

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 16, 1969

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before the afternoon's proceedings I wonder if I might welcome our young guests today. We have 40 students of Grade 10 standing, from Niverville School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Dyck and Miss Chomiak. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

We also have with us today five students of Grade 12 Senior standing, from the Grafton School in North Dakota, United States of America. I bid them a special welcome today, and these students are under the direction of Mr. Pearson. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a question of information. I don't know whether it was announced to the House, and if it was then I missed it. Could the Speaker identify the wonderful choir that entertained in the Legislative Chambers during the lunch hour? Is that information available to the Speaker? We were treated with some beautiful choir singing and I just wondered whether the Speaker is aware as to who was responsible for it.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for Inkster for bringing that matter to the attention of the House. No information of the choir being here has reached me at this point.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, there is an Order for Return on Page 1 of the Order Paper, and thereafter I understand that there is agreement in the House that we should proceed to the Committee of the Whole House on Page 2 to dispose of the bills for third reading, and then to Page 16 to dispose of the bills for second reading.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, to go over to bills instead of the resolutions — (Interjection) — Yes, I have no objections. I certainly want to accommodate the government so that they can probably call the election later on today or Monday.

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize to the House for overlooking that matter of the adjourned debate. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the information requested by this particular Order is of utmost importance and should clear up some of the misconceptions that have been prevalent regarding dominion-provincial relations and the particular position of Manitoba vis-a-vis federal-provincial relations, and the reason that I feel, Mr. Speaker, that there is further elucidation required on this subject, is that I am astounded to find that there is a great deal of ignorance in the area in the strangest places, Mr. Speaker. The first demonstration of the people who should know better who have confessed on this particular subject, came when the Honourable the former Minister of Housing in the federal House announced in his resignation that he had re-read Pierre Elliott Trudeau's book on Federalism and the French-Canadian, and that he learned by reading it more carefully that the Prime Minister of the country was one who believed in ten strong semi-sovereign provinces held together by a rather loose central government, and Mr. Speaker, when we find that the Deputy Prime Minister of the country says that he only just recently learned of what the Prime Minister of the country was saying with regard to federal-provincial relations, especially since an election was fought on that basis, I think that it comes as a shock to most Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that what is happening in our country because of this misconception and because of the attitude of our present provincial government, is that we are heading on a disaster course which is not going to be changed because there aren't what the Prime Minister himself has referred to as the countervailing forces necessary to prevent the country from going where the Prime Minister, coupled, aided and abetted by the provinces, the direction that they are moving in. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hellyer subsequently admitted in a more recent statement that not only had — it wasn't the case of him re-reading the book, it's a case of him getting the flu and reading the book for the first time, and thereby determining that the Prime

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... Minister's thesis is in this direction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this Tuesday's newspaper there was an editorial by Charles Lynch, and I think that most people would suggest that Charles Lynch is probably one of the most prominent political writers on the Canadian scene and one would expect, since he literally drooled at the feet of Pierre Elliott Trudeau during the federal election, that he would have known what Mr. Trudeau was talking about. But, Mr. Speaker, the amount of ignorance that is demonstrated by Mr. Lynch in his column of Tuesday indicates that the country should start looking at what is being said so that there will be an understanding, and I believe that the question that is put by the Member for Gladstone is very pertinent, because what is the question asked for, Mr. Speaker? It says he wants to know the amount of taxes that are paid to Ottawa by the provincial taxpayer and the amount of monies that the province receives in return. And this information, Mr. Speaker, I think will demonstrate that by and large the Province of Manitoba in particular, and other have-not provinces in general, benefit by the federal cost-sharing programs, and the tendency of both the federal and the provincial governments - all the provincial governments, including our own - is to get us out of these tax-sharing programs, which I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this will spell disaster for the economic solvency of the province if the program is proceeded with.

Now what did Mr. Lynch say, because I think that this is important. Mr. Lynch said that Mr. Hellyer wants to lead a pressure group within the Liberal Party in support of a strong central government and away from the trend towards regionalism that he detects in Mr. Trudeau's philosophy. "I had not detected the soft spots in Mr. Trudeau's federalism that led Hellyer to quit." He had not detected the soft spots in Trudeau's federalism that led Mr. Hellyer to quit. Now, Mr. Speaker, I repeat: one of the most distinguished political columnists in the country, certainly one who drooled, I repeat, at the feet of Pierre Elliott Trudeau during the federal election.

Then he says, "But without admitting that Mr. Trudeau is primarily a provincial rights man, I must admit that some signs of the old Pearson approach have been creeping in." Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit that Mr. Pearson was a much stronger central government man than is Mr. Trudeau and I intend to prove it. "That being so, and believing as I do that without strong central government the country will inevitably deteriorate into a series of regional empires, the only hope is to stiffen the sinews of Mr. Trudeau." Well, Mr. Speaker, if the sinews of Mr. Trudeau are stiffened in any respect, then we can expect what Mr. Trudeau asks for in his book, and that is ten strong provinces.

Furthermore, "thus make the Federal Government an acceptable agent of progress in all parts of the country." This is what he said that Mr. Trudeau is doing. "Mr. Hellyer had a dimmer view of Trudeau's federalism than I have, and he finds more provincialism in the Trudeau philosophy than I have been able to detect. If he is right, then it is supremely important that the country hear what Hellyer is saying and that the country be influenced by it."

Mr. Speaker, I think that Mr. Lynch's article indicates that he believes, and he goes on to say that he has urged, Mr. Lynch has urged the Federal Government to elbow its way - "elbow its way into provincial jurisdiction like education, roads and urban renewal." Now a man who believes that, that the Federal Government should elbow its way into jurisdictions like education, roads and urban renewal, supported Mr. Trudeau during the federal election whose policy is entirely contrary to this occurring.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come to the question of finances and it relates to the problem that I'm talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I was hoping the honourable gentleman would come back to that because I was also wondering whether or not he was making a political speech today.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I am making a political speech and a political speech deals with the federal-provincial relations and the financing of our country. On the basis of...

MR. SPEAKER: That is his privilege so long as he keeps within the confines of the matter that's before the House.

MR. GREEN: I intend to do so, Mr. Speaker. Earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, I requested from the Minister of Finance that he give me a breakdown of the monies that are received from the provinces and of the monies that are paid back to the provinces. He gave me a document for which I am indebted. Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Provincial Government Finances, and it's dated March 20th, 1969. It indicates, Mr. Speaker, the amount...

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Could that same material be made available to other members of the House?

MR. GREEN: I would presume that on request to the Minister of Finance it could be made available. I think that that is what the Order is requesting.

MR. EVANS: . . . recall whether that was an official Order or whether it was something that I handed to my honourable friend privately. I will be very glad to provide the same to the Member for Rhineland.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the document indicates that in the case of Manitoba - and I'm going to deal with per capita amounts - that the Manitoba taxpayer pays \$207.14 per capita in federal taxes. He received in return in federal cost-sharing programs for federal payments of one kind or another, the sum of \$84.56, which means, Mr. Speaker, that 40 percent of the amount which is received from provincial taxpayers is paid back, and of course the federal treasury also needs money so the balance of the 60 percent is spent presumably on federal programs. Now if one was very quick and superficial one would say that, well, if Manitoba had a better tax-sharing break, then the entire \$207.00 which was received from Manitobans would be given back to Manitobans. But let's see what would happen if that occurred, Mr. Speaker, because the Province of Manitoba receives 40 percent back, the Province of Ontario per capita taxpayer pays \$320.27 to the Federal Government and the Province of Ontario receives \$47.61, or 14 percent of the amount that is collected, which means that the Province of Manitoba is subsidized in part by taxes that are paid by the citizens of Ontario.

The Province of Alberta per capita taxes are \$200.96; the amount which they spend in the provinces, or return is \$59.40 or 29 percent. This includes all taxes that they collect and all taxes that they give back.

The Province of British Columbia; they pick up in British Columbia \$230.70, they give back \$65.90, or 28 percent of what is collected.

The Province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker -- \$178.26 collected, \$58.83 given back, or 33 percent - and of course I have asked the House to consider that Manitoba gets back 40 percent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not something new. For years the have-not provinces, which included the provinces of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, the Maritimes, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island by the way, and if you take one of the others, Newfoundland receives back 200 percent. They get far more - they get far more than is collected. If the Federal Government stopped the tax-sharing programs and cut off all revenues to the Province of Newfoundland and gave Newfoundland the privilege of collecting and retaining 100 percent of its taxes, the Province of Newfoundland would suffer by exactly 50 percent. Their provincial treasury would have exactly 50 percent of the amount of money that they now have. The province of Prince Edward Island - it's 200 percent; it's the same thing. Nova Scotia is dollar for dollar.

But, Mr. Speaker, let's not for the moment consider the other provinces. Let's consider the Province of Manitoba. Manitobans pay \$207.14 per capita; they receive back \$84.56 per capita. If the Federal Government was to release to Manitoba, as sometimes I hear being requested by the government benches, the entire tax load, let us recall that what happens to Manitoba happens to every other province. It means Ontario would get back its entire tax load and instead of receiving a net \$280.00 rough from every citizen in Ontario to the federal treasury, the federal treasury would lose \$280.00 per capita and it would not have that money available to spend throughout the provinces. And for years, Mr. Speaker, my understanding of history is that provincial premiers fought for the Federal Government to enter fields which they could not finance with their own relatively narrow base of taxation - not the tax base, but the amount of taxes that there were to collect. It was considered necessary for Canadian unity for the wealthier provinces to be taxed and that there be an adjustment so that the less wealthy province, and Canadians in the less wealthy provinces, would not lose by virtue of not having the same development as the others. And this is the result, this is the result, Mr. Speaker, which I suggest to you economically, economically if the Federal Government would only do it, it would be wise if we gave them our entire tax base, some more taxes -- and I'm only talking mathematically for the moment; let's not talk about provincial jurisdiction and how this would affect the political administration of the province. But economically, Manitoba would benefit if more and more of our tax base was collected by the Federal Government so that it could be distributed to all the provinces. And what our government is saying - and they appear to be saying this consistently - is, release to us the tax revenues that you are now collecting from Manitoba. Give us back our income tax; give us five points on our income tax, ten points,

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... fifteen points, whatever the number is. The more income tax that Manitoba releases to the Federal Government, the less well off Manitoba is by virtue of the figures that are being shown here.

Mr. Speaker, I realize I've tried to make this point on various other occasions and various other members — the Leader of the Opposition said that this is an insane policy, and various other people at various times have tried to make this point but it just doesn't appear to have come through because we still have on the Order Paper suggestions that the Federal Government not enter into tax-sharing programs without consulting the provinces and thereby inhibit the possibility of money being spent in Manitoba. Because what does that policy mean? What does it mean if the Federal Government enters no tax-sharing programs without consultation of the provinces?

Well we know from history what it meant. We had — let's look back and see what it meant. It meant, Mr. Speaker, it meant that many, many provinces were insisting that the Federal Government participate in such fields as education, social security, the Canada Pension Plan, and because there was a particular situation in the province of Quebec where they did not want federal assistance to education, where they did not want the Federal Government to participate in social security schemes, that the country was held back, in fact, by a veto of the province of Quebec, and what my learned friend the Attorney-General and his colleagues in the cabinet are now saying is that we return the veto power over Canadian participation in these types of programs to all the provinces, which for all practical purposes means to the province of Quebec. It means that whether or not we will participate in such programs will be decided by the province of Quebec.

Now Mr. Speaker, that's exactly, that is to the letter what Pierre Elliott Trudeau says in this book, and if our government is going along with that type of program, then what I am trying to indicate is that there is no differences of opinion at all between the Weir position on constitutional reform and the Trudeau position on constitutional reform, and I would urge anybody who thinks otherwise to read this book, because Mr. Speaker, I'll just quote slightly from it — (Interjection) — it's very inexpensive, \$2.50. Consequently there is no need to evoke the notion of a national state to turn Quebec into a province different from the others.

In a great number of vital areas, and notably those that can turn the development of particular cultural values, Quebec has full and complete sovereignty under the Canadian Constitution, and what Mr. Trudeau objects to is the Federal Government doing anything that would interfere with that sovereignty. He says, and I read from page 36, "Provincial governments, on the other hand, have jurisdiction over all matters of a purely local or private nature; over education, natural resources, property and civil rights, municipalities, roads, social and labour legislation and the administration of justice, and more generally, over all matters relating to cultural development or to development of the land."

And then again: "If we look at all aspects of the problem, therefore, I think we shall find the general spirit of Canadian federalism quite acceptable. I should be very surprised if real statesmen, given the facts of the problem, arrive at the conclusion that our constitution needs drastic revision." And isn't that what the premier of this province says? That we don't need revision of the constitution. What we have to do is keep the Federal Government out of provincial fields. — (Interjection) — I'll agree it's the same theory as is held by the Member for Rhineland. He says that there should be no federal participation in the fields of provincial jurisdiction and that there should be a veto power by any province. That's what he says; that's what Mr. Trudeau says; that's what Mr. Weir says.

Again, on page 86: "Therefore, no argument based on a new federal jurisdiction over education could possibly be used at present to justify education grants," and I... the word "education". Now Mr. Speaker, we have Charles Lynch who says, who apparently should know, says that he supported Mr. Trudeau and he urges that the federal government elbow its way into provincial jurisdictions like education, roads and urban renewal. There's a learned columnist who supported him during the campaign and he says that this man believes in central government participation in fields which Mr. Trudeau specifically eliminates from his book.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue. He said — he's talking about the Quebec refusal to accept federal participation in the areas that I have spoken of — he said, "They seem to believe that Ottawa has a deep dark plot against their faith, language and rights. They are against this because they have always been against everything, against old age pensions, unemployment insurance, family allowances, fiscal agreements, Medicare, the National Film Board, CBC,

(MR. GREEN cont'd.).... radio and television, in short against what they call 'English Protestant money'. The federal government is still preparing, and has been since 1919, a Medicare program. When it is completed you will see nationalists...." This is familiar, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the members of the government benches should listen, because this is what they say. "You will see nationalists protesting that it should really come under provincial jurisdiction. You might think that in the meantime they would clamour for rapid provincial action to prevent terrible cases of deprivation, but do they? Not a bit. They claim that health is not the business of the state at all but of intermediary bodies. The truth is that they are disgruntled because they are against state intervention in any field; in education, social security, family welfare, economic stability, natural resources, private enterprising, housing - that's a pregnant word - housing, health and all the rest. They believe that they are against socialism," etc.

Now Mr. Speaker, in his book, for those who read it, Mr. Trudeau indicates that the provinces have these jurisdictions now, that the province of Quebec has these jurisdictions now, and that if the Federal Government stayed completely out of the provincial field that the province of Quebec should be satisfied and I say that he doesn't - he a debt to every province in Canada to fight for its own resources. Mr. Speaker, that is the course of the existing provincial government. When the existing provincial government attended at Ottawa, they said the very same thing, and they are now asking for the same thing. They are asking for the Federal Government not to use its tax-spending power to assist provinces in assuming their provincial jurisdiction without the consent of all the provinces, which means a veto, which means a veto by any province in the country. — (Interjection) — Well that's what's being said.

MR. LYON: That's what you're saying.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker — well I've heard it from you people.

MR. LYON: No you haven't.

MR. GREEN: I've heard it from you people. Now what a difference, Mr. Speaker, from what is being said by the former premier of this province, who came back to Winnipeg and made a speech this week, which is reported in the Winnipeg Tribune. What did he say about these same areas? "Much of what we seek for Manitoba will never be done by Manitoba alone. Manitoba will never make the most of its possibilities by itself. It can only do so if we have a national government ready, willing and able to help us. We cannot sell wheat alone; we can't beat poverty alone; we can't build our cities alone; we need Canada to help us. Our province will never fulfill its own purpose or maximize its own possibilities, in English or in French, by itself. It needs the broader resources and the wider help the federal power can supply." He also suggested "the senior government, federal and provincial, should provide more assistance to urban government, direct assistance to urban government, focus of so many of the festering problems of modern living."

Does the member for Rhineland agree with that? Because he has just said that he didn't. "So we can't stop at a constitution" - and this is important - "so we can't stop at a constitution that divides the power and allocates the functions, no matter how clever. We need a new dimension." Mr. Speaker, what a difference two years makes, because that's what the former premier of this province said. It says "now" and I wonder whether the present premier can ascribe to these particular views.

Mr. Speaker, I have raised this issue again on this particular motion because I have indicated there appears to be a fantastic misconception of what is happening in the country vis-a-vis federal-provincial relations. I originally thought that this misconception is limited to the individual who catches only a glimpse of things and sees the premier arguing on television with the Prime Minister of the country, but when we find, Mr. Speaker, that the deputy Prime Minister found out, only roughly three weeks ago, that this problem exists, and when we find out that one of the leading columnists in the country can write that he is a centralist, and he supports the present policy of the federal government because he is a centralist, I think that this issue has to be exposed for what it is. The Prime Minister of the country is not a centralist and it wouldn't be so bad if we had a man who believed in provincial rights in Ottawa but a whole bunch of provincial premiers who were trying to involve this government - the federal government that is - in provincial affairs, but we don't have that situation. We have a peculiar situation where some of the provinces who can benefit most by federal participation and who used to ask for it, that is the province of Manitoba and the province of Saskatchewan, are now retreating into a narrow provincialism, which is perfectly consistent with what the Prime

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... Minister of the country wants.

Now Mr. Speaker, you will recall that in the federal House the Prime Minister introduced a measure relating to the rules of the House, and there were some particularly undemocratic clauses in those rules and there was a particularly violent debate by the opposition on the stringency of the rules, and as a result of the debate there was a compromise made, and after the compromise was made, the Prime Minister indicated, rather in a childish way, that he had trapped the opposition. He had trapped the opposition into going along with what he really wanted by including in it a whole bunch of harsh things which they then thought they had the credit of removing.

Mr. Speaker, are we headed - and I ask this government - are we headed into the same type of trap? Is the Prime Minister of the country saying to the provinces, or leading them down the garden path and saying, "We want you to stay out of the federal cost-sharing program; we want you to release to us more and more tax points"? And will he subsequently at a later date yield, say that it's done, and say, "Boy - did we trap those provinces! Now they are left on their own, which is exactly what I wanted in the first place, and we are limiting drastically our federal tax-sharing program."

I want to repeat these figures, Mr. Speaker, because perhaps the significance of them didn't reach the other members. Manitoba receives 40 percent of the amount that is collected in taxes by the Federal Government, receives it back from Ottawa. Ontario receives 14 percent. We are being subsidized by the Ontario tax base. Alberta receives 29 percent. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rhineland says we are not getting our full share back therefore we are not being subsidized. I would like to ask the Member for Rhineland: does the Federal Government need any money for its areas of responsibility? He surely has been in favour of the defense program. Does Manitoba have to pay a part of that defense program? Unless you get your full share back you are not being subsidized - well that's absolutely ridiculous, absolute nonsense. The only way you can find out whether you are being subsidized is to see if you get more back than other provinces get back, and the province of Ontario gets 14 percent back, the province of Quebec gets 33 percent back, the province of Alberta gets 29 percent back, and the province of British Columbia gets 28 percent back.

Now Mr. Speaker, in whose interest is it to eliminate the amount of money that is being collected by the federal government from the provinces? Wouldn't the province of Ontario be the first government - and by the way, they are. If you encourage them to take their taxes back, although they have been an outstanding province and have been, I think, a good participator in the idea that there has to be regional distribution of wealth, if you say that the province of Ontario wants all its taxes back, then you will return to the province of Ontario not 60 percent but 86 percent of what is now being collected from it, in addition to the 14 percent that they are now getting and which is being used, so that the province of Ontario should go along with the federal government's type of federalism. The province of British Columbia should go along and will go along. The province of Alberta should go along and will go along. But Mr. Speaker, the Maritimes, who now receive 200 percent, 100 percent, should they go along? Because this is what is being suggested by those people who say, "Let us keep all our taxes."

Mr. Speaker, I say that the danger is that where at one time certain provinces protected the have-not provinces from the type of federalism that the Prime Minister is talking about, from the type of inducements that British Columbia, Alberta, Quebec and Ontario would be very happy to have, that there were certain provinces who protected them from this, we now don't have one, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that it's incumbent on this province not to insist that the federal government get out of the areas of cost-sharing, not only that they not get out but that they get in and they get in deeper, because to the extent that they get in deeper, we have a fiscally more sound position in the province of Manitoba, and when this Order for Return is completed, Mr. Speaker, and the figures given, I think they will verify that the province of Manitoba does very well. By the fact that the federal government has instituted a federal hospitalization program, would we prefer to pay the entire cost ourselves? That would be sounder economics from the point of view of this government? That the federal government should get out of the Medicare program? That would be better? Well, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what the people in Quebec said, so let's see whether it fits...

MR. LYON: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Let's see if what the Attorney-General says...

MR. LYON: Would my honourable friend permit a question? Is my honourable friend

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . trying to say that the federal government should determine the priorities of spending in this province or any other province?

MR. GREEN: I say, Mr. Speaker, that when a federal government is elected. . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'll take advantage of this opportunity and tell the honourable gentleman he has 4 minutes.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I say, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain things which by the sociological and economic progress of the country become national, and the only way that you know that a program becomes national is when the mass of the people in the country start calling for a national program, and the minute — the Attorney-General well knows that in 1962 and 1963 there wasn't a single political party running federally who didn't say that Medicare had become a national program and that the federal tax-spending power shouldn't be used in that respect. So yes indeed, I say that I am not prepared to accept the fact that we are going to limit the power of the federal government to the vision of the people of 1867. Is that what the Attorney-General wants to do? Because if that's what he wants to do, then he can tie hands with the Prime Minister of the country, and that's all I'm trying to convince you of. What you are saying, all I'm trying to convince you of and all I'm trying to convince the House of, is that there is no argument at all, Mr. Speaker, between what the Premier of this province is saying and what the Prime Minister of the country is saying, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have got to know this because the average person, and not only the average person but Charles Lynch, says that Trudeau is a federalist who wants to spend money on education, and nothing could be further from the truth. Trudeau told the people of the country that the reason he got into federal politics was to stop the Federal Government from spending money in provincial areas.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman is certainly on thin ice, and I appealed to him a few moments ago to stay within the confines of the detail before the House.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I've only got a couple of minutes to go, and the fact is that this question that is on the Order Paper, if it doesn't deal with what I'm talking about it doesn't deal with anything; that that's all that it deals with. It deals with how the country is going to move fiscally; whether we are going to put it into a fiscal strait jacket constructed in 1897, which is what the Attorney-General and his Leader want to do, or whether we have to convince this House and the people. . .

MR. LYON: That deliberate distortion is not even worthy of a response. It is a deliberate distortion.

MR. GREEN: Well, then, he shouldn't have made a response, Mr. Speaker. If it wasn't worthy of a response, he shouldn't have made it.

MR. LYON: Just so that you're aware of my feeling.

MR. GREEN: But, Mr. Speaker, that is the fact. The fact is that this is misconstrued by many people, that it's about time that we undo the misconception, and it's about time that we had it known. At least if the government is doing this, let it be known by the people of this province that the Provincial Government does not want federal expenditure on education without the consent of all the provinces, and I repeat, that means veto by the Province of Quebec, that the Provincial Government does not want the Federal Government to enter into housing programs without the consent of all the provinces, and I repeat, that means veto by the Province of Quebec; that the Provincial Government does not want the Federal Government to enter into any social security programs without consultation and consent by all the provinces, and I repeat, that means veto by the Province of Quebec, and if that is the case and I suggest that it is, that it's not a distortion because the First Minister said exactly that when I asked him the question on housing. He said that he agrees that there not be a housing program without consultation and consent of all the provinces. That means veto by any provinces in this country, and what we have said is that we need a constitution which will permit us to move ahead in these areas, and if there is a particular situation that exists in one province, that that particular situation should not hold the country back. But Mr. Speaker, that is not the course that we are embarked on, and I ask the members of this House to give careful consideration to that, to the fact that there is no countervailing force, that everybody is being led down the garden path of fiscal bankruptcy by the Prime Minister of this country.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . ask my honourable friend the Member for Inkster a question?

MR. GREEN: Certainly.

MR. CAMPBELL: Can my honourable friend the Member for Inkster tell us when that book that he was quoting from was written?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the book is a collection of essays which was written, I would say, between 1959 and 1962.

MR. CAMPBELL: Does my honourable friend - this is a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker - does my honourable friend not realize that ten or eleven months in office has done a great deal for Pierre Elliott Trudeau just as it would for my honourable friend if he were in office for awhile?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, what we do know is not what I think, but what we do know is that Mr. Hellyer thinks that it hasn't done a thing for him.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, when my honourable friend from Inkster complains that the Provincial Government should not ask the Federal Government to relieve certain areas of taxation to the provinces, I agree with him 100 percent. I think this would be wrong, and I think that we would have an awful lot to lose; but having said this, I certainly take objection to some of the things that were said by my honourable friend who just finished his speech. Unfortunately, I'm not as well prepared as he is but I think that certain things should be said immediately.

My honourable friend is trying, as far as I'm concerned, to over-simplify things. I've been listening to him very carefully, and if we listen to what he said, and he's entitled to his opinion, the only possible way of being a federalist, a centralist, the only possible way would also be to be a Socialist, and I think this is the case that my honourable friend is trying to build, trying to put the members of this House in a box and say: "Well, if you believe in a strong Canada you must be a Socialist," because this is exactly what my honourable friend is saying. He wants compulsory grants. He wants compulsory programs, dictated and thought up in Ottawa, and Mr. Speaker, there is an alternative. I think that probably by now my honourable friend . . . members of the Government realize it would be wrong to say to Canada, to say to the Federal Government, "Let us raise our own taxes." I think that they've learned that they're wrong. Maybe this is not what they meant, but this is what they've said. I think, and I agree with my friend from Selkirk who said that we want the regional distribution of wealth; we definitely want this. This is something we want and, as far as I'm concerned, this is the key to the word "federalism". This is the main key, is to collect this money and let the different areas of Canada have a share in this great wealth in the economy of our country. To me this is federalism and I think that this is federalism to other members of this House aside from the members of the New Democratic Party.

Now, I do not criticize my friend for saying what he said, for believing this, but I would not want for a minute, Sir, the members of this House to feel that this is a true statement of fact, that the only way you could be a federalist, the only way you can believe in a strong united Canada is to say that you have to be a Socialist, because I don't believe that at all. Not at all. And I think that this country would be a lot stronger, a lot stronger if we had, yes, a very strong central government but a government that would discuss the priorities with the different provinces. I'm not suggesting, and this is not what Mr. Trudeau or Mr. Lynch are suggesting, that the Federal Government does not spend any money - does not spend any money, but that it does not necessarily have to dictate to all the provinces and they're not by necessity the priority. My honourable friend is the first one to say - and his Party has said it - special status for Quebec. Oh, you'll rise and say, "I'm not talking about these things, I'm talking about the language problems and that," but I think he must stop for a minute and say, special status for Manitoba, special status for other provinces, because we have our list of priorities and I'm not going to be ashamed to say that I don't like to repeat, and my friend loves - well, not so much now because I've repeated myself so much, but he loves to say the Member for St. Boniface did not like the compulsory part of the Medicare program, and I say no, I don't. I say, no, I don't. I say I would give anything to go back in the good old days of MMS where we could start by reasoning, not everybody race for this Socialist money to put in our pockets, where we could go back and say to the Federal Government: You're interested in the health, in the medical health of our people in Canada. All right. Give us a certain amount earmarked for health, but let us determine how we want to spend it. And Mr. Speaker, this is what I said; this was my main point that I was trying to make anyway.

Then the question of hospitalization, and I agree with the Attorney-General that I wish we didn't have hospitalization the way we have it now, and I would like to turn back the clock and

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... I'm saying to the Minister of Health, go back to Ottawa and get all the members, the different Ministers of Health in the provinces and say: "All right, you have so much money to spend. Let us determine our priorities." And if this was done I think it would be much better and I think that if my friend is fair he's going to admit that it would be better. He's going to admit that we then could start at the bottom, like I said, and spend more money on home care and have beds that will not have a per diem rate of \$50.00 or \$60.00 a day, and put people in the nursing homes and geriatric and rehabilitation hospitals where we'd spend less money. But this is not being done now under the Socialist plan, because the people say, "If I go in and occupy a bed for acute treatment in this hospital, it's all paid for. I know I don't belong there. My doctor knows that I don't belong there, but he knows that I can't afford to be anywhere else because I'd have to pay for myself."

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Member a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: the question is asked, I'm sure the honourable gentleman will accept the question, but he too must remember that he is leaving, I believe, the subject at hand and I hope he'll come back to it as soon as possible.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member said that I took the position that in order to get federal money you have to be a Socialist. Is he not aware that in the same book from which I have read, that the same Mr. Trudeau said that the best way of bringing Socialism was by doing what he said and creating it in the ten provinces, one province at a time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Maybe it's because I didn't read the book, I don't really get the point. What I'm saying is that it might be a fact; maybe we're finding out something. Maybe the statement that was made that Pierre Elliott Trudeau was a Socialist, maybe that was right, but like my honourable friend maybe he's changed his mind when he saw what this was leading us to. He doesn't have to be ashamed; maybe this is true; but the point is, I didn't say that you had to be a Socialist, I said that you had to bring in Socialist programs, that only Socialism would be... and you made it quite clear that this is what you thought of because Canada should determine the programs. And I say that it's only natural — I think I gave two good examples. I gave the example of Medicare, where if we'd had to start a few years ago instead of fooling around with this Medicare and the Liberals being caught in this political issue — and it was a political issue — and the Conservatives having to do the same thing, if these people would stand up instead and tell the people where their tax money is going, and tell them what they're going to do for them, and not try to buy these votes because they think this is what the people want. And I say think what the people want, because the people want good care, medical care. That doesn't mean that the only way you can get good Medicare is with a compulsory national plan. That's the difference between my honourable friend and myself. Spend some money on health, yes. Spend some money on hospitals, yes.

I'd like my honourable friend to not speak on this but he'll have other occasions, or maybe some of his friends can answer this. Am I wrong, Mr. Speaker, am I wrong when I'm saying that if it was possible to go back to Ottawa and say: All right, we know that you can only spend a certain amount of money on a hospital, on hospitalization; what we would like to do is get this money and review this every year; get this money and let us decide on our priorities. Don't you think we'd make a better job? Don't you think that instead of, as I started to say, instead of putting all our people in acute beds, in building hospitals of acute beds that are very costly, we start at the bottom and provide an opportunity, a chance, or an alternate for those people who are now occupying those beds that shouldn't be there. Wouldn't that be more realistic? Wouldn't we do better and wouldn't we save money for the people of Manitoba? Because if you get money from Ottawa it's still the money that comes from your pocket. Even if you pay 10 cents to get a dollar, it's still your money, and we could do an awful lot more for them.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I want. I want a strong government. I was the first one in this House that said that I did not believe that Quebec could say: No, we're not going to have this; we'll get out money back. I did not believe in this. They've got to pay part of it. But why? Why does it mean that if you believe in a list of priorities that you can be less of a Canadian, less of a federalist, less of a centralist. I don't get this at all, because to me a federalist is not saying all the rules, all the shots, all the priorities will be called in Ottawa. I don't believe that this is true. I believe that Ottawa has the right to say: "All right; in one instance, in certain instances more than others, the people of Canada should share in the wealth equally, in education for instance, and send some money back here in the field of health." This could be

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... done by the government earmarking a certain grant for a special thing and let us decide this here.

Mr. Speaker, you mentioned — I don't want you to believe that I am not listening to you. My speech is very short, I wasn't prepared, but I could not at this time let my honourable friend leave you, Sir, and the members of this House with the feeling that the only way that you could be a centralist or a federalist is by believing in these plans suggested usually by the Socialist. It's my right, it's the right of my friend to believe that, but it would be wrong for me if I did not get up and say that I don't believe that this is the case and that some of us, anyway, believe that we could be like Pierre Elliott Trudeau, believe that we could be interested in a central Canada, a good central government, and still have other methods of showing so. And my honourable friend is misleading a bit, by omission, let's say, when he's talking about Hellyer. Hellyer wanted to give the money direct to the municipalities, from what I understand, and rightly or wrongly don't forget that this Premier was cheered by everybody and by the members of this Party when he said in Ottawa, "Let's change Confederation, but let's make it work in the meantime." My friends cheered with the rest of the Manitobans when this was said. — (Interjection) — Nobody from your Party cheered when this was said: Let's make Confederation work? — (Interjection) — Well, did you cheer for the phrase then without knowing what he meant?

A MEMBER: I knew what he was saying....

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I agree.

MR. GREEN: I knew what he was saying. I didn't cheer, I cursed.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, one cursed, one fellow cheered for the phrase, and the others don't know. But nevertheless, the people of Manitoba cheered. — (Interjection) — I thought that early in the session that a member from your Party, probably your Leader, stood up and congratulated the First Minister for that. I might be wrong. I'll try to find this — I don't know if I'll find it at this session — I'll try to find this and I'll bring it here, and if I can't find it I stand corrected. All right, but nevertheless the people of Manitoba cheered. Cheered. This is the point that I was trying to make. The people of Manitoba cheered because they want to improve Confederation but they don't want necessarily to sabotage it before it's improved, and according to the Constitution now, I believe that it is impossible for the Federal Government to deal directly with the municipalities, and this is no disrespect for Mr. Hellyer who was very interested, was keen on this and very interested in, as I said, ideas on housing, and probably was in a hurry to implement this and wanted to deal directly with the municipalities, and the Prime Minister of Canada said no, he'd never said that he wasn't interested in housing but he wanted to deal with the provinces. Well, either he deals with the provinces under the Constitution now, or the Constitution is changed. It's as simple as that, Mr. Speaker.

Before I sit down again, I say that the one thing I disagree with this Party though, is to say if they went out and said to the Federal Government, "Release some areas of taxation to us," because that would be suicide; not political suicide, it would be suicide for Manitoba if we said we'll look after our own affairs. It would be ridiculous and it wouldn't be fair because we contribute in the economy of the eastern provinces also, and they have a lot of protection and some of this money must go back to us and we should be able to share in the wealth of Canada, share in the — I'm not going to delay this by — apparently my friends would want me to quote something probably very interesting but I'd have to read it and delay. I'll use it another day, Sir. I just want to say, though, that I agree in part with what my honourable friend said but I believe that he has to stand corrected when he wishes to convey the thought that only Socialism is federalism or centralism in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I was going to adjourn debate. I'm not prepared, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bills listed on Page 2 of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 44, an Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act. Sections 1—passed; Section 2...

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, Section 2 is the portion of the bill which is the effective one and I feel certain that there was an amendment there which should be passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. 5 (a)—passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I don't even see Section 5.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well then, I'll read the amendment.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll read the whole motion here. No. 5. Notwithstanding subsection (4) the additional zone does not include any lands lying within (a) the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews, or (b) the Rural Municipality of St. Clement, or (c) that part of the Rural Municipality of Springfield lying north of a line commencing at the northeast corner of fractional Section 3, Township 12, Range 4, East of the principal meridian, then easterly along the northerly limits of Section 2 and 1, Township 12, Range 4 east of the principal meridian, and Sections 6 and 5, Township 12, Range 5 east of the principal meridian to the northeast corner of Section 5, Township 12, Range 5 east of the principal meridian.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I think this is an important bill and I don't think it should simply be passed by without some comment. This came about, as we heard in Municipal Affairs Committee, because the Municipality of St. Andrews had been denied the necessary zoning to allow what they hoped would develop into a building site for a brewery which had thought of coming into Manitoba. I'm not sure whether this brewery is still considering it—this was some time ago. But because of that, the Municipality of St. Andrews approached the Member for Selkirk and asked that the Municipality of St. Andrews, the R. M. of St. Andrews be taken out of what is known as the outer zone.

The outer zone is part of a green belt around Metropolitan Winnipeg and the purpose of it was to put in some sort of control, some orderly control on the development in and around a major centre like Winnipeg. It's to avoid helter-skelter construction, the kind of costly construction that eventually comes back to haunt the city or any urban area, because as construction is permitted along the main roads leading out to these areas, the main arteries, and it tends to be strip type of development, the demand for services goes up, the pressure for roads, for transportation that is, for schools, for sewage, water; all these things then become a pressure on the community as a whole to supply. And it's to avoid this type of spread or sprawl that the Metropolitan Corporation was given this control or authority on the outer zone.

Now I know that in 1963, I believe it was, the Cummings Royal Commission, which studied Metropolitan Government in Greater Winnipeg, did after hearings suggest that, in view of the fact that new boundaries were being created, that the municipalities of St. Andrews, St. Clement, Springfield and others should perhaps be removed from this outer zone, and if the government had acted at that time, if they had followed the recommendations at that time, then there could have been some logical explanation for it. But to act, as they are now, under pressure and in haste, without taking into account the entire question, it makes no sense at all to me. I don't think it does anything but destroy the concept of planning. Tomorrow, if someone else decides that it's against their particular interests they'll come before this House and ask for some other municipality to be removed. And it's being done arbitrarily without a study.

It's true the Cummings Commission did make recommendations back in 1963 or 1964, but it's a few years since then and what has happened in the meantime? Do we know, does this House know what sort of planning has gone on for St. Andrews? Do we know what the plans are for sewer and water installations to the entire north area? Do we know from Metro whether West St. Paul is going to be developed in the near future? I suspect that any development that's going to be taking place in the next 20 - 25 years in this area will be in a northerly direction because the sewer lines are there, and if that happens, then you're starting to spread and encroach on this area which is now being requested should be removed from Metro control.

If there is a rationale behind this, if there is a need for it and if it makes sense, then I would suggest we don't stop there. If it's fair and equitable and correct that St. Andrews should be removed - and in committee St. Clement was also to be removed, as well as part of Springfield - so why not the rest of the recommendation put forward by the Commission? Parts of

(MR. MILLER cont'd.)... Rosser, parts of Macdonald, parts of Tache, of the R. M. of Ritchot — all these are municipalities, rural municipalities on the perimeter of Metropolitan Winnipeg, which the Cummings Commission felt might be eliminated. But the government didn't do anything about it, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we act precipitously, without thought and simply because someone screamed "I want out", then we're not acting in a very responsible manner, and if we are acting responsibly, then surely let's look at the whole package. Let's look at all of these areas that were suggested be removed. Let's call in Metro. Let's seek their thoughts on the subject. Let us see why they feel it should or should not be removed; what it means to Metro planning; what it means to the 500,000 people living within Metropolitan Winnipeg. Why don't we think about them sometimes?

I heard the remark in Committee, "Well, the R.M. of St. Andrews, after all, if they can get something going here for them why shouldn't they? Mr. Chairman, it's not that simple. I'm also concerned about the 500,000 people that live in Metropolitan Winnipeg. How is this going to affect them? What is the cost going to be to those people now and ten years from now? Are we going to be buying up land at inflated prices later on to undo the mistakes that we allow today?

The suggestion was at Law Amendments Committee or Municipal Affairs Committee that everybody in St. Andrews is for it. Mr. Chairman, the press has had a few letters to the editor, and surprisingly enough there are people who don't want it, people who say that this is the finest potential residential area anywhere within the Greater Winnipeg area, who feel that the land between the river and Main Street is the kind of land that should be set aside for drives, for the public, and for at least beautiful residential area and not to be polluted by industry. And it's going to be polluted, because if a brewery goes in there they have to dump somewhere. If they're not going to dump into the river they're going to have to dump into a lagoon system. What's going to happen to these areas? Why should we give choice land, choice beautiful land which is rapidly disappearing because we somehow look at today and forget to look at the day after tomorrow?

Mr. Chairman, I think we're being short-sighted, I think we're being incautious, and I think we're acting without due thought and consideration. We created Metro, and some of us may have our disagreements with them and I have had my disagreements with them, but to simply disregard them entirely and to say we will do as we please when it chooses us because somebody somewhere doesn't like something, I think is being irresponsible. If we're going to do the job let's do it properly; let's do it in consultation with Metro; let's do it in consultation with the other areas that might be eliminated or taken in; let's do it with the planning authorities; let's see where we're going. Let's not just act because somebody pressed the panic button.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, if Metro had dealt with this application of the Tartan Brewery on a basis of planning, I question as to whether or no this bill would have been brought in to the Legislature. But Metro did not deal with that application on a basis of planning; it dealt with that application purely and solely on a selfish, economic basis, and by so doing proved to the people of St. Andrews that they had no interest whatsoever in planning outside of Metro Winnipeg. Now...

MR. DOERN: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: When I'm finished. The recommendation that was made by the Director of Planning to the Planning Committee of Metro, provided in Paragraph 2: "The refusal of the application at the present time is without prejudice to a reconsideration of the application by council if the Provincial Government is prepared to enter into discussions with the council with a view to making arrangements, statutory or otherwise, under which the tax revenues produced by the brewery would be paid to Metro." In other words, all that Metro was interested in, in refusing this application, was revenue. They weren't interested in planning.

Then furthermore, recommendation No. 3 read to the effect: "The refusal of the application at the present time is also without prejudice to a reconsideration by council if the Federal Government's new regional development program, the details of which are now being completed, changes the boundaries of the areas eligible for federal assistance so as to make Winnipeg so eligible, and permits the brewery to locate within the Metropolitan area." There again they're only interested in their own selfish economic interests. They were not interested in planning as far as the outer zone was concerned; they were only interested in getting revenue. And if St. Andrews Municipality had had the power to make a deal with Metro to hand over half the taxes of that brewery if it were a brewery, that application would have been granted, according to

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.).... that statement.

Now, you would think that the Municipality of St. Andrews had no planning scheme at all. The municipality has been under a provincial town planning scheme for a number of years, and even if the Tartan Brewery or any other industry wanted to settle in St. Andrews, this portion of St. Andrews, they'd still have to make application to the Town Planning Committee for a rezoning there, and I don't know whether they would get that rezoning or not because, as far as the people of St. Andrews are concerned, they're very anxious to retain the residential aspect of lands lying east of the main highway and west of the Red River. But that's neither here nor there.

The St. Andrews Municipality passed a resolution on the eighth day of April, 1969, a copy of which was filed in the Law Amendments Committee, which reads as follows: "Moved by Councillor Dutchak, seconded by Councillor Jenkins, Whereas the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews has a town planning scheme suitable and adequate for its purposes, and is quite capable without outside interference of determining and projecting its planning needs; and whereas part of the said municipality is within the additional zone of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, and its planning and zoning in such zones comes under the jurisdiction of said corporation; and whereas past performances of such Corporation had made it quite evident to the council of the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews and to the citizens thereof the said Corporation has no interest in the development of such additional zone other than to use its powers and jurisdiction to further its own selfish interests and ends; Therefore be it, and it is hereby Resolved that the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews, in Council assembled, request the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba to support a Bill at present before such Assembly, asking that such additional zone be removed from the control and jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. Carried unanimously." And there is the certificate of the Secretary-Treasurer certifying that to be a true copy of a resolution passed by the Council of St. Andrews on that day.

Furthermore, the Interlake-Selkirk Area Development Board sent me a letter under the signature of A. B. Cooper, the Chairman, and this letter which I'm about to read was completely unsolicited; as a matter of fact Mr. Cooper ran against me in the last election as a New Democratic Party candidate. The letter is dated April 23rd, 1969, and it's addressed to me, and it says: "Dear Sir, the Selkirk Area Development Board wishes to go on record as supporting the location of the Tartan Brewery in the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews, and we feel that as a Board we object very strenuously to the position taken by Metro Council in refusing the application by this firm. It is felt that the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews was discriminated against in the matter of this brewery and that the wishes of the people were ignored completely. It appears strange that permission is granted to a noisy and hazardous seaplane base to be located in this municipality without any reference to the wishes of the people, and this dictatorial attitude is resented extremely in a democratic society. Yours truly, Allan B. Cooper, Chairman, Selkirk Area Development Board."

Now it has been said that all of the people in St. Andrews are not in favour of this bill. I can say, Mr. Chairman, that there was a meeting called in the south end of St. Andrews to consider another matter, at which over 200 people were present, and there were only about six people out of those 200 had any objection at all - not to this bill, but their objection was to a brewery being established there. But there was no objection at that particular time expressed to that area being taken out of Metro, and I can say, too, that I believe that if a vote were taken in that area tomorrow, that over 95 percent of the people would vote in favour of this bill.

Now going back to the Cummings Report, it is true that the Cummings Report, which I think was published around 1962, did recommend that St. Andrews and St. Clement and that portion of Springfield, Manitoba, should be taken out of the additional zone of Metro, and the reason why they did that, Mr. Chairman, was due to the fact that when the boundaries of the Metropolitan Corporation were originally set up, they included the municipalities of West St. Paul and East St. Paul. When the municipalities of East St. Paul and West St. Paul were taken out of Metro proper, they became part of the additional zone, and they gave a buffer of 5 miles north of Metro proper. Later, when West St. Paul and East St. Paul were taken out of Metro because they were not benefitting from any of the services that Metro provided and they were paying taxes to Metro, they were then put into the additional zone, and as matters now stand, that is, before this bill was introduced and before it will be passed, there is an additional zone there of 9.2 miles, and if St. Andrews and St. Clements are taken out of that additional zone, there still

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.)... will be an additional zone of 5.2 miles north of Metro proper, and I would urge the committee to support this bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, before I speak would the Member for Selkirk permit a question? If Metro is interested only in revenue, what are these 95 percent of the people of St. Andrews and the Honourable Member for Selkirk interested in?

MR. HILLHOUSE: All we are interested in is having autonomy in our own municipality, that's all.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Andrews brought this matter before us in what I consider was a highly emotional vituperative manner which I actually found somewhat amusing in its excitability. Now that he has indicated that the only purpose that he has, and the other 95 percent of the people of St. Andrews have, in this is to bring about autonomy, I can understand the excitement with which he spoke. I was naive enough to think, Mr. Chairman, or maybe I was practical enough to think that what they really wanted was industry in their municipality, and what really motivated them was a selfish, economic, basis. That's really what I thought. I guess I'm not as idealistic as the Honourable Member for Selkirk or for the 95 percent of the people, to whom autonomy is so important that he had to come and speak on their behalf and attack Metro, in this case which involves a brewery, and it may be unfortunate. It seems unfortunate that it had to be a brewery that brings the honourable member to his feet when for four years, surely the people of St. Andrews knew about the Cummings Report, but even more, for at least ten years, knew what the Metro Act was all about and knew that they were in the outer zone.

Where were they? Where have they been for ten years or more? Where is this question of the right and the need for autonomy, in their hearts and in their souls and in that of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, when for ten years they sat around, smarting I suppose under this terrible burden that has been placed on them, where they have no autonomy at all to act on matters of planning, and I must say very cynically and quite openly, that I don't believe that this bothered them one bit until they had a chance to get some brewery, or let's say industrial expansion - the fact that it's a brewery doesn't make it any different from any other form of industrial expansion - and now they rise to their feet in indignant manner. I can't help but feel that this cry for autonomy came about only when they realized that their selfish, economic interests were being adversely affected by the recommendation of the committee of Metro, and I am under the impression - and I'd like to be corrected if I'm wrong - that this matter was never finally disposed of by the Metro Council. I am under the impression that there was a recommendation made from the Department of the Administration to the Committee on Planning, that the Committee on Planning made a recommendation to Council, and I don't think Council made a final decision or gave a final rejection; if they did, well that's still a matter for debate.

So I am under the impression that the excitement that was aroused by the threatened loss of this industrial expansion precipitated the matter into the court and precipitated what was really a very violent speech on the part of the Member for Selkirk. Well, he's certainly entitled to speak the way he did, and did speak that way, and attacked Metro for being selfish and having only an interest in its economic advantage; it's only interested in revenue, not planning; and I'd like to ask the Honourable Member if he knows what planning is all about, if he dismisses revenue as being not a part of planning, and certainly planning involves an orderly development which involves an orderly distribution of the burden of cost, which involves a proper management of the cost of services, which provides that there shall not be a waste in development - and money is what it's all about. It's not just a question of making sure that we have nice shady trees and recreation areas. It's also a question of the cost, of the very very great cost of the provision of municipal services which we know so much about. That's what planning is about, and I don't think the Honourable Member for Selkirk knows what planning is about if he dismisses the financial aspect that lightly.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I... the honourable member is putting words into my mouth that were not uttered. I accused Metro of failing to plan, and the reason why I accused them of failing to plan was because they were trying to protect an economic interest which did not belong to them. They wanted a share of the taxes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, that's what the Honourable Member for Selkirk says but what he said earlier was that Metro is only interested in revenue, not planning. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, he says in respect of this particular application. Nevertheless, revenue is still part of

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) planning, and planning is still connected with revenue and you can't divorce them.

And I'd like to refer to -- I might indicate, Mr. Chairman, that in spite of what I have already said, I am not unalterably opposed to this Bill. As a matter of fact, I haven't decided which way to vote yet and I'm kind of looking forward to hearing a discussion on it because the principle is important. The Bill itself deals with a very practical approach to dealing with some aspect of the principle, and in effect it may or may not be the right thing to do at this stage. But the approach by the honourable member, and what I fear is the approach of this government as it has expressed itself through the words of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, whom unfortunately I didn't hear and whom I can only interpret from newspaper report and I know how inaccurate it may be, unfortunately it seems to me that the way the Minister of Municipal Affairs is tackling this, or has tackled this problem, shows a very short-sighted approach too, because if it's right today, where was he 10 years ago and nine years ago and eight years ago? And where was he after the Cummings Report came through, and where has he been all the time since the Cummings Report has been sitting on his lap? And if not on his lap, then on the lap of his predecessor, whose lap was much more attractive than his, I should say. -- (Interjection)-- Yes, I'm sure we all do. Where was the Cummings Report and its relationship to this particular Bill and the principle behind it?

May I just quote a short sentence from a report which was made by the Planning Advisory Service of the American Society of Planning Officials, which is the international body dealing with planning, body of officials, talking about the fringe problem, and I quote: "It is on the fringe of our cities that often the most difficult planning problems arise. Here the city is in flux, with new residential and industrial construction, conversion of farm lands to urban uses, and extension of municipal services required by the more dense settlement. Very often, however, when the area of urbanization extends beyond the municipal limits of the central city, the means which exist in the central city for controlling these developments are no longer available. Unrestrained and haphazard development, premature land use conversion and sub-division, mixed land uses, inadequate facilities for health and sanitation, may all result from this lack of adequate control." That is the problem of fringe areas, which I imagine the Honourable Member for Selkirk was not too concerned about and which I'm not sure the Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs nor the government he represents was much concerned about.

I quote a little further, Mr. Chairman, from a report made by the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board of British Columbia, also dealing with urban sprawl, and in summary it starts out with the following statement: "Urban sprawl is a major problem in the lower mainland. It affects the economy and efficiency of the whole region in many ways. It creates third-rate communities, squanders money, wastes land and sows innumerable problems for the future. It is everyone's responsibility and must be tackled on many fronts."

And in this same report, when they speak of the effect, and they ask the question what's so wrong about sprawl, they say: "It produces inconvenient, ill-served communities. It destroys productive farmland prematurely, unnecessarily. It ensures that eventual development of the areas affected will be difficult and inefficient. These are factors we must always be concerned with when we deal with all development, regional development, expansion in those areas which are not yet fully developed."

Well, when the Greater Winnipeg Investigation Commission reported, back in the middle Fifties, it gave an extensive report in making the recommendation which preceded the creation of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, and under the section dealing with regional planning and zoning, on Page 267, it stated as follows: "The Metropolitan Council should be given adequate powers to direct and control, in a general way, the physical development of the entire Metropolitan area and to require local development plans and land use regulations to conform to a comprehensive plan of metropolitan development." In the opinion of the Commission, you will recall, Mr. Chairman, they indicated what they thought should be eight cities in their entirety and -- and I quote: "and its outer fringe area where future land uses should be predominantly agricultural. Responsibility for the preparation of a major development and land use plan for the Metropolitan area, and the added fringe area, should be given to the Metropolitan Planning Board and responsibility for the adoption of this plan should be given to the Metropolitan Council alone. Representations of local councils or local planning boards representing areas either within or without the limits of these proposed eight municipalities, objecting to any feature, would be made to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) there should be the right to require final adjudication of differences by the Municipal Public Utility Board after public hearing provided by adequate legislation."

And there isn't the slightest doubt in the world, Mr. Chairman, that if the Tartan Breweries was not satisfied with the final decision of the Metropolitan Council, if indeed the Council was acting for pure selfish, financial purposes, there were appeal rights that could have been used where there could have been a review outside. But the honourable member, in his excitement, in his emotional demand for autonomy, actually, I believe, pre-judged this matter, assumed that the council would be supported, and precipitated it into this House. And I said earlier, I don't object to it being here. I only object to the way it had to come here and why it had to come, when and how it did.

Now I refer to the Cummings Report, which was made in February 1964, and indeed the Cummings Report did cut back certain of the municipalities, certain of the land which should be covered within the Metropolitan area, and dealing with the outer zone, it indicates that "It seems logical" - and I quoted those words - "It seems logical that the boundary of the additional zone should coincide with the northern boundary of East St. Paul or West St. Paul," and did recommend certain reductions in the other zone, and it didn't say "five miles", and the Honourable Member for Selkirk, I believe, is wrong in assuming that five miles is right and nine miles is wrong, or that five miles is right and three miles would be wrong, or that five miles is such a magic figure that it is the way one judges, or indeed that it should be the same regular diameter or radius around the geographic centre of Metro that determines it. One has to have a fringe zone so described that will adequately look ahead to what will be those problem areas where sprawl may occur and which should be controlled, and in one direction maybe one mile is enough - and as a matter of fact they indicate here that the Floodway itself is a pretty good boundary on the eastern side of Metro and therefore one mile might be sufficient; and the other way, in which the flow of population growth may tend, maybe should be 9.2 miles, so the mere juggling of figures is an inadequate and I believe an ignorant approach to the problem that should be measured as to how one determines what a fringe area should be. And I suggest that if it were done that way it may well be that exactly the boundary line that is determined by this Bill would be the boundary line that would be arrived at as being logical. But that's not the way we handled it here. No, the Honourable Member for Selkirk rose in excitement, the Honourable Minister for Public Affairs then took hold of the problem, took the reins and dealt with it. And now I can only report from a newspaper report - I think it's the Tribune from the appearance of the print - that the Honourable Minister says that the government probably will vote in favour of a Bill to remove three areas from Metro's additional zone. And the report states that the Honourable Member for Selkirk started the move to take out of Metro the additional zone because Metro had exceeded its authority. - (Interjection) -- That's nonsense. Well, he rejects it. He did not make the statement. I certainly do believe he didn't make the statement because he knows too much to have said that. Well the newspaper report says that by agreeing to pull St. Andrews out of the Metro additional zone, the government appears to be agreed with Mr. Hillhouse's charge, and now since he denies the charge, maybe the government didn't agree with that.

But the Minister is quoted as saying, and this is in quotations, "Metro's planning work will not be hampered by this action, and that without the three parcels of land in Metro's additional zone it will only be tidying up something." Only be tidying up something. And that's the way this government approached the problem. Only be tidying up, when indeed this Bill should have been brought by this government four years ago, three years ago, two years ago, after a proper study, a proper evaluation, so we could deal with it in a calm manner without the emotional aspect, and one which would bring about a proper approach. For that I certainly fault this government, for not dealing with the proper problems of planning and not enabling Metro to do it, and without a proper consultation, to fall in happily with a proposal in order to get rid of a problem. There should have been a proper appraisal; there was not.

And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, although I imagine - and I say this word advisably - I imagine that the Bill as amended will create a proper border on the northern edge of Metropolitan Corporation, I only imagine so on the basis of what I read in the Cummings Report. But I cannot take it to be so because it wasn't studied outside of the Cummings Commission and because the government, I don't believe, has dealt with the other, the other recommendations which are all part and parcel, almost one sentence - I believe it is one sentence, which I'll

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) read into the record - that the recommendation of this aspect in the Cummings Report is that the extent of the additional zone be reduced so as to follow the eastern boundary of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway, the northern boundary of East St. Paul and West St. Paul, the present boundary of the parts of Rosser and Macdonald now within the Metropolitan area, some portions of Assiniboia and Charleswood now in the additional zone, and the boundaries of Fort Garry and St. Vital, all as shown in Appendix E to this report.

I notice, Mr. Chairman, that while I was speaking the Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs was called away and is only coming back now, and I realize that he wasn't able to hear a portion of what I said. But I will indicate to him that I've just finished reading the recommendation of the Cummings Commission Report on this specific aspect of the additional zone in its full circumference. And I would ask of him as a courtesy to this House, Mr. Chairman, to indicate how he intends to vote; why he intends to vote on this Bill as he does; and whether or not he can assure us that with this Bill, as it's now amended, the entire recommendation of the Cummings Report in this aspect has been taken care of; because if not, I warn him now he should be prepared to explain why not, because if it was right then it's entirely right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Can the honourable member now tell us how he is going to vote on this?

MR. CHERNIACK: I've been waiting to hear the words of wisdom, probably from the Honourable Member for Carillon who has a great deal of experience in Municipal Affairs and who has not participated in this debate. -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition thought that I was an expert on municipal affairs; I hope he still thinks so.

MR. MOLGAT: I assumed my honourable friend, having spent some time, if I'm correct, on municipal council - Metro council - school board? - would be able to make a decision without any further recommendation.

MR. CHERNIACK: I really thought he was waiting for my opinion.

MR. MOLGAT: Well I was listening with interest.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'll listen to your opinion.

. continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I'm not surprised at all that members in the House, members within my group are those which are opposing this kind of a proposal. I gather that there is some opposition. I don't know how the Honourable Member for St. John's is going to vote. He indicated to me that he had an open mind and that he was willing to be convinced and I think that perhaps he may be convinced, but I want to say that this is a motion that I'm going to support. I think that it's true to say that the government has to share some blame in the sense that they have neglected to deal with the Cummings Report of 1964, and that had they done so we probably wouldn't find ourselves in the kind of a bind today that we are in.

But regardless of that, Mr. Chairman, I think we have to be practical. We have to realize that we have had a study of the Metropolitan Winnipeg area by what I think is a competent group of people. I don't think that it requires another commission. I think if we recognize the work that was put into this study by the people on the Cummings Committee that we should have proceeded then. We should not have procrastinated as the government has done, and that we would have had a much better relationship as between Metropolitan Winnipeg and the outer municipalities today. I don't think we ought to get into a situation of one municipal government fighting with another. I think there should be a rational approach to the total development, and in that connection that is the reason why the Cummings Report was set up, that there was a conflict of interests as between municipalities, between Metro Winnipeg and some of the outer zone municipalities, and that we had to arrive at some consensus. And in looking at that report I can only conclude that although it's unfortunate that not all of that report is being implemented by this measure that is before us, but that at least it meets the recommendations of that report to some degree.

And for a very important reason I say that, Mr. Chairman, and that is that we are in conflict here as between the Federal-Provincial Government and the Metropolitan Corporation, where on the one hand you have a program of financial aid to areas that want industrial development; and on the other hand you have a body that on the basis of planning is going to oppose any development in that particular area. There is a conflict of interest and I'm sure that it could have been dealt with long before today, but I am not one of those that is going to allow the matter to carry on indefinitely without a decision; I am not one of those that is prepared to procrastinate on the proposals of the Cummings Commission. I would like to see some movement in the direction of the adoption of that report, and even if it isn't in total, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to support it.

With respect to some of the comments that were made, including those of the Member for Seven Oaks, or the Member for St. John's, I want to point out that there is no brewery coming into St. Clements, which is the municipality which I have the honour of representing.

MR. HILLHOUSE: It's not coming into St. Andrews either.

MR. USKIW: Well that I'm not aware of, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member for Selkirk says it isn't coming into St. Andrews either. This may be so, and there is no industry that I'm aware of that is contemplating a location in my constituency in the Municipality of St. Clements, but they too have asked that they be taken out of the additional zoning of Metropolitan Winnipeg. So I don't think that they are as abrupt as has been suggested. I think that they have considered the matter thoroughly and they feel that they have no interest in being part and parcel of the Metropolitan Winnipeg area, that there is enough of a buffer zone as between the metro area and the municipalities in question, and that truthfully they want to control their own development. I think we have to give them the credit for being able to do so, or for wanting to do so, and I appeal to the House to give the matter the best consideration.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk I don't think is pursuing this on the basis that it's only in the interest of one concern that wants to develop in an area. I think he is being practical; this thing should have come up before. Maybe it's the fault of all the legislators over the last four years or five years, but nevertheless let's proceed with at least, if not all the report, part of the report as recommended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this whole matter came to the attention of the Legislature in the last few months because of a particular brewery which made application to erect its buildings and factories in the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews. They did so because they wanted to

(MR. STEEN cont'd.) be as close to the Winnipeg market, and at the same time get the benefits of the ADA development loan program. I understand that now the whole question of the brewery is out of it, and in spite of the fact that 50 percent of the discussion back and forth of the subject seems to revolve around the brewery, that question and that aspect of the Bill has been removed. But the Member from St. Andrews, who represents part of the area that this Bill as amended in the Committee covers, saw fit to introduce a Bill in this House which would in effect remove all of the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews from the additional zone of metro and bring it in line with the Cummings Commission report that was received a number of years ago, and bring it also in line with the legislation which amended the boundaries of metro at that time and resulted directly from the Cummings Commission Report.

In the Municipal Affairs Committee, in which I have the pleasure and honour of being a member, the Member from Springfield saw fit to extend the Bill and the provisions of the Bill that we have before us to cover the Rural Municipality of St. Clements and portions of the Rural Municipality of Springfield, so that the entire northeast corner of metro would be the same. But I thought that both the member from Selkirk and the Member from Brokenhead and the Member from Springfield, all those taking part in the deliberations on this particular Bill, had been very consistent in one or two aspects. First, that they had managed to remove the whole parts of municipalities and not leave parts of the same municipality in metro and parts out of it. Second, they had managed to keep roughly the same amount of additional zone in that area of the city as there exists in other areas of the city. So that they have been consistent in that there is roughly a five mile additional zone which surrounds the part of Metro Winnipeg that has the power of electing people and that is directly under the authority of metro and receives its benefits.

The Member from Selkirk pointed out very graphically, I thought, that the people of his municipality of St. Andrews, and this applies to the one of St. Clements and the one of Springfield, receive no benefits whatsoever from metro but have to answer to metro and are subject to their control. In the last ten years since the establishment of metro - nine years I guess it is - we haven't received any application in this Legislature asking that these particular areas be removed, but now it has come to the attention of their councils. And something else has happened in the last nine years, because nine years ago neither St. Andrews or St. Clements had planning commissions or planning authorities of their own municipalities. Today they do have, and these planning authorities follow the same principles of planning as do other planning authorities and other municipal authorities throughout the province.

Now what the effect of this Bill, as I understand it would be, would be to reduce the additional zone back to where it was nine years ago - approximately five miles plus. It would also leave the areas that have gone out, or would go out of the additional zone and back to the strict control of the municipalities concerned, underneath the planning authorities of that particular municipality. There is no question any longer of favouring or not favouring the erection of a brewery anywhere in the additional zone, or in metro, or outside of metro.

And if I followed the arguments of the Honourable Member from St. John's to its logical conclusion - and I recognize his love and devotion to economic planning, planning period - I would say that the Member from Selkirk was guilty of not including in his Bill the fact that the additional zone should go up to Hecla Island or some other place. Why not include all of the area north of Winnipeg? Because at one time or another the people of this area, our own economic development, our recreational desires, extend all along the boundaries on either side of Lake Winnipeg, and we could carry a rather pointless argument I might suggest to that conclusion.

But I think that since this matter has come to our attention, since the three members of the Legislature who are directly concerned with the area that is seeking this form of relief, recommended in the strongest possible terms, we as a Legislature should take it in a graceful way, should give it the attention it deserves and should pass this particular Bill; keeping in mind that we have still protected metro with the additional zone that we originally intended to ten years ago when we first established metro, keeping in mind that we have done to the entire corner, or the entire area concerned, exactly the same treatment that the Member from Selkirk sought from his municipality, and that same privilege has been extended to the Rural Municipality of St. Clements and the Rural Municipality of Springfield. And I think without any further hesitation, Mr. Chairman, we might bring this matter to a hasty and worthwhile conclusion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, would the member permit a question? He has the

May 16, 1969

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) Cummings Report in front of him I assume. Could he inform the House - answer the question I asked of his Minister, whether the rest of the sentence of the recommendation of the Cummings Report has been carried out? That is, the other reductions of the additional zone that were recommended, have they been reduced back to the recommendation?

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, I am really not in a position with the Cummings Report or the maps in front of me and I don't know what has taken place in the southeast or the southwest or northwest corners of the city. If the member would like I'd endeavour, only to please, to attempt to find out the information, but he is in the same position that I am and can seek the answers from the Department of Municipal Affairs.

MR. CHERNIACK: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. I only thought that the honourable member would be knowledgeable about what went on and what is going on. If he speaks in favour of cutting into a piece of the pie he ought to know what the rest of it is all made up of. I thought he would have known, but I'm sure the Minister knows.

MR. BAIZLEY: The answer to the honourable member's question is "no," Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, if I may now, I have been in doubt as to how I should vote because I've indicated earlier that the principle is one I understand and respect. Changes in planning should be done on a planned basis, and I've indicated that I have no real objection to this particular request that is being made except in the way it is being made and the way it has been looked after by the government.

Now I did ask the Honourable the Minister if he would indicate how he was going to vote and then why he's going to vote that way, and then give information as to whether, if he agrees with the recommendation, whether the whole recommendation is being looked after. The only statement he made so far is that the recommendation is not being looked after by this Bill and has not been looked after. That being the case, I must invite him again to indicate the rationale behind his participation in this Bill's action, or else I am forced to say that I can't vote for something that is not rationally explained by the Minister in charge.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm very willing to help my honourable friend support this Bill. There is no change or interference with the principle of planning that has been given to Metro. There became an obvious need to correct the boundaries of these municipalities at this particular time. There have been strong requests from the Honourable Member for Selkirk, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and the Honourable Member for Springfield to tidy up the boundaries in this area, and I can assure my honourable friend that there will be consultation and study, if he likes that word, as to what progress, if any, the government needs to make in considering reduction of the additional zones in other areas of the province.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is the Minister going to wait for another brewery to come down to the southwest corner in Macdonald in order then to capitulate?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I think that when we're discussing this Bill that the Minister is attempting to create the impression that this is simply a matter of bookkeeping, it's simply a question of doing a little tidying up - tidying up the map, a little readjustment. The Member for St. Matthews talks of it in terms of a certain symmetry or neatness - five miles - and we know from his previous suggestion, which I think was well motivated, that he has a very neat and logical and aesthetic mind and he likes circles and he likes symmetry, and I think that's a very desirable characteristic, but it may not always prove to be either practical or desirable. I can't share the government's position that this is simply a matter of giving the people what they want in a very simple manner of redrawing a line. I don't know where the Member for St. Matthews gets his information from, because he indicates that he knows that the brewery is not in fact coming into the area, or perhaps the Member for Selkirk is the originator of that comment. Is that a fact?

MR. HILLHOUSE: I don't know who the manager of the brewery is. If he walked in here now I wouldn't even be able to recognize him, but my instructions are, from other sources, that he does not intend now even to set up a brewery in Manitoba.

MR. DOERN: So in other words whereas at one time this appeared to be the key reason, or at least some of us interpreted it to be the main reason for this Bill, now that reason apparently has left and now we are left with simply a question of redrawing the map to make it more symmetrical and more rational.

A MEMBER: And without a brewery.

MR. DOERN: And without a brewery. Right. Mr. Chairman, I think that this matter

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) has to be approached ultimately on the question of principle and this has already been said. The government has outlined its principle; it's simply a question of a map. I suggest that the principle really is the question of land use control, as to whether or not in fact we're going to have a metropolitan area planned within its boundaries and also have some say in its adjacent boundaries for obvious reasons, because we're all familiar with the problem that is unique - not unique, rather, but common in all of North America - that major urban centres are confronted with the problem of industry locating just outside their boundaries, using their facilities and drawing upon their social services and yet not paying for them. Mr. Chairman, the real issue is the policy in respect to the additional zone; it's not really the location of the boundary per se.

I might point out to the Member for Selkirk, who's certainly much more knowledgeable on this question than I am though, that in his own City of Selkirk the rolling mills located in land just outside the boundaries of the city and for many years paid no taxes, as I understand it. They located outside the boundaries of the city; the people of Selkirk provided services of education and sewer and water; and yet the rolling mills for a number of years did not really contribute their fair share of taxation. I think that was a concern.

MR. HILLHOUSE: That statement is absolutely wrong.

MR. DOERN: Well, perhaps you can explain it later on. Also, if we look at the City of Brandon, we know that - I think Simplot Chemicals did something similar. I think that up in Thompson you have the case of Inco Mines which located just outside the boundaries of the town. So this is a well-known method, and perhaps for a businessman it is the only rational method for people in business to get the best possible economic advantage, but the question is, what about the people of the cities and towns that are in that area whose tax responsibility is being deliberately avoided? I think this is where part of the fight is involved. Naturally if it is in part, it is a fight between Metro and St. Andrews, in very simple terms.

MR. HILLHOUSE: tax responsibility is there, assuming this brewery was built in St. Andrews, what tax responsibility would there be between St. Andrews and Metro respecting that brewery?

MR. DOERN: Well, I must say to the Member for Selkirk that it would seem to me that we must ask the question of why doesn't the brewery locate inside the boundaries of Metro Winnipeg? If they located a few feet inside then we could assume that they were in their area, that they were using their services, but surely we can be suspicious when they locate only a few feet outside, or a mile or two outside. It would seem that they were attempting to be in the area yet not pay for taxes, and if the people come from that area, if the children go to those schools, if they ultimately must extend

MR. STEEN: Would the honourable member permit a small question on the point that he's now discussing.

MR. DOERN: Well, if you'll allow me to finish my sentence, I will. The point is that these people will be using the facilities, some of the employees of those areas will be living within the boundaries of the area and then will be commuting to work. Also, we know what happens, that as soon as industry goes in, people will demand services in that area, and roads will be extended, sewers will be extended and so on. Do you have a question?

MR. STEEN: The question I was going to ask the honourable member, is what part of Metro or the additional zone is also in the ADA development zone that could qualify for this particular brewery?

MR. DOERN: I'm not sure what the member is talking about any more because we're now talking about the theoretical brewery which he dismisses out-of-hand, and now he's asking me the details of the ADA plan.

Mr. Chairman, another question here is that I'm not sure that the Member for Selkirk, who again is more knowledgeable, indicates that 95 percent of the people in his area would favour being taken out of the additional zone, now apparently for reasons of autonomy, now apparently no longer for all the economic reasons or for the reason of the brewery. Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether he's right. I'd like to refer to a letter that was in the Free Press a few weeks ago written by a gentleman named Neil Wood from Old St. Andrews, and he winds up his letter by saying as follows: "I say to Mr. Willis, that if it is in fact Metro's intention to try and keep the area residential, then he has my vote and the vote of all such citizens or residents who desire nothing more than to be allowed to enjoy the peace and tranquility of living here in this day and age of progress."

(MR. DOERN cont'd.)

I think there are lots of other people in the area who live there deliberately because of its semi-rural setting. They want to be to some extent outside the Metro zone, perhaps for tax advantages or perhaps for aesthetic reasons, but if they start going into industrial development and questions of sewage lagoons and space for sewage lagoons and the stench from them, or possibly dumping industrial waste into the river and so on, then the whole nature of these areas will change. The Province of Manitoba created this boundary and now they are apparently just simply allowing it to be changed. The very instance for which the additional zone was created, they apparently now are willing to let it slip by.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply sum up by saying that I would like to see the plan and I would like to see the personnel that are in St. Andrews and their new plan for the development of their area. I would assume that if the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, who for instance said there now is a planning authority in St. Andrews and they presumably have staff, they presumably have rational plans, I would like to see them or I would like to have some indication of how they're going to proceed in their area, because I'm quite convinced that Metro does have plans like that. I'm not as convinced that the municipality does.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply sum up by saying that we either need a comprehensive new plan based on some further studies and based on some new concepts, because otherwise it seems to me we're just adopting a piecemeal approach and we're going into this in a very bad manner. We're violating the principle of rational planning, and it is for that reason and for no other reason that I must oppose this Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I haven't participated in the debate this afternoon on this particular Bill but I would just like to indicate my support of the Bill, including the amendment that was proposed in committee earlier. I feel that planning, in my opinion, means in so many instances regimentation and that municipalities such as mentioned in the Bill and the amendment, if they're being regimented by an outside body as far as planning is concerned and that they cannot proceed on their own with the development as they please, I feel that's an injustice, and I think what we are doing with this Bill is removing some of the injustices that were created and that these municipalities should be relieved of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The balance of Bill No. 44, and Bills 62, 35, 52, 63, 76, 77 and 82 were read section by section and passed. Bill No. 26 - Sections 1 to 4 were read and passed.) Has the Honourable Member for St. Boniface got an amendment?

MR. DESJARDINS: No. 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. 7. (Sections 5 and 6 were read and passed.)

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move an amendment here that Section 7 of Bill 26 be renumbered as Section 8 and that the Bill be amended by adding thereto immediately after Section 6 thereof the following section: Sale of shares. 7. The Directors of the Company shall from time to time, but not less frequently than once in each year, inform each shareholder of the company by written notice, mail postage prepaid to the last address on record of the shareholder, that: If a shareholder of the Company wishes to sell his share in the Company he so informs the Company in writing, the company will provide the name of a shareholder to any person who enquires of the Company to the possibility of acquiring a share in the Company, that any time that there is a shareholder of the Company who is willing to sell his share in the Company: (a) to the amount paid by him to the company for the share or a lesser amount; or (b) purchase the share for another person for an amount equal to the par value of the share or a lesser amount. The Company shall not issue a share to any person.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 7 (a) . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: How do you know I understand it? Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that was requested in Committee. The mover - I don't remember now the mover of the Bill - the mover of the Bill wasn't there. I know the people representing the Rossmere Country Club Golf Course were agreeable with this, and at the time we had representation by a person that stated he was a shareholder in the club but not an active shareholder, and he was there to oppose the Bill. He felt that he should have a chance to dispose of his share. One of the questions that we asked, as I say that was asked to the Rossmere Club, the officials of the Club, was if they would object to let these people, these people that were inactive that want to retire their share, would they be in favour of making this a little easier for these people by advising them that they could list their share if it was for sale with the officials of the Club, and that in turn they would receive or would be given the name of people that were

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) wishing to purchase that share. That seemed to meet— well it did meet with the approval of the committee at the time but it was felt that the Legislative Counsel would have more time to prepare the amendment if this was done in third reading. Mr. Chairman, he asked me to explain and he's not listening and I won't remember what I said. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, O.K. You mean you wanted time to check with your member? Well anyway, this was recommended, Sir, by the committee and also acceptable, as I say to the officials of the club.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the trouble the member took to explain it, and I must inform the committee that the honourable member who was asked to and did move this Bill on behalf of the Rossmere group was not a member of the committee and was not able to be present. He was not aware of the information given to us by the honourable member and is now in the position where he was not informed by these people of this proposed change. And I'm wondering, Mr. Chairman - he has now gone to attempt to get clearance on it - I'm wondering whether it would be acceptable to the committee to set this Bill down to the bottom of the list and then come back to it, to give him an opportunity to speak to the people who asked him to present it.

MR. DESJARDINS: I certainly have no objection, but I hope that the member doesn't indicate that I am not telling the truth when I say this was acceptable, because I was somewhat in the same position with the Bill for St. Boniface, No. 77. I took the trouble of finding out when I heard there was some amendments, and I can say that the Honourable Member from - Wellington? -- (Interjection) -- No, Mr. Petursson - Wellington yes, was a member of this committee and was there when this motion was made, but I have no objection.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the honourable member that I don't for a moment question what he said nor does the Honourable Member for Kildonan, but he lacks the experience of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the fact is he was not informed of the change and did want an opportunity to get confirmation and I think that he should not be denied that. But certainly not only does he accept it, but I reviewed it with him while the member was talking and it seems like an eminently fair amendment.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . Mr. Chairman, to advise the members of the different parties when there's changes, however this is just a thought and I have no authority to say this, but members of the same party to bring back to their own caucus any changes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll hold the Bill for a few minutes until the honourable member comes to the telephone and we'll proceed with another Bill.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Private Bills Committee and I was unable to attend the last meeting, and therefore I do not have some of the amendments that are being proposed or have been proposed in Committee. I attended an earlier committee meeting where some of the bills were dealt with, but the last committee meeting I could not attend and therefore I do not have those amendments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Kildonan, I take it, advise us -- we'll carry on with the next Bill. After the caucus is over we'll deal with it. (Bills Nos. 31 and 38 were read section by section and passed.) Bill No. 39 - Section 1 --

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman were there any amendments to this Bill?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any amendments? No, no amendments. (Bills Nos. 39, 45, 58, 65, 66, 40 and 41 were read section by section and passed.)

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I got the okay for Bill 26 and I wonder if we can proceed with my motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thanks very much. We're dealing with Bill 26, if anybody is trying to follow us.

MR. DESJARDINS: You can have a vote on my amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, this is the amendment. I'm calling fast. If anybody wants to yell at me, they can.

MR. DESJARDINS: But it would help if we knew what you were calling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh. You mean read it over?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, we were up to the amendment. We had no vote on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't need it. I'm just calling the sections on your amendment.

MR. DESJARDINS: I know, but my amendment is not there until it's passed. I stood up at 7 and made the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. The proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface as read here a few minutes ago. All those in favour. (The balance of Bill 26, with

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.) amendment, was read section by section and passed.)

Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole dealt with Bills Nos. 44, 62, 35, 52, 63, 76, 77, 82, 31, 38, 39, 45, 58, 65, 66, 40 and 41 without amendment, and No. 26 with amendment.

IN SESSION

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the committee be received.

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

BILLS NOS. 44, 62, 35, 52, 63, 76, 77, 82, 26, 31, 38, 39, 45, 58, 65, 66, 41 and 40 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The intention now to

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if before we go to any other business if I might have the leave of the House to have a substitution made on the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. PAULLEY: Then I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the name of Mr. Uskiw be substituted by the name of Mr. Petursson on the Committee of Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before proposing the adjournment motion, perhaps I could have a moment's time in the House to discuss the business of the House on Tuesday next. As you're aware, Sir, the Committee on Public Utilities will be meeting Tuesday morning in Room 254, and the suggestion was made by the Chairman of that Committee that in order to accommodate persons wishing to make representations that the Committee would be willing to sit all day Tuesday. There have been some informal discussions in the House since that time with that view in mind, and I was wondering in order that we could advise, or the Chairman would be in a position to advise the Committee on Tuesday morning before the House meets, if we could have some expression of opinion now from the honourable members as to whether or not they would be prepared to meet in the Committee of Public Utilities Tuesday afternoon and Tuesday evening if necessary to accommodate the persons making representations.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest on behalf of our group that we reconvene at 2:30 on Tuesday and play our cards from there.

MR. LYON: Perhaps before the Honourable Leader of the NDP speaks, I had thought myself at first that that course would be perhaps the most desirable until I then realized that we would not be in a position, or the Chairman would not be in a position, if we follow that course without settling it now, to advise the persons appearing before the Committee on Tuesday morning as to whether or not they should be back Tuesday afternoon. In other words, we might bring them back only to have the House sit Tuesday afternoon, so if we could agree now to sit Tuesday afternoon or not to sit Tuesday afternoon, then I think we would be meeting the desire of all of us to accommodate the persons who are appearing before the Committee.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I consulted with my colleagues in respect of this and we have no objections at all. We appreciate the desirability of allowing those that are coming in from afar, and I believe that there are a number, that the Committee meetings continue all day. We would be agreeable, but we feel however that it might be advisable for us to meet at 2:30 and then immediately adjourn and go back into the Committee. There is that slight difference and we would be prepared, and of course this would -- well it may not require unanimous consent -- but just merely to open and close the House at 2:30 on Tuesday, and if that would be agreeable then of course the Chairman of the Committee would be able to tell the people Tuesday morning that this exercise in democracy would be proceeded with at 2:30 and then back up north to Southern Indian Lake.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, the House might find that after the hearings Tuesday morning they may not want to sit in the afternoon, but we'd be flexible this way, and if the Committee feels they want to sit in the afternoon, we could just adjourn right after convening at 2:30.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, not being a member of the Committee I still feel that I should make my views known. I certainly would have no objection to using all day Tuesday for these hearings so that we can get them over with, and then too I would know where I was at,

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) although I intend to attend the meetings regardless of whether I am a committee member or not.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could meet both points of view then by this suggestion, that we do agree now to adjourn until 2:30 on Tuesday afternoon, with the further understanding however that there is every likelihood, and the Chairman can so advise the persons appearing before the Committee, that we will be continuing to sit in the Committee Tuesday afternoon. If that's agreeable, then I would make that suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Finance, that the House do now adjourn.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to take this opportunity to wish everyone a very very pleasant weekend. The House is now adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 on Tuesday afternoon.