr. Speaker, when you consider that there will be 28 councillors and they are going to have to be working in their local communities much harder than they did before because there are less councillors in the local communities, Mr. Speaker, you will find that they are almost in a position of being permanent people as far as the Council is concerned. Aldermen and councillors are on call 12 months of the year and basically 24 hours of the day. It's not quite like being an MLA in the City of Winnipeg. I can tell you that my calls as an MLA don't even come near, nowhere near the calls I received as a local councillor, because, as I said, this is the service area of government.

Mr. Speaker, that man is going to have to be a person who is going to be better paid if you're going to have people run for that Council. Mr. Speaker, a full-time person in this legislature, which is a Minister, earns in the neighbourhood of \$33,000 a year. Now I admit the Ministers are responsible for the whole province but I assure you that a person that is full-time in the City of Winnipeg, and especially those that are going to be on the Executive Council are going to have to be full-time men. I don't know where you're going to find full-time men for Council at the salaries that we are paying at the present time. I'm not advocating increases in salaries, Mr. Speaker, I'm only saying that to find these men to go full time on the Council is going to be a more costly proposition. So that the 28 councillors will very probably end up costing us more than the 50. So let's not have any misapprehension that the fact that it's popular to lower the number of councillors because the people think there is a saving of money, because it won't happen. It never has happened. Centralization has

always cost more money and it will continue to cost more money.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the Minister has really gone to the Taraska Report to say . . . I believe it's in that report that says we should have councillors on the basis of electors. Mr. Speaker, I can't really get too excited whether it's electors or population but I would say that many of the people that the councillor is responsible for are not electors, they are young people that are involved in recreation, they are people that are not of an age to be elected, because we are making services within the communities as far as parks, etc. are concerned. The councillor is responsible for the whole population of an area, not just the electors and I don't think that we can look at it from an elector point of view. In fact I would like to prefer looking at the bill, as far as the areas that have been presented are concerned, as population because those are the people that are to be served. All the people are to be served. I don't know whether it's just something to make it sound like the councillor will not have to represent too many people but it's there and I don't know why, so we prefer to look at population.

Mr. Speaker, I have to bring up at the present time my own area of St. James-Assiniboia which has a total population of approximately 75,000 people and our councillors will now be representing approximately 18,000 people each.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that a community committee of three anywhere is of any use. I don't think they were of good use while we had the community committees, twelve of them, we had several of them that were just three representatives, one person was away, one person was sick, you don't have a meeting. A community committee with a total of three is pretty well a useless situation especially when they have to represent that large of a population. I would ask the Minister to consider that from the population point of view in the St. James-Assiniboia area.

Mr. Speaker, the rundown of the — well guess we can call them constituencies — that have been brought forward to us looks as if they will follow the constituencies of the provincial members in the province. That's why I'm not calling them wards. The government looks as if they are going to follow the provincial constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, this government thought that they would take over the city after they unified it with the structure they set up with the ward system and they were badly disappointed. Mr. Speaker, it was very obvious that there was an attempt by the NDP Party at that time to take control of the city. There's no question when we take a look at the number of city members versus the rural — and I must say that I can't bring the rural into this — but we take a look at the city members and we say, well the NDP hold most of the city seats. Mind you, that's going to change drastically. But I assure you that they believe that there's their election organization, there's their votes and they will have their organizations ready to go in the City of Winnipeg within these constituencies at the present time. I think one other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that when several of the honourable members from the city on the NDP get knocked off, there they'll be, standing ready to run for the city election. There'll be no question about that; their organization will have them ready to go.

Mr. Speaker, they're going to be very badly disappointed because as I said earlier the people of Winnipeg do not want party politics within the City of Winnipeg. They have proven it every time there has been an election in the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, the honourable members have short memories. Let's go back to the first Unicity election. Mr. Speaker, the members opposite keep saying that there was a group of people who weren't NDP who were a party. Well there was a group of people who weren't NDP who decided that they didn't want partisan politics or party politics in the City of Winnipeg so they had to be other than NDP because the NDP was the only party that wanted it. The honourable members don't seem to understand that. They got whipped, whipped soundly by people who didn't want party politics.

Mr. Speaker, the reduction of councillors cannot work in this city unless the structure is changed. Mr. Speaker, why the Minister gets up and says there's a lot of changes in the structure I'll never know. He has basically said, I'll let them set up their own committees. Well there's nothing wrong with that, they're going to set up basically the same committees as they had before. —Interjection)— Mr Speaker, I heard the Minister say, we don't know that. No, we don't know that but sincerely hope that they don't start setting up a lot of new committees and having a lot of restructuring at the present time because that, also, is not what will help the operation of the City of Winnipeg.

The city councillors will set up their committees, will be able to elect their commissioners, and, Mr. Speaker, I say right now that the Minister should have eliminated the board of Commissioners in this Act without any hesitation whatsoever. There is nothing that a department head cannot do that the Board of Commissioners are doing. You need one person who could be called the manager over the department heads to co-ordinate the facts; that they are not duplicating services with one another. The Board of Commissioners is an expense that is not necessary in the City of Winnipeg. Really, you've got department heads all through the city and then you have another group of department heads all through the city. There is absolutely no necessity for the Board of Commissioners in the operation of the City of Winnipeg and it is also a place where it causes more

slowing down. They say the Board of Commissioners are an advisory capacity to the committees. I don't know why the department head can't be the advisory capacity to any committee. The Board of Commissioners is something that is not desirable within the present Act. So, again, the Minister has done really nothing to change the structure from that point of view.

People wonder, Mr. Speaker, why the councillors become involved in the administration and try to get involved in the daily operation of the city. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are so many things done at the committee stages that the councillors never even get to know about, and they happen within their own communities, that they always have to be going along and checking up and finding out what is happening in their own area. They become involved in the everyday operation of the city because the legislation that they are forced to work under, forces them to do so.

Mr. Speaker, Council should be referring things to different committees as they are going to be set up by the The committees should be, in turn, considering them and making recommendations to Council. The Council then will make the decision and the administrative body, made up of the C airmen of those committees, with the administrative people who are the heads of departments, will see that they are carried out. That way you will have councillors working on policy and becoming very involved within what is happening. They will be able to go to one central place to find out what is happening within their constituency. Today the hodge-podge that they have to go through regarding budgets and everything

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what happens. The Board of Commissioners recommend the budget; it comes down to the Community Committees; it goes back to the Committee of Environment, etc.; it then goes back to the Executive Council; it goes back to the Board of Commissioners for more recommendations. If the recommendations are changed it might come back to the Community Committee. And that procedure goes on not only on budgets, Mr. Speaker, it goes on on nearly everything that happens in the city. There is absolutely no way that the city can continue to operate under that structure whether there are 10 councillors or 100 councillors. It just won't work and it hasn't worked. It's proven it hasn't worked and the Minister has not come forward with any great changes to the structure that are going to make it work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot said from the honourable members on the other side of the House regarding our convention where we spoke of six areas having six councillors each, with three of them going onto the immediate Council. It was a situation that was recommended by different people. It came from the Public Works districts of the city. That's where it started and that's where the people that made the recommendations at our policy meetings got that particular idea.

I'm here to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that is not what we are presenting. It's not a bad idea to have people up front making policy and people back down in the communities that will be working on local problems but that is not a necessity to change the situation. What we should be doing, Mr. Speaker, is that we should be eliminating about three-quarters of this bill, which tells the councillors how they should do their work, and we should be saying in this particular legislation that the Provincial Government wants the Council to decide what will be decided in the local areas and what will be decided at downtown main meetings. They are the people that know what the problems are within the local areas. Variations that come within the overall policy, or with the overall planning, can be made to local areas. Building permits could be issued at the local areas if they are to the codes and being built within the area according to the plans that are there.

The fact that the decisions regarding what people want in their area can go downtown and be completely eliminated by councillors who have no interest in it whatsoever is not a desirable thing, and the more that can be done as far as decision-makings at the local community council is desirable because then your councillors, Mr. Speaker, can truly stand up at the council meetings where they are there to set policy and set policy, because many of the things will be done before they get downtown.

But this bill controls the structure of the city completely as to what they can do or what they can't do. I would just, for the life of me, wonder why, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education, when there are problems out in the school districts of this city or this province, stands up and says, "That is the prerogative of the elected member; that is the prerogative of the school board. I am not going to interfere with the closing of schools or the changing of anything within the school district. That is the prerogative of the elected school trustees," is what the Minister of Education says. Yet this government, as far as the City of Winnipeg is concerned, says, "We are going to control the councillors of the City of Winnipeg. We will decide what they will be able to do within their local areas. The school trustee can decide when he wants to close a school or make it bigger." The councillors can't do any of that, and they are completely controlled.

Mr. Speaker, that is just one of the things that the NDP government is famous for, that they will have a policy in one area and they will say, "Well, gosh, we've got it here, but it doesn't matter. We won't have it over here, because that's not the way we want it over here, because we want to control these fellows and that's all there is to it."

Mr. Speaker, the situation of the Minister of Finance having control over the financial situation of

the city is — well, unhealthy, as my colleague said, from one point of view that I will get to — but not really that much of a change. The Minister says that he thinks it should be an elected member that takes the responsibility. Mr. Speaker, the Municipal Board is an appointed body, and I don't like to think of the Municipal Board as a body that will do as the government tells them, so therefore I would say if there is going to be a change, you should probably just eliminate the Municipal Board and let the city look at it from the way they are now, let the city decide their financing. I don't agree with that, so I say keep the Municipal Board. I say keep the Municipal Board because the financial decisions of the City of Winnipeg will be made by the government in power sitting here on Broadway, and if that isn't party politics controlling the financing of the City of Winnipeg, I don't know what is. I can just see the people of the City of Winnipeg coming down and saying, "Mr. Minister, we would like to do this." And it is possible — and I don't say that this Minister will do that — but it is possible for the Minister to say, "Well, if you want to do that, you've got to do this. In order for me to approve this, you've got to do something else."

Mr. Speaker, it has been happening in this province when we had other Ministers of Finance who dealt with the city, and every time they wanted to do something, they had to give up the park or they had to give up the Auditorium or they had to give up something in order to get finances the way they wanted them to be. Mr. Speaker, I assure you that the problem of the trading will be there — will be there — if the Minister of Finance which is the government and Cabinet, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and honourable members on the other side, are basically in control of the finances of the City of Winnipeg. No criticism from the point of view that the City of Winnipeg does want to have control over their financial affairs. And I must say that I think the members of the City of Winnipeg Council are responsible, but if the City of Brandon, the City of Thompson, and all the other cities and municipalities within this province have to be responsible to a municipal board who takes an overall look at the finances and the loaning and the amount of money being loaned generally by cities and municipalities within this province, why not the City of Winnipeg? I am not here to say that they shouldn't be watched by a group of people to make sure their spending doesn't go crazy. You have never heard this side of the House ever say that we wanted a situation that didn't have some control, because we do. But to put it in the hands of the Minister is just going a little bit too far.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why Brandon has to go there. I don't know why Thompson has to go there. I don't know why Portage has to go there. I don't know why all the others have to go there, and not Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, there is another problem today. It's the fact that cities and municipalities can borrow all over the world. They can walk out and borrow money almost anywhere. You have to have a place in this province that knows what is going on all over the whole, complete province. The Minister of Finance of any government in power should not be the person in control. There are hearings demanded by the Municipal Board of over \$500,000, and Section 2 is taken out of the Act. The Minister doesn't have to have hearings. He can make the decision he likes. The only thing the Minister has to do is, if he feels like it, he can refer it to the Municipal Board for some recommendations. So really, Mr. Speaker, the change is not that great except that it puts the control of the financing of the City of Winnipeg into the hands of the political power on Broadway and that is not a good situation.

Mr. Speaker, I would wonder why the Minister of Urban Affairs, which will be Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and again the government in power at the time, would want control over the planning district of the City of Winnipeg. It didn't take me long to figure it out, because I had just been sitting in the MHRC Estimates and I wondered why they weren't all that worried about the fact that there is only approximately 59 acres, and that's according to the report put out by the Urban Institute of Manitoba. There certainly aren't more than a hundred or so acres that have been bought by MHRC that are within the development plan of the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, I'll make a correction — maybe there are 500, because I think it might be in the corner of Fort Garry, the 1,250 acres they own in the Fort Garry area. I think it might be 500 total. It's pretty obvious that the helter-skelter spending of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to buy land anywhere, anytime, regardless of when it can come into production, is the reason why the Minister of Urban Affairs wants to have control over the development plan of the City of Winnipeg. And if he is going to start bringing those pieces of property into production that are not in line with the step-by-step program of the present development plan of the City of Winnipeg, if you think we are going to have costs — well, I will just tell you, Mr. Speaker, you are going to have costs to the City of Winnipeg that will be coming out their ears. They won't be able to add it up on a fast adding machine because the putting in of services that are not within the present plan is probably one of the most costly things you can do.

But no, the government now has control over the development plan, and strangely enough, a department of government has gone out and bought a lot of land that is not presently within the development plan, and the Minister can approve the development. As he says, the city can make it up. But he can approve it, disapprove it; he can change it. And if the City of Winnipeg does not go in and do it, and he thinks that there should be some area where it should be done, he can ask them to do it, and if they don't, he can. Talk about controls over elected councillors, over a people that we elect.

Here we have a situation where we elect Council and Mayor by the people, who are put in the position of having the finances controlled by the party in power on Broadway, the development of the city controlled by the power on Broadway and a set-up where it looks very much as if they're trying to get control of the elected members by what I think is damn close to being gerrymandering as far as the Wards are concerned. —(Interjection)— Oh, Mr. Speaker, they moan and groan but you know, it's there. If you think it's nonsense, look at it.

A MEMBER: Did you read the bill?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I've read the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you the control that this government is taking over the City of Winnipeg in those two areas is just something that they should look very closely at. I wish they would talk to the NDP councillors on Council for one minute. They're starting to be a little quiet now. Somebody must have put the lid on but I assure you when I've had occasion to have some discussions with two or three of them, they don't like what is happening in this, and I don't know that they'll comment but they certainly weren't happy when they first saw it. They have even come to realize what the job of a councillor is and they certainly know that this government doesn't know what the job of a councillor is. And I'm very disappointed that the Minister of Finance has even forgotten, from the days that he was on Council, what the job of a councillor is. I'm not going to quote from the things that he did say about the importance of local government when he was a mayor, but they're there. They're on the record I believe of 1970 of Hansard; they were read by somebody. But the Minister now all of a sudden believes that we can have less councillors and give better service. It may be possible. It may be possible providing the councillors can go downtown and talk about policy and that decisions can be made in the local community areas that refer to that area. You might have something done if he's got a secretary and an executive assistant to take all the calls — and that's costly.

Mr. Speaker, the planning procedure of the city. We now have another step which the Minister says is another place for the people to be heard. Mr. Speaker, I can say to you that there is nothing wrong with the people to be heard, but these decisions on planning and zoning variations, etc. have to be done. It is going to slow down the process for anybody who comes before a community committee to begin with, to ask for a variation or a zoning change, but you know who it won't slow down the process for, Mr. Speaker? It won't slow down the process for MHRC. It won't slow down the process for any government body, or any government department because, although I believe, Mr. Speaker, sincerely, that the government years ago or has always had the power to have control over Crown lands that they own within a city or municipality, I think it's there. I think it's there. Well, it's back, let's put it that way.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this, that the MHRC, as I said, is not under that control anymore. The Minister says that it can't be under the control of the city because the programs of the Provincial Government that are going ahead cannot possibly be stopped. Well, as I said in the MHRC Estimates, they are going too fast. They're mixing up their programs to the point where it's really disgusting. They are controlled politically from this House. They're not allowed to be a corporation that is credible within this community and they could be. They have good people over there. They are not allowed to become involved as any normal provincial housing corporation is concerned. They are completely controlled in the purchasing of land from the Land Acquisition Branch and if you want me to present a report or table it in the House I can table you one that says that the Land Acquisition Branch and the MHRC have been in a battle for years. We also know that the MHRC will be negotiating; I want a piece of property; the Land Acquisition Branch will come in; it'll take 212 days on an average for them to get it and in the meantime, the land has been purchased by a developer and we have to buy that same land back on the proposal system. That was admitted right in those Estimates. They could co-operate with everybody in this city and they could get along well if this government would clean up the mess within its own departments and there'd be no need. . . . But there will be a need because the Minister of Public Works is still a big cry-baby and the Minister of Finance is wiping his tears by saying, "He can do anything he likes in this city." Because he was pouting before, he can build buildings as high as he wants them and nobody cares whether it's a washroom or not over there but he can build whatever he wants anywhere he likes, because the Minister of Finance has given him back his rattle.

Mr. Speaker, the Crown just does not have that right. They shouldn't have that right. It shows they're not capable of co-operating with another elected group of people.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing that I would say that the bill does. . . . The Minister of Finance said that he knows that the people of Winnipeg want to have their Mayor elected and I don't think that anybody in this Chamber doesn't know that because the people of Winnipeg have said that. It's something we do in North America that we don't want to give up. But if the Minister is aware that the people of Winnipeg want to have their Mayor elected' he should be aware that they don't want him to be a rubber stamp. I don't say the Mayor should be wandering around telling everybody in the city what to do but he shouldn't be a rubber stamp. He's allowed to be *ex-officio* at every committee and you know when the Honourable Minister of Finance was the Mayor of West Kildonan, he was *ex-officio* at every

committee It's nothing new. I don't know of anybody that's ever kicked the Mayor out of a committee meeting yet. So we did a big thing, we made him *ex-officio* on every committee that he could attend anyway. —(Interjection)— Well, it didn't say so in the Act but I know of nobody that kicked him out.

Mr. Speaker, the bill does nothing to give local representation or people more authority over their affairs in their local area. It does absolutely nothing to save the people of Manitoba money. In fact it could even cost more to run the administration under this basis. It does absolutely nothing to set the structure of the City of Winnipeg in such a way that the councillors can rule their own destiny in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Speaker, the bill hasn't got hardly any changes in it other than the lowering of the number of councillors. It's a window-dressing bill and Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that when we get to Committee we will be making some recommendations, not very big ones but they will be there. They'll be there in such a way that we would hope that we could make the city work better. —(Interjection)— And the honourable member says we're voting for the bill. I would say to him seriously, wait and see.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Public Works.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Eimwood): Mr. Speaker, I listened with some interest to the honourable member but I still conclude that although he may have read the bill, I don't believe that he read the Taraska Report because he failed to make any reference to it. He failed to refer to any of the recommendations of that Report or demonstrate any apparent concern or knowledge of it. If he stays around I intend to read him one or two paragraphs to see whether or not he is familiar with it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this legislation can be characterized in a short phrase, namely, reforming the city, and this is really what I would characterize Bill 62 as. I've had a considerable personal interest, like a number of members in this Chamber, about Urban Affairs. I have followed the development of the city since 1966 as a member of the Legislature, since 1970 as a Minister. I think one of the first meetings that I attended in the Minister of Finance's office, who was then the Member for St. Johns, concerned the development and the planning of a new City of Winnipeg Act. Since that time I have attended all of the City-Provincial luncheons which are a sort of a monthly liaison meeting.

I read the Taraska Report with considerable interest. It was established as a committee of review for the City of Winnipeg Act and it had three distinguished members on the committee. First, Peter Taraska, who was a man with considerable public experience, now a Citizenship Court Judge, Earl Levin, a former metro planner and a man who has exercised considerable influence in the Metro Corporation and the development, and Allan O'Brien, a professor of political science and a man who was the Mayor of Halifax for a number of years. I think these men are all distinguished in their field and I think that their analysis was very sound. They advertised very broadly. They invited councillors, MLAs, and civil servants to meet and appear before them and they heard some 87 briefs and 74 oral presentations.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of the Taraska Report is as follows: In my opinion, it analysed the shortcomings and weaknesses of the City of Winnipeg and pointed out some of the problems and failures of that present body. I would like to give an example from that report and then deal with those particular examples in some detail.

For example, they pointed out as follows on Page 334. First a paragraph on the achievements of the present City, and secondly the failings. They said, "The evidence indicated some impressive achievements unrecognized by the spokesman for the Conservative Party. A single Council for the whole of the greater Winnipeg area, a unified administration, a single tax base, a unified municipal services, a formal mechanism for citizen participation in the process of government, and general acceptance of the unification of the city."

Well, we know that those are the positive achievements of the government legislation. Now, what about the failings? It said as follows in the Taraska Report, "But evidence also indicated failings and deficiencies in important areas of the government, a lack of leadership, a lack of accountability, confusion of roles and responsibilities among the political committees themselves as well as between the politicians and the administration, low staff morale, complicated and cumbersome approval processes, a narrow parochialism among the and a neglect of large-scale city-wide policies by the Council."

And just another brief example on Page 134. I give a final example. "The qualities that are lacking are leadership accountability and policy orientation." They are the qualities which they say they regard as absolutely fundamental to the improvement of the government of the city. And this is what they deal with in the succeeding portions of the Taraska Report: responsibility, accessibility, relative autonomy and effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, the recommendations made by the Taraska Report as essentially a modified parliamentary system. I think that there are a number of solutions that would fit the problems of the present City of Winnipeg. The Taraska Report comes up with a particular solution. I think there are a number of solutions and I think that the diagnosis of the committee is correct in terms of the

weaknesses of the present City of Winnipeg but I believe that the prescription that they have made is only one of a number. Bill 62 is an alternative that certainly fits and resolves some of the problems.

So what are the failures of the people on Council? Leadership, accountability, and policy orientation. The Taraska Report is silent on who is to blame but, Mr. Speaker, I intend to deal with the particular individuals and the governing body, I think, who have in fact made the City of Winnipeg not function as well as it could. And they are easy to characterize: the Mayor, Stephen Juba, the Deputy Mayor, Bernie Wolfe, and the ICEC majority on Council, which is in effect the government of the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, one can say a lot of things about the Mayor of Winnipeg but one cannot accuse him of exercising leadership. That is one characteristic that he does not have. He cannot work with the members on Council and never has worked with the members on Council. He can provide gimmicks but not leadership. He can entertain us with stunts but not leadership and he can bully and threaten people but he cannot lead. I could give many illustrations of this. I think some of the honourable members recall the famous time the Mayor burst into the Hydro Committee and made a tremendous speech to the Premier of the Province saying that you cannot steal or take away our hydro from us. To which the Premier replied, "Well, don't you remember, Mr. Mayor, that we met on this just the other day and we had agreed that there was no particular problem." Or, we recall of course the time that he came to the Convention Centre opening and announced his candidacy and made an attack on the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg. That was a bit like being invited to somebody's birthday party and then eating the cake. Or, we recall the more recent time when the trucks rolled up to the legislative lawn, came here, all the mosquito fogging equipment, and the Mayor leaped out and had an altercation with the Premier, probably a few days after the decision had been made by the Minister of Mines to permit fogging in the City of Winnipeg.

Well, you know we have also heard the resignations and we have heard the threats and all this sort of stuff but leadership we have never seen. The only time that the present mayor exercises any leadership is when the issue is already decided, when people have already come up with the majority opinion, and then, as John Galbraith said the other night on television, he said, "You wait until the parade is passing your door and then you step boldly in front and lead the way." That's the only time. When the consensus is developed, when it is apparent that the majority of people are going a particular way, then somebody steps in and claims that this is the exercise of leadership.

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of Winnipeg have not been served well by the present incumbent. He has two achievements that one can relate and one can think of in twenty years in office, one before he became mayor and one after. The only two that I can name, the only two that I can think of, are in 1957 when the liquor laws were changed and in 1967 when the mayor supported the Pan-American Games. That's not a very impressive record for twenty years in office. But he wins elections. But you know, Mr. Speaker, don't we all? There are people in this House who have won elections, two or three or four or five times. There are members in the House who have been here, I suppose, fifteen and twenty years and there will be a few more of us who will be around for another term which will take us into that illustrious realm.

It is not uncommon. It is thought to be uncommon but it is not uncommon for mayors of big cities in Canada to be in office for a very long period of time. It seems that mayors appear to attract a particular breed of cat. We had Tom Terrific in Vancouver; now we have Art Phillips. We had Hawrelak in Edmonton. We have Juba in Winnipeg and Charlotte Whitton down in Ottawa, and so on. Mayor Drapeau in Montreal. All characters, all hard to beat, all people who apparently have a lot of colour, all people who get re-elected and re-elected and re-elected and re-elected, and I wouldn't doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the present mayor will be mayor of this city until he is about 105. I think that he has got at least 40 years to go, and one of the reasons

A MEMBER: What if he runs in Elmwood?

MR. DOERN: That's fine with me. He can run anytime. Anytime. I don't care. I say that he can continue for another 40 years, plus 20, is 60 years, and one of the reasons, one of the reasons is that the amount of effort is almost unnoticeable. The amount of hard work, the amount of dedication, the amount of leadership, perseverance — non-existent. Non-existent.

The second person, Mr. Speaker, who has failed in his role as the Deputy Mayor, is Bernie Wolfe. And I say that with some regret because here is a man who, up until the present, in the last few years, had probably the most power on council. He certainly had power equal to the Mayor. He was the representative of the majority party, and yet he did not exercise leadership. He had as an example the fate of one Dick Wankling, and the Honourable Member for St. James will recall those heady days when he was on council, the leadership of Dick Wankling and the fact that Dick Wankling was dispatched and knocked off politically by the present Mayor. And the whole ICC went into a panic. They were told to dump the Deputy Mayor, they dumped the Deputy Mayor. It was just a pure case of political sacrifice. They put in Bernie Wolfe, and Mr. Wolfe unfortunately, has decided to play it safe.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of that limerick — I wish I could recite the whole thing — about the lady from Niger who smiled as she rode on a tiger. —(Interjection)— Well, maybe the

honourable member could give me the rest. And when she came back, something or other happened and the smile was on the face of the tiger. And I think that is Bernie Wolfe riding the present Mayor, except the Mayor has eaten him up. The Mayor has his smile on his face, and unfortunately the Deputy Mayor is being digested.

The present Deputy Mayor is a man of considerable strengths and considerable weaknesses, but unfortunately, he has failed to exercise any leadership on council.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with my favourite group, the ICEC. And I would like to deal as well with the myth of the businessman-politician. You know, only businessmen, people who are oriented toward business like the Member for River Heights and some of the businessmen-farmers that sit on the benches of the Conservative Party, all these men love free enterprise. They all bolster free enterprise. They all feel that they are the only people who can run this province.

You know, that's very similar to the way the Liberals used to be in Ottawa. All of us in this House, I am sure, with the exception of the few Liberals, have for years spent our time condemning the federal Liberals for their arrogance and their belief that they have divine right to rule Canada.

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, the same thing affects or infects the Conservative Party of Manitoba. They really don't believe, they can't imagine, a bunch of New Democrats running the province. It just isn't right, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't sound right. It doesn't feel right. They are the true heirs; they are the governors of this province. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to read one more quotation, and this is from the Rea Report, which is very highly praised in the Taraska Committee's Report. It was a study of voting patterns in the City of Winnipeg, I guess in the past 57 years. And I just received it, unfortunately, a few days ago. I happen to know Professor Rea. I think he is one of the best professors or research people in Manitoba. He is, I think, very sound in his research, and he has produced this report. I haven't really had the time to read more than a few pages, but I read the prime conclusions from the report, a one-paragraph conclusion on Page 23 on the performance of the Winnipeg councils over the past 57 years. And it is as follows:

It should be obvious from the evidence included in the appendices that no credit whatsoever should be given to the Citizens' denial (meaning the Citizens' groups, ICEC, etc.). We should give no credit whatsoever to their denial that they are a political party. They deny it. In fact a disciplined party situation has existed and functioned in Winnipeg since 1919. The report has attempted to indicate as well that hypocrisy has not been the only result, but that several serious disadvantages have also ensued. The Citizens have been enormously successful, never losing control of Winnipeg City Council in the past 57 years, but control also implies responsibility, and it seems to have been evaded. The result has been not effective leadership, but as the rollcall vote makes clear, interest protection. here is nothing wrong with this situation *per se*, if the electorate has been able to assign group responsibility and judge accordingly. And the final sentence: The clearest charge against the Citizens (this particular group) has been their failure to acknowledge the political responsibility which their position of power surely entails.

Well, that is the problem, Mr. Speaker. And I say that when we look at the performance of these honourable gentlemen opposite and their little brothers and sisters on city council, when we look at their performance, what have they produced? They have produced some monumental failures in the sense that they pose as businessmen and administrators first, and then secondly, they are humanitarians. The New Democrats regard themselves as humanitarians first, and secondly, businessmen and administrators.

But you know, I think if you look at the record, I think that we have done, first of all, without question, more in the realm of humanitarian things and social legislation, but we have done just as well, if not better, in the administration of the affairs of this province. I don't think we can match the kind of projects that have been put on the table by the honourable members opposite. They have brought us CFI. Their colleagues have given us Trizec and proposals typified by this new arena proposal, the new Winnipeg arena proposal. And you know, Mr. Speaker, they are suckers for that kind of thing, and this is what I find very disturbing. Some businessman comes to city council a few months ago and says that he is going to build, for the people of Winnipeg, a brand new arena worth \$15 million, free. He is going to give it to them free. This is a present. There are no strings attached. He is going to present the people of Winnipeg with a free \$15 million arena. And the members on council, who are Liberals and Conservatives disguised as ICEC members, they are all excited because they say, "Wow! This is just terrific. We won't have to raise taxes, you see. We won't have to go to the borrowing places and borrow the money. We won't have to raise the mill rate. We won't have to be worried about anything. We are going to get a free present."

Then this individual tells them what's involved and they are still interested, Mr. Speaker. They are still keen. All that is required is as follows: free land worth hundreds of thousands or millions; no taxes forever, worth a half a million to three-quarters of a million a year; possibly a loan if they can wangle

the Provincial Government's Municipal Fund loan — they might throw seven-and-a-half million bucks into the pot, says the Mayor; and a few other concessions as well. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, is that what you call a free arena? Give a million or so in land? Provide half a million to three-quarters of a million forever? If it costs fifteen million bucks and it is a half a million a year in taxes, in thirty years it will have been paid for. And then possibly a loan, and then complete control to an individual, and a non-profit corporation. Boy, Mr. Speaker, you can be sure of one thing, if you want a non-profit corporation running it, you're going to get a non-profit corporation running it. And it is going to sound all too much like Kasser and Reiser who came to the gentlemen opposite and they were going to build them a pulp mill, they were going to do them a big favour. Well, unfortunately there are management fees, and unfortunately there are annual salaries and expense accounts that one can draw on, but a free arena, who could believe that?

And these are the hard-nosed businessmen, the men of the world, the realists, the guys who look at the bottom line, the people who look at the ledger. Figures don't lie. They are the people who have been running council for 57 years.

But you know there are weaknesses in people who have a business background. For example, I think some people — and look, I will admit as well there are weaknesses in every profession — but the myth that I am attacking is that the businessman is the best political leader. And I say that these are some of the weaknesses, that a person may lack the broader view, they may not have a knowledge of economics. They may lack political savvy and they may not know or not be motivated by what is best for the public interest or what is best in the public interest, and that is ultimately what counts. And that is, I think, a test on which some of the members opposite and some of their colleagues fail. So they have frequently made bad business deals or poor business deals and they frequently, I say, without ceasing, without cessation, have made excessive concessions and excessive grants to businessmen. We saw that in CFI, we saw that in Trizec, and we see this in the Golden arena proposal.

I think that the record, Mr. Speaker, speaks for itself.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago, I did an analysis, a personal analysis, of what it is that . . .

A MEMBER: What did you find out about yourself?

MR. DOERN: I wasn't included in the analysis.

A MEMBER: Any weaknesses, Russell?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I studied my colleagues, the colleagues in my government, the ones that I thought were the most capable, people who had somehow or other the greatest political ability. And I tried to determine whether it was education or what background it was that somehow or other made them the best of this particular group.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOERN: I didn't study the members opposite. That was more than I could bear, Mr. Speaker. I leave that to some other historian on the other side. I would say this, when you analyze people who have the greatest political experience, I come to the following factors. And I will give you one factor in the end, but it seems that first of all they have long experience, secondly they have high IQs and third, they are dedicated. And that is about as far as you can go, because you can't make any correlation between education and outstanding public service. There are people who have probably Grade 5 who are very good and people with PhDs who are very good, but you can't correlate it.

A MEMBER: What had you figured for the Member for Radisson?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would love to give you an analysis of the Member for Radisson . . .

A MEMBER: Don't get mean.

MR. DOERN: . . . but since he is not present, I wouldn't risk it. I always feel somewhat endangered when I criticize my colleague because I feel that I may be beaten up later on.

MR. DOERN: The one thing, Mr. Speaker, that I deduce, and this is my own observation, and it is like a tautology or it's an analytic statement, and it's as follows: The best politicians have the most political experience. Now how they got it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOERN: . . . how they got re-elected, how they were able to keep persuading people, that is not being answered. But I tell you that if you look at the people with the most ability in the House, it seems that you can correlate that almost directly with the most political experience. Now there are exceptions. I am not going to name the exceptions on the Tory benches, but I just want to say that in general, if you look at the most capable parliamentarians, the people who are the most effective representatives and the people who have been re-elected, who will be re-elected, they somehow or other seem to be the ones with the most experience, and it just breeds more and more and more success.

Mr. Speaker, there is no substitute for political experience, whether you have been in business, whether you are a graduate of the universities, it doesn't matter what. The most important thing seems to be to get elected and then it seems that that will stand you in good stead for further success in the field.

The ICEC, Mr. Speaker, posing, like its predecessors for 57 years, as an independent citizens' organization . . . You know, here are a bunch of people, one day they are Liberals and Conservatives, and when they run for the election, they are independent. The day after the election, they are working as Liberals and Conservatives. They are running against us in the provincial elections. They are working and campaigning in federal elections. But they are both, you know, they are independent and they are Liberals and they are Conservatives.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have a phrase for those people, political drag queens. They wear their political drag on occasion when they want to bamboozle the public, and they try to sell the public on this notion that they are independent.

Well, we can see some of these independents. We have got a couple of these independents right here. We have three of them. The Member for St. James, he was an independent who saw the Tory light. The Member for Wolseley, he saw the Tory light. The fact that he was a Tory before didn't matter. The fact that he was a Tory on Council didn't matter, but he came out and suddenly became a member of the Conservative Party.

Of course none of us have been fooled by this, but a few people are fooled. A few people are fooled by this. But the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that I think there has been a failure to lead by this group. This is the group, if you want to point the finger of blame at where the failures on Council are, I have already said so, the present Mayor, the present Deputy Mayor, and the majority party.

You want to know what's wrong with Council? Go and talk to those people. They have provided the government; they are the government of this city. The failures of this city should be laid at their doorstep. They can't run the city. It's the same bunch who have run this province frequently into the ground and it's the same bunch who have run this country for 110 years in effect.

What do the Tories come up with? What is their solution? We've put down our solution, Mr. Speaker, it's in legislation. Let the Conservatives vote against it and let them campaign against it. I would really challenge them to do that. I would like nothing better than for them to go before the people of this province and say, "We're dead against this legislation and we're going with the Conservative legislation, and here's the Conservative legislation: the reintroduction of a metro type of government." Boy! Now there's the best brains that we have, sitting across from us. Robert Matas, Tribune Legislative Reporter, headline: "Tory policies indicate shift." And another article . . . Hey, here's a really funny one on the same one, a really funny headline written by Mr. Matas — I don't know if he wrote the headline — "Lyon exhorts Tories to keep in tune with the times." Well, they're listening to a very peculiar tune. They're hearing the old refrain "Let's go back to metro." Remember the good old days, Mr. Bonnycastle, Roblin's baby. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. ORDER.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that the member interrupts me because he was actually helping me at that point in time. But those were the days, you will recall, Duff's abandoned baby. Now these people are coming to claim him, this little illegitimate child of metro which they abandoned for all these years, they want to own up. They want to claim parentage at this point in time. Duff didn't. The ex-premier, Walter Weir didn't but this party, under the Honourable Sterling Lyon, he's going to go full-steam behind, back to metro, back to the good old days. Because, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that they don't want, they really don't want a strong city. They are probably afraid of a strong City of Winnipeg, and I have never been afraid of a strong City of Winnipeg because I believe that if Winnipeg is strong that the province will be strong and I think that that is the correct assessment of the situation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of minutes left but I would like to just say this in conclusion. I believe that this particular bill is an improvement, a significant improvement over the last. There are fewer restrictions in this bill, although some honourable members don't appear to think so. I think there are fewer restrictions on Council. We have taken a number of these things out of the bill. We have also reduced the size of council, which I believe is unwieldy under the present system. Under the original system you could have had a council of 50, under a modified parliamentary form, just as we have no problems whatsoever in this House — sounds like quite a statement — in terms of functioning because of 57 members. That is not a problem and never has been in this House. Similarly, in Ottawa there is not a problem in terms of function with 265 members. But when you have a parliamentary system, you can have those numbers or 630 whatever the precise number is in Great Britain. It works with larger numbers, but it doesn't work when you have a different system. So because the mayor is elected directly that kind of a system only goes well with a smaller council.

I think that what we should all do now is to closely observe the future performance of the Mayor, the Deputy-Mayor and the majority party, in this new improved version. There is no doubt that the system can work and I think this is also the best system that we can provide at this time, given the nature of the council, given the evolution over the past period of time, given the political realities of our day. And if people are still satisfied, if they are still satisfied several years from now, there are really only two options left. One is to vote in new blood, new leadership, a new majority party. That is one solution. The second one is to go to the parliamentary form of government. Those are the two alternatives before us. Our concern is to provide the best possible government that we can at this

particular point in time. It's not a case of the poor Mayor, we've made some changes in his portfolio, or the poor Deputy-Mayor, we've made some changes in his title and in his function or the poor council, Mr. Speaker, we have slashed the council in half. Well, I don't think that this should be our concern. Our concern is to provide an effective government structure for the citizens of Winnipeg and its success or failure will be in the hands of the elected representatives on council.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend this legislation to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak but I cannot let the remarks of the Minister of Public Works go unchallenged. I am somewhat surprised and in fact can't believe some of his remarks that he brought to this House this morning. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Public Works . . . It is almost certain that he will not be the CKABINET Minister after the next election, not because he may be defeated but because maybe there'll be new blood in the government side and he may not be so fortunate to have the First Minister appoint him to that position. Or secondly, he must have already started his battleground and started his campaign in the contest to challenge the present mayor for the Naylor of the City of Winnipeg. Perhaps that's what we heard this morning and I'm sure that's what we heard because, Mr. Speaker, we certainly heard the arrogance of the Minister of the strong criticism. In fact I couldn't believe it, the vicious attack on the present Council of the City of Winnipeg, on the ICEC members. It was a blanket charge of everybody. I just cannot accept those charges, Mr. Speaker, because —(Interjection)— Yes I did. Yes I did. Because Mr. Speaker, I believe that the present Council under the circumstances, under the present legislation, have done a good job in the last few years or tried to do a good job in the last few years.

In fact, I'm sure if you check, Mr. Speaker, with some of the other members . . . I'm sure the Member for St. Johns did not accept the words of the Minister of Public Works. I'm sure the Minister of Finance would not accept them because you cannot lay a blanket charge against everyone. Surely he could have been debating the things that the Council have not done, what the problems were, but to lay a blanket charge that the whole problem was because of the members of Council, I think it's not fair. I know he blamed the Mayor for lack of leadership — I'm not going to dispute that, if he's right or wrong — a lack of accountability. I will agree maybe there is a lack of accountability but that's the legislation's problem and legislation's fault, Mr. Speaker.

He talked about the Mayor being twenty years in office and accomplished nothing. Well perhaps it is a good start for a good battleground for a good debate in the coming election for the Mayor of the City and maybe the Minister of Public Works wants to have that opportunity. I would like to indicate to the Minister that the Mayor had as great a support in River Heights and Tuxedo, in St. James-Assiniboia, four to one against running against somebody else, as he had in support in his own area, in his own backwoods of the city, the north end or where he lives. So his support was general throughout the whole city. So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the vicious attack on the whole Council. If he wanted to raise some members of Council who are not doing their job, that's fine. That would have been fair. His debate would have been fair, but to make an attack on the whole Council that he did, I think it's not fair, it's not right, because, under the circumstances, I think the Council have done a pretty good job because it was a big job to do. There was a great change in legislation. We've changed from a 13 municipality; a 13 city concept to one city. There had to be a reduction in personnel, there were many changes. You had changes that had to be brought about and a lot of time was spent in that area and the Minister should realize that.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can leave that alone and maybe go to some other areas of the legislation that we are concerned with, that we should be confronted with and that's the unicity concept of government. I'm sure that all the members in this House are aware that Bill 56, when it was before this House a few years ago, I took a very strong position against it at that time. I felt quite strongly because in the City of St. James-Assiniboia we were a pretty low taxed area. We were receiving services probably much better and in a more efficient manner than many other parts of the City of Winnipeg. All you had to do . . . only in the matter of a few years when some residences had their property tax tripled, well no wonder . . . So that was my feeling at that time.

But I think we have to deal with reality and deal with what is before us today and we have the one city concept. We have a unicity concept and we can't dismantle that, we can't go back to say, be it thirteen cities or whatever we had before. Perhaps the people that were selling the one-city, the unicity concept, was that it would provide an equal or a shared tax base for the provision of all the people of this city and I think that was one strong point. So at the present time we cannot go back to dismantle what we have, I think the costs would be too great and even then we still wouldn't have a system because there would have to be changes.

I would also agree, Mr. Speaker, that the concept should be designed that the elected officials, the civil servants understand their respective functions, what is supposed to happen, what they are supposed to do. Even with the changes that we have I don't believe that this will take place. I think that the government or the urban government must be designed in such a way, Mr. Speaker, that would maximize citizens' involvement. I don't know if this will happen. I think that it would be, again,

responsive to citizens for information and to ask for improvements for the local residents. I don't know if this will take place.

I know that the Minister of Public Works mentioned one thing and he said one of the recommendations in the Taraska Report was a parliamentary system. I would have been happy to see if we would have moved in that direction but I don't really believe that we've moved in that direction, Mr. Speaker. Surely the experience from some other municipalities or other cities should have indicated to the Minister and to the government and probably demonstrated that the strong mayor system is essential for a successful government. What has happened here in fact is I think that some of the powers have been removed from the mayor and I am concerned.

When the Minister of Public Works says he should be accountable, I would like to see that the mayor should be responsible for budgets; he should be responsible for policy initiatives; he should be responsible for administration and that should be his platform and that's what he should run and that should be his responsibility. If he doesn't perform in four years he'll be out pretty quickly. In those areas he should have the responsibility in some form of a parliamentary system and he's got to be accountable. If he's not accountable and if he doesn't perform very quickly, very quickly he won't be in that position in the matter of one election. So I say give him those responsibilities and we'll find out pretty quickly through that method, through that system so that people will know who is responsible, what is happening in the system. At the present time we don't, Mr. Speaker.

I do believe that some of the changes in the bill will be beneficial. Reduction of city council from 50 to 28 I think is beneficial. I know in my own constituency I had a survey and the return in the survey was around 20 percent which is pretty high in any kind of a survey. One of the questions was, should the council be reduced from 50, should it be what the Taraska Report recommended, 39, or should it be further reduced? I would say 90 percent of the people indicated it should be further reduced and they put somewhere between 25 and 30. That was what most of them put. So 28 members is somewhere what my constituents indicated.

I would also indicate the Member for Sturgeon Creek had a good point. The council is responsible for services and they get the calls of any little problem that happens in the constituency or in their area. They get the calls, perhaps more than even the elected members here. But not only will those councillors be responsible to 14,000 or 15,000 electors, they will be responsible to 25,000 people, so it is getting pretty large. It is getting almost identical to what each member will have to have here. So in that respect I don't know what pressure will be put on each councillor.

The other point is that, in areas where the Council will still have to meet, what happens if one councillor is not there? What is going to be the quorum? Should it still be three, the full three? So there will be some problems to iron out.

However I cannot argue, I will accept that there should have been reduction. I, as well, accept that reduction from the twelve community committees to six, I believe, which was recommended by the legislation, and I believe that is in the right direction as well.

I believe elimination of the statutory set-up and freedom for the city to elect its own committee organizations, I accept that as well. I think it's in the right direction, but certainly the legislation does not go far enough. To say that it is some form of parliamentary system to make the council and to make the mayor more accountable, it does not go far enough, Mr. Speaker.

I am as well, I believe, concerned where the legislation allows to make a councillor run for council and mayor at the same time. Now I wish to ask the Minister what happens if he gets elected as a councillor and also as a mayor? Does he have to step down from his council seat, and will there be a by-election or what happens, or will there be an election in that council seat? The legislation is not clear and I wonder if it is proper and if it is perhaps in the interest of the council.

I know that some councillors accept it, quite favourably to it, the others were quite against it, so I have difficulty to see how that provision, how that mechanism will work, Mr. Speaker.

I am really concerned that the point that is in the legislation that will exempt the Provincial Government from the city plans and by-laws in respect to billing and so on. I believe it's in the wrong direction. —(Interjection)— Well, I don't know. We're not debating the federal legislation at the present time. I don't know if the federal legislation has to apply to the city by-laws or not. I don't know. So the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says, "No, it doesn't."

Now I know the government likes to take the position that because we couldn't get some of the zoning passed through for our housing legislation it was the total fault of the city council and that's why we don't want it to apply to the Provincial Government. And in fact the Chairman of the Environmental Committee of the City of Winnipeg has indicated that any legislation for the MHRC that has been before council in fact they have put the legislation through pretty quickly while they have laid aside all the others and tried to provide for a speedy passage for the government, or for any government agency.

Well, the Minister of Mines says it's not so. I've heard from the city councillors on the byline shows

indicating that it was so. Perhaps the Minister of Finance can indicate and give us some specific areas that they had to wait for years. But I don't believe that it makes for good planning. —(Interjection)— Well, I'll agree; yes, other agencies as well. I don't think it will make for good planning and this is an area that I believe, again, unless the Minister can demonstrate why the necessity to exempt the Provincial Government, perhaps he can convince me but at the present time he has not convinced me and I'm really concerned because it certainly doesn't make for good planning of the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker.

So I am concerned. I believe, as well, it's questionable dealing with the mayor's role as well. I have indicated already that I believe that the mayor should be responsible for the budget. He should be responsible for the policy initiatives and administration. Make it a form of a parliamentary system where you'll have debate take place in council, there will be some councillors supporting his position asking for amendments and changes. Perhaps there will be some councillors against which will be criticizing, which will only create I think a good parliamentary system. People will know what's taking place and they can assess it as to what councillor is doing a good job, where the councillors stand, what position they take because at the present time nobody knows even if the councillors are present on many important issues that are before the council.

So, again, I am concerned that the functions of the mayor should not only be for ceremonial activities. I think they should be expanded. Make him accountable and in a very short time, in a matter of a few years, citizens of the city can assess if he's performing, if he's accountable, and can replace the mayor through a referendum instead of making the mayor strictly a ceremonial official of the city, Mr. Speaker.

The other point I am as well concerned with — the amendments would give the Finance Minister I believe final decision in respect to capital borrowing by-laws removing it from the Municipal Board. I feel that this is unnecessary, again, because on every by-law and every matter, perhaps the council will have to deal with government, with the Minister of Finance. Again, I feel that this is unnecessary and I think it's a bad piece of legislation putting it in the legislation.

So these are a few of the points that I want to make at this time. I wish to indicate I did not intend to speak. In fact, I have looked at the bill quite briefly and knew what the amendments were but perhaps they require some more study but I couldn't let the remarks of the Minister of Public Works go unchallenged. I'm sure that he wasn't speaking for the whole government; if he was then I hope that the Minister of Finance would indicate so to us and I'm sure that even the Member for St. Johns did not accept all the words of the Minister of Public Works. I wish to indicate, again, that under the circumstances in a transition period for a four-year period, the council had a pretty difficult time bringing all the changes about and perhaps worked quite hard to do that. And to have a Minister get up in this House and say, "The council did nothing. They were no good," it's just a blanket charge that should not be acceptable, Mr. Speaker.

So these are some of the points that I wish to point out to the members of the House as I indicate again my position. When Bill 36 was the first time before this House — the original bill — I took a very strong position against it. Today we have a unicity concept of government for the City of Winnipeg. We cannot dismantle it; we cannot break it down so the only thing we can do is to make it better and make it more efficient. So the points that I have brought before the House I hope would be given consideration by the Minister of Finance and by the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take a few moments at this time and comment on the bill to amend the City of Winnipeg Act, as well as to make a few comments regarding the Minister of Public Works' statements.

The Minister of Public Works tried to bring forward two points. One is that this bill is going to create more freedom for the City of Winnipeg, which I dispute, and the other one that he spent many moments labouring on was the lack of leadership shown by His Worship, Mayor Stephen Juba, Deputy Mayor Bernie Wolfe, and the majority group at city council, the ICEC. I would say, Mr. Speaker, on that point I disagree with the Minister as well.

As far as the bill is concerned, I welcome the reduction in the number of councillors. I think that having served on the council with 50, it was an unwieldy council and it did not act in a parliamentary procedure and therefore it made it even more difficult to operate with 50 councillors plus a mayor at one time. The only way, in my opinion, that the 50-person council could have worked was rather than sitting every second Wednesday night, the second and the fourth of each month or the first and third, whichever the case might have been, that they would agree to meet for two or three days solid each month and go through the business of the various committees. —(Interjection)— The Minister of Mines and Resources says that he had suggested that. The mayor of the city, Mayor Juba, also suggested it on numerous occasions but many persons who belonged to the NDP group at city council were the persons that were most strongly opposed to such a concept. They said that a city council should operate in the evenings where the majority of the persons in the public could go down and see them in operation, and follow their business dealings with great interest.

Bu what happened and I can cite you an example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this moment, was that one of the first pieces of business that came before the new City of Winnipeg was the Convention Centre. At that time the council was operating under temporary quarters in the Administration Building and on that particular evening there were 49 councillors present and each councillor is permitted to speak for five minutes unless he or she is granted an extension. On that particular night, 48 of the 49 councillors present spoke on that piece of business, that one item, and it took over four hours to get through with that particular piece of business.

Then there was an amendment put into it and the matter came back before council two weeks later and at that time over 36 speakers again spoke on the matter. Now if the council was operating in the morning, afternoon and night, much as this Legislature does, we would have eliminated a lot of those persons who wanted to make those second and third speeches on a particular subject. In my opinion, that would have been the only way the 50-person council could have operated in an effective manner. But, by having council meetings under the present form, it did not operate effectively.

The matter was spoken on this morning about the Community Committees. The Member for Sturgeon Creek and the Member for Assiniboia mentioned the weakness of the Community Committee of three, which they will have out in the St. James-Assiniboia area. I happen to have had four years experience on a Community Committee of three. I can tell you that when a councillor, one of the three, is absent, due to illness or due to holidays, it's very very difficult for two to operate, particularly if the two of them have opposing views on a particular item of business that is before that Community Committee, or particularly when public delegations came before them. The delegation might have been working very closely with one of the two councillors, yet the other councillor who is present could be directly opposed to the requests of that delegation and what we end up having is a stalemate. No decision is really made that particular evening and the matter is either referred to a senior committee of council or to council. Therefore, the decision is not really made at the local level.

For years councillors, whether it be through the Canadian Federation of Mayors Association and through the Urban Association in Manitoba, have been asking for greater powers to operate at the local level with the opinion that the councillor is the person who is administering the services that you and I come in contact most often with, particularly in response to our family, and our family needs, our home and our pieces of property. They look after the services that we see day in and day out. Therefore, the Member for Sturgeon Creek mentioned that in his days as a councillor that he received numerous calls compared to his days as an MLA and I have said this both last year and again this year in this Legislature, that the number of requests and telephone calls, complaints, requests for assistance that a councillor receives far outweigh what an urban member of the Manitoba Legislature receives. I'm led to believe, by rural members of the Legislature, that the reverse situation is the case as far as they're concerned; that many persons in the rural communities know their MLA far better than they do the village councillor and so on. But in the large metropolitan, urban areas such as the City of Winnipeg the councillors are known to the people and do get the bulk of the work.

So I would hope that this particular government would do something that I felt was a great weakness in the previous council's Act, and that was they previously set the indemnities, back in 1971 for the councillors then, at \$5,700.00. How this was arrived at, I don't know. Maybe it was 57 MLAs times \$100 and that's how they arrived at that figure. But they did say in the Act, if the councillors deem it necessary to have a greater sum, in the way of an indemnity, they do have the power to increase it and to pay committee allowances. I think that this Legislature should take the responsibility and we should set the indemnities for the councillors. I think that they should be at least the equivalent amount to what an MLA gets, in the way of an indemnity. I also like the way that the MLA indemnity is set where it's tied to the cost of living. I think we should set the councillors' indemnity and tie it to the cost of living factor. —(Interjection)— Well, the Provincial Government is the creator of the urban government and I think we should give them a decent start in the way of indemnity because they are going to have to work twelve months of the year, almost at the same pace that we are working in this Legislature as MLAs for five months of the year. —(Interjection)—

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm just interested in whether the honourable member doesn't feel that they should be, firstly, most capable of deciding their remuneration and, secondly, would that not be a greater responsibility that those who fix the salary are the ones who are responsible to the electorate?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: Well I would answer that with a question, and ask why, back in 1971, did this government at that time set the indemnity?

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Again, in a question form. Would it not have been the logical thing to start them out with something so that they know that they had a beginning, which would be a basis for further consideration, since there was no other way of establishing a salary until after they were elected?

MR. DEIUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns is correct when he says that we should start them out with something and I would agree that this time we should start them out with something in the neighbourhood of an equivalent amount that an MLA receives so that they at least get off to a decent start and get paid a proper indemnity for the many hours that they will be working at City Hall. But that is not an item in the bill; it's an item that I think should be in the bill and we can debate that further at a future time.

The Minister of Public Works, in his statement has said that what we're trying to do is give the council more power. Yet on the other hand, for capital borrowings, the Minister of Finance is the almighty person. And on planning matters and the expansion to the City of Winnipeg, the Minister of Urban Affairs is the almighty person. So really I don't believe that this government is giving the City more power. They're perhaps streamlining the Act but, at the same time, they are making two Ministers of the government — in this particular case it happens to be the same person but that may not always be the case — they are giving two Ministers the full power to control the finances of the City of Winnipeg in the way of growth, and to control the City of Winnipeg as to its Planning Act. Therefore I say there is nothing left for the City to do and perhaps this is why we'll only need 28 councillors. Because all they are going to have to do is control the services such as the garbage pickup, the flooding of the rinks, the parks and so on. There is going to be very, very little left for the City in the way of growth plans, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I permitted the Member for St. Johns two questions. Perhaps, if I could finish before 20 or 25 after, the Minister of Mines and Resources can ask a question; I am always pleased to answer.

I have said that the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, has too much control. I believe that in the past the Municipal Board, although it was a politically-appointed board, in many cases was a very good board because all parties that were appointing persons to such a board usually looked for persons of experience. The Municipal Board in the past has usually had some former municipal councillors with great experience who, in my opinion, added much to the decision-making of that board. Also by having the Municipal Board in existence, even though they were appointed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, they were still an arm's length removed from the provincial government of the day. I believe that's an important factor. I think that by having that additional experience plus having that board an arm's length away from the provincial government, regardless who is the provincial government of the day, I think is a most worthwhile committee to review the finances of any municipality or any urban government.

As the Member for Sturgeon Creek mentioned in his remarks, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Urban Affairs, who has control over the growth of the City of Winnipeg, and he made some reference to this particular government owning vast acreages of land within the City of Winnipeg for future development, particularly development of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, from experience and when I was a councillor I had a number of occasions to meet with either the Minister of Urban Affairs or the Deputy Minister regarding the acceptance of Manitoba Housing and Renewal projects within our community committee area. Generally people have a reluctance to accepting projects that are promoted by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation and councillors must treat these items with kid gloves and a real educational process is needed so that we can have such developments come on stream. I believe all members of this Legislative Assembly do believe that there is a need for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, for low income housing, but they want to see it well planned, they want to see it in smaller units rather than 100 to 150-unit sizes and prefer to see smaller units of housing so that the people can blend in with the communities,

On that very point, I would once again like to point out an example that I have seen, where the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has operated. In the Tuxedo-River Heights area, for example, Carpathia Elementary School has approximately 500 students. There are one-third from the general River Heights neighbourhood, one-third from the military base and one-third from the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. So in each case there are about 160 students from each of the three sectors and there are too many students in each group to blend in with the second and third group. If a youngster comes from the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation project, that boy or girl can usually find another student in the same age group, likely in the same grade, who comes from the same complex to chum with, rather than mixing with the youngster who comes from the military family or the youngster who grew up in the general neighbourhood, the normal neighbourhood. This, in my opinion, has always been a classic example of the weakness of having a large Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation project in any one given area.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a great reluctance on the part of the general population in accepting Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation in their particular community. So therefore, if the Provincial Government has great acreage set aside in Winnipeg for future projects, and the Minister of Urban Affairs has the last say as to where and how these projects will proceed, therefore what they have virtually done, is taken the controls away from the citizens at

large and the councillors. I can foresee in the future some vast problems in this particular area.

The Minister of Public Works, in his remarks — and I see he is back in his chair — he mentioned that what Winnipeg has really lacked the most in the past four or five years, there's been a mayor without leadership, a deputy mayor who is tolerating the existing mayor but really disapproves of most things that the present mayor does but he is tolerating him and not fighting him as the case was with the former deputy mayor and therefore we don't have leadership from the deputy mayor; and a council that is controlled by the ICEC which is primarily a council which is representative of the businessmen of the community and therefore it is not always the best person who is serving on that council.

He also mentioned, in the case of the mayor, or in the case of any politician, that a politician must have three requirements. He must be a person of above-normal I.Q.; he must be a person with a record of experience and he must be a person who is dedicated. I really think what he was trying to do was to describe Mayor Stephen Juba because if anybody in this Chamber doesn't believe that Mayor Stephen Juba has an above-average I.Q., I think that person has not met the mayor yet. Experience, the man has been in office twenty years. Prior to that he served in this Chamber so I think his record stands for itself. And dedication, I think that this particular individual, he wouldn't be re-elected year in and year out if he wasn't a dedicated individual, and re-elected with vast majorities.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1971 Unicity elections, the mayor received more votes, personal votes, than this particular government did in 1969 from the whole of the province of Manitoba. And the mayor was receiving his votes from only approximately 55 percent of the people of the province of Manitoba. His record at the polls speaks for itself. He is a very powerful individual and I think that this government is doing the city and the successor to this mayor a great injustice when they are leaving the post of the mayor almost powerless. It is all right as long as we have our current mayor in there because he has a great deal of power within the City of Winnipeg and he's got very great persuasive powers and he has the ability to work with the press and work with other levels of government and to get his own way in most cases. But, whoever his successor might be, and it could be the Minister of Public Works, I think whoever his successor might be that that person should be a person who has some authority at the municipal level so that he is more than just a rubber stamp as the office now stands. The mayor of the City of Winnipeg, in my opinion, has less power at the city level than the Lieutenant-Governor has over the control of this House. And so he, in my opinion, is no more than just a public figure that welcomes people to the city and presents them with a lighter or a pin on behalf of the City of Winnipeg, and is asked to be an *ex-officio* member of all committees and give his point of view when his turn comes.

I think that the mayor should have veto power, as the mayor had prior to Unicity. If there is a piece of legislation that he feels shouldn't be proceeded with, he can delay it for two weeks or until the next council meeting and allow councillors to have a second review of that piece of legislation. So therefore I would hope that the government some day would strengthen the mayor's position, although I believe that this particular government would like to do away with having the mayor generally elected from the mass population. But as long as we have the current mayor, Mayor Stephen Juba, I don't think this government will ever proceed with what they would really, deep down, like to do and that is have the mayor chosen by the councillors as sort of the chairman, the way Metro elected their chairman; rather than having the mayor elected at large.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that, in my opinion, the Provincial Government is not doing what most municipal politicians and elected persons want, and that is greater authority over their future. What they are doing is hamstringing them, tying them to both the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Urban Affairs. They have left the mayor more or less as a powerless figure. They have done one thing that I believe is good and that is they have reduced the number of councillors because the former system was not working. But I don't really believe that they have reduced the amount of red tape that these councillors will have to deal with. Therefore, what we are going to end up with is 28 full-time councillors, led, hopefully, by a rather powerless mayor in authority, but perhaps power in the fact of personality. And the great battle between the province and the City of Winnipeg is going to continue on; it's going to continue in greater lengths in the future for the simple reason that the council will come constantly, cap in hand, to the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Urban Affairs, to try and persuade them to go along with their thinking and their line of direction. I would hope that this legislative body would have the courage to, at least, establish a base indemnity for the councillors, as they did back in 1971, so the councillors don't go through the embarrassing habit of trying to get their indemnities into proper proportion with the work-load that they are faced with each and every day.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the reduction in the number of councillors but I do see a lot of weaknesses in this bill and I hope that some of the weaknesses can be corrected at committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to speak but the honourable member did indicate that if he finished early he would take some questions.

He has indicated that the power has been reduced in the city in the area of finances and in the area of planning. At least that's the way I understood him. Now, is it not a fact that the power with regard to the city is exactly the same? That the power of the province with regard to the Municipal Board has been changed to an elected person, but that the City's power with regard to finances has not changed? It still has to be agreed to at the provincial level of government, that the change has been to change it from an administrative board to a political board, or to the Minister, and that with regard to planning it's exactly the same — that the Minister of Urban Affairs now has to approve third reading of a planning by-law of the City of Winnipeg. So that those two changes are not reductions. If anything they are the status quo.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there are two distinct differences in regard to the finance; that the decisions will now be made in the Cabinet room perhaps spear-headed by the Minister of Finance rather than the Municipal Board. I did say in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that the Municipal Board, yes, is appointed by the Cabinet of the day, the government of the day. But I've always believed that they have been able to work at arm's length away from the Cabinet and in many cases the persons appointed to that Municipal Board were persons of long-standing experience in municipal government and in many cases those persons don't have, perhaps, the political personality hang-ups that a Cabinet or a Minister of Finance might have with a council. They are removed at least an arm's length away.

In regard to the planning and the Minister of Urban Affairs, true, the Minister of Mines and Resources said he did give it third reading in all cases but now that Minister is going to be given the right to initiate planning action and not be asked to approve or disapprove at the final reading and on appeal. So, in my opinion, he can now initiate planning for the City of Winnipeg which he didn't do previously.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL (NO. 64) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT (4)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 64. The Honourable member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed the bill and recognize the Minister and the government have finally decided to reduce the speed limit in the province. From 30 m.p.h. zones it will now read 50 kilometres; in 60 m.p.h. zones it will read 90 kilometres; in 20 m.p.h. zones it will read 30 kilometres. I would say, Mr. Speaker, this decision by the Minister and the government has been long awaited by many groups and many individual citizens across the province, especially those that are interested in the conservation of our energy.

The Manitoba Trucking Association has had that as one of their resolutions for their last two or three annual meetings. I think the Manitoba Motor League and other safety groups have been urging the government and the Minister to take a look at this type of legislation.

It does create some problems, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, for people who live long distances from this capital city of Winnipeg. People, as an example, that have to drive in from Thompson or Flin Flon, possibly, and due to their geographical situation do have a special reason for needing maintenance of the present speed limit. But nevertheless, we'll see what happens when the bill moves on to committee, Mr. Speaker.

The one thing of course that does concern me regarding the reduction of speed and putting it into kilometres, is many, in fact I daresay 95 percent of the people driving around this province today their speedometers are marked in miles per hour and I don't see how it's going to proclaim that it will only recognize kilometres for some time until the whole system has been put together and unified. I daresay that we'll have to deal with joint markings of signs for many years, because some people see fit to drive the older vehicles and I don't think we can impose a penalty upon them because somebody wants to drive an older car.

The other thing, of course, on the metric system, the many concerns and anxieties that are being expressed by the agricultural committees across Canada today certainly must be recognized when we're dealing with this kind of legislation. That concern is real and it's got to be on the stage now where the government of Canada is prepared to shelve or take another look at those sections of the metrification of our province, and take another look at it and maybe back off on certain aspects of the metric legislation. But on the other hand, I daresay in this section dealing with speed limit, that it will come about and likely work to the best interests of everybody.

The other section was dealing with certain restrictions that are not applicable when the vehicle is used by any police force. I would hope in that section there, the Minister would give us a better definition of who is this person employed by government as a peace officer who will not come under the sections of the Act. I'm wondering if this is a vehicle of possibly some people working for the

government coming out checking purple gas on farmyards is an experience that we had in my constituency last fall where inspectors come in. I wonder is that section being repealed to cover up for them or just basically what has the Minister in mind with that section.

The section dealing with the new definition for securing of loads on motor vehicles and trailers, of course, is a housekeeping section, Mr. Speaker. I daresay it's needed to bring the changes that were brought in last year.

The other section, the one regarding the prohibition for the use of sirens and horns, I'm sure again is one that there has been some problems with and it again is a housekeeping matter, Mr. Speaker.

The radar detection devices that the Minister now is going to try and regulate is one that I would certainly like him to give us more information on. As I stand here, I don't see how it's possible for the Minister or the government to regulate or bring under control these CB radios that are prevalent across our province. I daresay there are thousands of them today used on their personal belongings, or in their trucks and cars. The way they communicate back and forth as they travel about this province is very interesting if you happen to sit in with them once in awhile. They can tell where a police vehicle is or where a certain truck is almost instantaneously. I would think they would have our police force running around this province in circles trying to bring them under control. If the Minister feels that he is going to bring these radar detection devices under control because CB radio is certainly a radar detection device,

The other section of the bill — he may seize the device. I wonder why there would not be an appeal allowed in that section. No doubt the Minister will give us that information later on in the bill.

The other section, Mr. Speaker, deals with the hearings of applications by single members of the Motor Transport Board and the Motor Vehicle Board and I'm wondering why now they want only one single member to go and listen to a hearing. I have heard complaints that the present chairman of the two boards is maybe so busy that he doesn't have time to deal with both Boards. In fact there has been a recommendation from the Manitoba Trucking Association that the province should establish one chairman for each Board separately but I would wonder because those are people that are appointed by the Minister and the government and why all of a sudden a single person should be asked to go around and listen to the hearings in the various parts of the province. So maybe he will give us a better understanding of that when we get the bill into Committee. Those, Mr. Speaker, are just a few of the things that have been brought to my attention, some of the questions that have been raised to move the bill along to Committee and no doubt there'll be other questions raised as well when we get it into Law Amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PARICK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill. I believe we had some information from the Minister of Highways last year that the bill would be coming and it's here. The main points were pointed out quite well by the Honourable Member for Roblin. I agree with the hearing with one board member because apparently there may be two sittings the same day. The Board can split itself to take the hearings and I see nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. The regulation of radar detection devices, I think that some of these gadgets have been sold now for quite a few years and I don't know in what way the government is going to police it with the exception that it will be illegal for some of these to be attached to cars. I guess that's the only way. If somebody is perhaps caught with one then there'll be a penalty. I don't think the government will have an army of people go checking on who has devices on their car. I think it's a principle we can accept.

I think that it's perhaps overdue that we have some kind of guidelines in respect to sirens and the use of sirens and who can use them and who cannot. There are some people driving in some of the ambulances perhaps home and in no rush will perhaps use the siren with no need to. So again I feel that we are perhaps overdue with respect to some guidelines as to use of the sirens.

I accept and I think it's perhaps timely that we have the speed limit reduced which will result in 55 miles per hour and not only will it result in saving of our energy resources, it will perhaps be a big safety factor in respect to fatalities on our highways. As you know, Mr. Speaker, it's been proven. The statistics have indicated quite well in the United States what happened after their speed limit was reduced. Not only did they save something like \$2 billion worth of energy, of fuel in I believe a year, or half a year operation, but also there was a drastic reduction, just a drastic reduction in the accidents and fatalities, so I think it's a move in the right direction. There may be some people against this measure of reduction in speed limit, but I'm all for it.

The only other point that I don't believe is in the bill, I wondered when we went this far perhaps the Minister as well would have made it mandatory, the use of seat belts. This has been now requested by the Manitoba Medical Association. It's been requested by I believe three or four organizations that the use of seat belts be mandators. I know it's now law in several provinces. It's law in Ontario. I believe that Quebec was bringing in law. I don't know if it has passed or not. I'm not so sure about Saskatchewan. But I believe either two or three provinces have a mandatory law for the use of seat belts and I believe the Minister should have moved in this area as well while he is bringing in this

Monday, May 16, 1977

legislation. So these are the points I wish to bring and in principle I agree with the legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to make a substitution on the Committee for Economic Development.

MR. SPEAKER: Let's deal with this bill first.

QUESTION put MOTION carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a substitution on the Committee for Economic Development and substitute the name of the Member for Inkster, for that of the Member for Brandon East.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? (Agreed)

The hour being 12:30 the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon. :