

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 p.m., Monday, May 17, 1971

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I posed some questions to the Minister before we adjourned for lunch and I believe I was somewhere discussing the grants and I wondered what the grants are to replace. Are they to replace some other disbursements of the government or what they were for, because according to the Estimates that's the item that shows for \$1,750,000.

I also touched briefly on housing in respect to the present policy that has been announced by the Federal Government, that the tenants in low rental housing can buy the unit, and I feel this is the department that must deal with housing and urban renewal. This is the department that must take effective steps to provide housing for the disadvantaged, where these people cannot look after themselves, and I believe that it's time that we started to look and get the people out of the slum area or out of the urban ghetto. I think that these things have to be evaluated and I cannot see anything in this department that would deal with this at the present time.

I believe that today developers are told that urban planning is the key to the selection of sites for new industry, and I see where this department can play a very important part where industry will develop because transportation facilities are important for any industry. Your air transportation is important as well, and these are the areas that the government must concern themselves and get involved. I believe that the central area of Greater Winnipeg must be transformed into an area where people can live and enjoy themselves and have recreational facilities - and again I see no other area where the government can get involved except this department.

We have heard a considerable amount of talk about the Convention Centre, and at least this session we haven't heard anything about it. I wonder if it's still proceeding. Has the government made any policy in respect to that area or not? I feel that if this department's going to play an active role in respect to our urban problems and in respect to the city centre, it is an area where people will have to have recreation, where they can live, they can reside and they can enjoy themselves. I think that if this government is concerned about a vibrant city centre it must be concerned what this department will do in the way of making the city centre a vibrant area, an area where people can live and an area where people can have recreation facilities.

I know that there has been some considerable talk that in our downtown area we have a considerable amount of land that has been not developed and perhaps there could be an assessment formula where it would encourage, spearhead development of the land in these areas, and perhaps this would be an incentive to the people that own land to develop it with office buildings or residential areas that is presently required.

I believe that there's nothing in respect to urban transportation and I think this is one of the most important areas that the Department of Urban Affairs has to deal with. I know that the Minister has not made any mention of it, but my thinking, and I'm inclined to believe that if this department has any meaning, it must get involved in area transportation because it has to take the whole problem of our urban centre into consideration and deal with the whole transportation matter for the whole Greater Winnipeg area.

Again, I do not wish to get involved in arguments for or against the amalgamation or the uni-city, but we will have enough opportunity during the Uni-City Bill when it is before the Legislature. At the present time, the information that the Minister has given us, the purpose of this department is very sketchy, and in fact it has so little to do I wonder if there is any reason for it. So my argument is, if it has any meaning and if it will do the thing that it must do to improve the centre areas, to deal with the problem of urban centres, not in the city of Winnipeg only but in the whole Province of Manitoba, then I would like to see a different breakdown in the Estimates and the budget and would have hoped that this department would have had some real teeth and would have been able to deal with many of our problems that is before us at the present time.

I know that there has been no mention as well any more - perhaps we will hear later when the Minister of Transportation has his estimates before us - in respect to if we are

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) continuing with expropriation of land for the Inner Perimeter Beltway or has it been abandoned. I'd like to know a little more. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I certainly don't think it should go through the area that was proposed in the St. James-Assiniboia. Actually, you almost have an inner perimeter beltway right now. I don't think that we need a freeway that will carry traffic at 60 or 70 miles an hour at the present time. You have a Sturgeon Road at the present time which is 40 mile an hour traffic; you have Inkster Boulevard which at the present time, traffic I believe does move at 40 miles an hour. It's two way traffic and we are only 1.8 miles away from the outer perimeter in the west end of the City of Winnipeg so we are not at a great distance. What we do need in that area, we need two, at least two crossings or maybe more, bridges across to Charleswood area.

And another problem that we have in the west end of Greater Winnipeg is the east-west traffic. I don't think the emphasis should be placed at the present time on the Inner Perimeter Beltway, and since last year -- I know the Minister has stated that he had cancelled all expropriation orders, and until this year we've been informed or learned through the press that there has been some expropriation continuing in respect to a perimeter beltway, so we'd like to know just exactly what is the government policy. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I don't know what has been the change in the government policy and I'd like to know what it is. There was, I understand, five different locations proposed for the Inner Perimeter Beltway and I'm not aware of the five different locations. If the government has made up its mind where it will or they want it to go I could express my opinion on it, but I certainly was not in favour of the beltway going past Grace Hospital. When Grace Hospital went to get a building permit they were told don't build too close to Portage Avenue because you'll have too much noise, build a little way off Portage Avenue. Now the Inner Perimeter Beltway is proposed right adjacent to the hospital with a freeway and traffic that would probably flow at 60 miles an hour, with large trucks and trailers, and the noise would be much greater than it is on Portage Avenue, so that it doesn't make sense to me.

The second point, you would have to destroy almost a 40 acre park; you would have to destroy a couple of community clubs and go probably through the nicest part of St. James which is the Woodhaven Park - and that part of the Inner Perimeter Beltway would have to be built on stilts, quite high. The soil condition is not good in there so you'd have to go to hardpan, and I think for approximately at least a mile of road or highway would have to be built on stilts. I think it would be a very costly and most expensive proposition for the government to undertake, and before all the land is expropriated and before it's too late to change, the course, I wish the government would make up its mind to act and find out if this is the right location and express its opinion and give us, the people in that area, where the road is going to go. I have no argument that perhaps there should be some thoroughfare in that area, but certainly what was proposed before I don't think is agreeable to almost, I'd say greater percentage, or almost all of the people in that area. They were not agreeable to where the proposal was made.

So I would like to know, but this is the department I think that should definitely get involved and must deal with this problem if we're talking about really doing the job and creating the kind of climate that we had to and make our urban centres as viable a place that people can live, a place that they can have recreation facilities and areas. I think our urban centres must grow and certainly the Minister what he has proposed in the present budget and the present department to me has very little meaning. All it indicates is probably this is just to deal strictly with the transfer or with the Uni-City Bill and I don't think it's enough.

So I hope that the Minister will be able to answer some of the questions I posed to him and tell us what he really has in mind with the bill that he has introduced. I know that certainly the consideration must be given to the problems that we have in our urban areas, the underprivileged people or disadvantaged that haven't got good places to live in, and we have to deal with those things and we have to deal with that matter. So certainly the department can help there and it can do a job, but it can't do a job with the present budget that's set aside for urban affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 102-- The Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Well, Mr. Chairman, I intend to be brief. I wanted to mention -- (Interjection) -- Yeah, you're right, there is lots of time. I just want to mention that this new department that has been set up undoubtedly is another level of bureaucracy and something that's going to cost those that are involved a few more dollars in taxes, I would feel. I have no intention of spending a lot of time on the Estimates because I think that Bill 36 will give me the opportunity to speak.

I felt obligated to make mention tonight in regard to Grants in Lieu of Taxes at a million

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) and three-quarters and Transitional Support of \$825,000. I would hope that the Minister, owing to the fact that I missed part of his introductory remarks this afternoon, would explain to us what this transitional cost will be -- or support. I would rather imagine that it's a fact that it's a great changeover from what we have today to what the government is hoping we will have in the future, and I would think that if it's part of the area -- or if part of the area is covered that I think will be, is where the balance of the rural area of the province will be paying to help Art Moug offset his increased costs. I'm guessing this but I think this is what could be part of it. It could be a department, if it's well administered and not just a bureaucratic level, it could do a lot of good. Even with the boundaries that we have today, I think it could help our area a lot. I think that the Member for Assiniboia brought up a good area of discussion in transportation -- (Interjection) -- no, not the government of today, the municipal boundaries of today is good. I would say the government of today is terrible. My first look at it -- you know, I've only been looking at it for a couple of years and I think it's terrible so far and I'm hoping it will change previous to the next election.

The transportation facilities around the urban area, of Winnipeg particularly I speak of -- I don't want to enter into the other urban areas such as Brandon and so on -- but I think around Winnipeg that if we look at the inner beltway situation that was aborted by the government of today and put a stop to another level of government, Metro, and stopped them in everything they were doing -- as I say, aborted what they had in mind, all the plans they had made, responsible people for giving out of permits, those who were responsible for that, of planning. They have areas that are froze, that people can't sell their property, they can't build on it, they can't get a building permit for it, and I think there's good just reason why these people should be told that they can either go ahead and build and issue them a permit or you should buy their property, one or the other. I don't say that your plan is right or wrong, I'm not going into that part of it, but I think that you are being unfair to the people.

There is certain areas through Charleswood that have eight to ten building lots that are ready to go ahead and develop; their neighbours are selling those at \$3,000 -- \$3,200 for 60 feet. These people have five of them sitting there and they can't sell their property. They are paying taxes on this property, it's costing them their few dollars along with the local improvements costs that are there, and some of them are paying \$100.00 for 60 feet. It might seem small -- (Interjection) -- and there's no revenue coming back, that's right, and they have to hold on to this for an unlimited amount of time. I brought this up in the Legislature at the last session and the Highways Minister, with all due respect to his good judgment -- with all due respect to his good judgment, he would not at any time give me an answer who the government of the day was when that decision was made -- previous administration, but he will never say it was the Conservatives. -- (Interjection) -- I'll ask you, and you know if you want to tell me the truth, you froze it. Mr. Chairman, the Highways Minister froze it, and they are in that position today and there is no indication of it coming off.

I don't say that every indication or every proposal that Metro come up with was right, but it was a real good way to put the municipalities of Metro Winnipeg together and have them in a position where they could help each other. So this isn't the end result, this isn't maybe the good answer to the whole thing. Some improvements could be made. For instance, planning and zoning and rezoning. This is a real bad area of Metro Winnipeg today. Apart from that there's nothing wrong with it, and if you go to an area where -- I can't say, Mr. Chairman, at this time exactly who said this to the House, I just forget who it was, but he says that the common result for everybody. I say to you that in Metro Winnipeg we have several different people, there's close to a half million of them and they don't all want to live alike. Some of them like open ditches like we have in Charleswood; some of them like oil-sealed gravelled roads, they don't all want concrete; they don't all want boulevards, ornamental lighting, concrete backlanes, they don't all want sidewalks -- but there's certain things that we need that are hampered by this government. The government of today hamper the things we need. We wanted to join with our neighbours in St. James so we can slip over to the K-Mart, slip over to different shopping centres. We can't get over there. Charleswood is too small a place for this 10,000 people to have a K-Mart there. If we want to go across the river we've got to go back down to St. James or we've got to go back out to the Perimeter.

If your government got up in the House and said that we don't want an inner beltway crossing across Haney Street, through the golf course, spoiling a good green image, didn't want to go over Moray, I would agree with you, but I say put a bridge in there; just a bridge,

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) not necessarily an inner beltway. I'll go along with two bridges because it's only two miles away, or 1.8 like my honourable friend said, but I can't see if we shoot everything down by one stubborn Minister in the House who says: "If the Conservatives come up with it, it's no good. We shall shoot that down immediately." -- (Interjection -- No, I wouldn't mention his name. His initials? J.B. But no, not the name; I would never give you the name. -- (Interjection) -- Jim Bilton? No, not Jim Bilton. No. I should be a little bit more explicit probably - J.P.B. That gets you off the hook.

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, bridges we need. There are several proposals - I'll go along with that. There's areas that we could take it right from practically the Maryland Bridge; if we wanted to get the south and the north joined in good, there's two or three areas that we could put them in, and the north-south beltway on the west end of the Metro area here is not necessary to put in at the present time because we're only 1.8 or two miles away from the existing perimeter. It was something that at the time I would say that the Perimeter should have been possibly set out two or three miles farther west. As far as the beltway of today that they're considering is concerned, there's too many good homes, good river property that would be affected and shot down if it would were to be put in the area they are considering.

The urban reorganization that the government is considering today, Mr. Chairman, is going to be costly. I don't want to get into the high cost that Charleswood is going to be hit with, but certainly there's no reason to reorganize today what we have and the levels of municipal government we have. From my time on Council I am quite sure that the people in our area are well satisfied. They like the conditions they have there; they are quite satisfied with, as I say, the open ditches, the gravel oil-sealed roads, dust-controlled roads, they're satisfied with the open drainage; they're satisfied in every way. There is no reason that they want to become part of the City of Winnipeg with its 73 mill situation in comparison with the 47 mill situation that we enjoy in Charleswood.

They enjoy the 60-foot lots we have out there, a good many of them 100, and we feel that anything that is being forced on us today takes democracy away from our people. It shoots us down from the closeness of government that we have always enjoyed and we hope we can in the future. It's a thing that should be left to the people. I'm not the type of person that wants to shout that we should go to referendum; I think that's impossible. I'm getting into the depth of Bill 36; I have no intention to do that, or I didn't have any intention of doing that, and I'm going to leave it at that, Mr. Chairman, and speak when Bill 36 comes up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I too wish to make a few remarks in connection with the Urban Affairs Department, and I want to congratulate the Minister on assuming the position of being the first Cabinet Minister to have jurisdiction over such a department here in Manitoba, and I do hope that he will do his job well and be successful so that the City of Winnipeg is able to benefit as a result. I'm just wondering whether the setting up of this department is to give the City of Winnipeg special treatment. If it weren't for that I couldn't see just the purpose of having a special department aside from the Municipal Affairs Department as such.

Just what are the purposes in having this special department and having this separation come about? I didn't know what the commotion was all about. -- (Interjection) -- I see. Is there going to be a change in assessment as a result of this new department? I would like to hear from the Minister just what is intended in this connection. Are we going to have a change of the rules? We're having a Municipal Affairs Committee report being brought in which is under discussion at the present time, and I think it would be of interest to members to hear just what is being contemplated, whether there are or will be considerable changes in this direction.

I would also like to know from him as far as the Tax Deferral. We haven't seen the new bill. We don't know just what it will contain. How will it affect the urban area of Greater Winnipeg? Surely enough the outer fringe of the city, once it becomes one greater city, will not get the growth that was expected, I think, up until now because you saw more development on the outside fringes. I think once the Greater Winnipeg bill is through, that the purpose is to concentrate more in the inner area and have more development take place in the inner area of Greater Winnipeg. Otherwise I couldn't see the purpose either in bringing in a uni-city bill. I think this will mean that a lot of the property on the outskirts will probably not see development for the next ten years or so, or even longer. We see as a result now a tax deferral bill brought in that land bought up for speculation in these areas will be subject to taxation at the

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) higher rate, and since the bill is not out yet I cannot at this time completely determine, but I think the Minister should give us some indication of what he expects to see in this area and also in connection with development in the outer fringes.

Are special grants to come about - per capita grants, I mean - to the Greater Winnipeg area? We note from the British Columbia government news that certainly the City of Vancouver is getting very substantial consideration and grants, and I would like to quote a few comments from their report as of January-February - and this refers to the City of Vancouver, and I'm quoting: "In 1971, this municipality will receive, through the per capita grant, \$6,071,000 for municipal street and road expenditures; \$4,187,000 for pollution, policing and parks expenditures; \$1,231,000 for ambulance services and tourism and industrial development; \$820,000 for social services expenditure; the estimated payment to Vancouver for home owner grants is 12.3 million. Total provincial government grants to Vancouver City for the support of municipal services which are normally supported by the property tax will be of the order of 24.6 million this next fiscal year. As can be seen, provincial government payments to the City of Vancouver allow for a substantial reduction of property tax levies in this municipality. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Yes, if I can answer it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is the Honourable Member for Rhineland advocating that we should give special grants to the new City of Winnipeg, or Greater Winnipeg, along the lines he's discussing?

MR. FROESE: I certainly would like to see per capita grants increased, not only to the City of Winnipeg but to all municipalities in Manitoba, so -- well, you can start with Winnipeg and then branch out so that they'll all received it, because I feel that the rural areas should receive equal treatment but we can only bring it about by, first, giving something to the Winnipeg area - and then, in order to justify it, if we also have to give it to the other areas, to the rural areas, then well and good.

I think in certain areas you will have to probably have special grants. For instance, policing I think is a matter that you'll have to spend more money on in urban area than in the rural areas. There are other services which will cost more in an urban area and no doubt you will spend more because of this, so that if increased grants are warranted we should certainly look after them. I mentioned the outer perimeter zone, that there will probably be, most likely be very little development over the next number of years and this will also have another effect of devaluation of property in this area.

So these are some of the drawbacks, I think, of bringing in this uni-city bill and I think this is probably one of the reasons why we're setting up a Department for Urban Affairs at this time. I would like to know from the Minister just how he sees the over-all development of Greater Winnipeg. What does he intend to do to keep the people here, not only keep them here but to have people coming here, so that the city will grow? I feel that we have been losing far too many people even from the Greater Winnipeg area. I know of too many people that have moved to British Columbia and especially the west coast, because when I go there I meet so many familiar people out there, also at the Social Credit conventions, out there that I attend from time to time. So I think we should plan and we should certainly bring about plans so that people will want to stay in Manitoba, and that we show them that there is potential here and that there is also growth taking place here; and I would like to know from the Minister, in connection with this, whether he has anything special in the way of probably increased industrialization. Maybe they may figure that this is the Minister of Industry and Commerce's duty but I feel that as the Minister of Urban Affairs is here now that he should devote special attention to this, because I feel that Winnipeg is too much only of a distribution centre, that we have far too little in the way of manufacturing and so on, and these are industries that we need more than ever, and unless we do get them I can't see how we can expect to have real growth take place.

Mr. Chairman, these are a few remarks that I thought I would like to make at this time. I'm just wondering how much authority will be given to the department in connection with pollution. Is pollution going to be dealt with by this department in future more than is being indicated at this time? Certainly it would seem to me that this would be the proper department to handle matters of this type.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to join with the others in congratulating the Minister in this, his newest portfolio, and in his accomplishments up to date. I have a little trouble right at the outset with the name of his portfolio. I believe that he has given some explanations as to why he concerns himself entirely with the affairs of the

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) Winnipeg area. Urban affairs, it would seem to me, would include a number of other cities in Manitoba and representing one to the west, Brandon. Perhaps I am overly sensitive in this respect but it would seem that perhaps the man who chose this title is the kind of person we meet occasionally in the outback of the province, who, when questioned as to his residence, says "I live in the city," and this of course is a most unfortunate opening to any conversation we have with the visitor to our town. We are apt to say, "Well, the fishing must be awfully good up there, we hear;" or, "Your member is the one that writes all those funny letters." And they say, "Oh no. We're not from Thompson; we're from the City of Winnipeg." This is only the way we start the conversation, but, Mr. Chairman, I do feel that it is confusing at this stage and perhaps the Minister intends that his portfolio, Urban Affairs, be extended to include other urban areas of the Province of Manitoba.

I'm not familiar, except in a very casual way, with the terms of the new uni-city which has been the major effort of the Urban Affairs Department up to this point, but I have had a chance to read in fair detail the report of the Brandon Boundaries Committee, and this is another urban affair, in a sense, to me. And I'm interested at this stage to note what I believe to be a basic difference in the philosophy of the Urban Affairs' approach to uni-city and the problems relating to a number of jurisdictions with common area development problems, and common perhaps taxation revenue sharing problems.

I don't know whether the Minister in his heavy workload has had an opportunity to even read the report of the Brandon Boundaries Commission but, if he has, I wonder if he would perhaps comment on this, what I would consider to be a basic difference in philosophy. The uni-city plan would propose to replace a number of jurisdictions with a single larger unit and to achieve, through a single large unit, some efficiencies and some economies presumably. But the Brandon Boundaries Commission proposes to not replace the jurisdictions involved, but to bring together those jurisdictions having some common interests in an area, a regional development area where they would propose to join together in planning of zoning, and eventually of course to reach a formula of tax revenue sharing. But they would ensure that the original jurisdictions would remain, that that contact and that established connection with the individual problems of the municipalities and the city areas, urban areas, would be retained, and this level of government that had taken many years to build up and to make efficient would continue but that they would join together in a planning council where all jurisdictions would have representation.

Now I may be wrong, Mr. Chairman, I think this represents a complete, almost an opposite view to the one taken on the uni-city comment and I hope that the Minister in his summation would give us the benefit of his comments on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two about the Estimates currently before us and raise my perennial plaint about the formula applied for payment of grants in lieu of taxes. I'm not certain at this point, Mr. Chairman, whether we're on Resolution 102 or 103, but possibly in view of the fact that the category of Estimates that we're looking at is -- (Interjection) -- on 103, the category of Estimates we're looking at is so short in content that I can deal with the various points that I want to raise all on the same resolution anyway.

I appreciate that the formula applying to grants in lieu of taxes in the Province of Manitoba is one that contains within it a great deal of difficulty when it comes to trying to be equitable to all those municipalities who feel that they for some reason or other deserve special consideration, and I know that the municipality that I represent, Fort Garry, has for the most part, while regretting the fact that it doesn't perhaps receive a grant it feels should be of the size that is warranted for the University of Manitoba, nonetheless concedes that under the difficulties and the complications of the formula that it has been treated fairly. But the municipality does feel -- and I'm not telling the Minister anything that he doesn't know -- that a revision of the formula is perhaps overdue. The application of it, as I've said, is difficult; the government applies it as fairly and carefully as it can, but certainly there are arguments that can be raised by municipalities like Fort Garry and others which I think are cause for a re-examination of that formula at the earliest possible opportunity by the Minister and by the government to make sure that it is equitable across the board and that there aren't inequities creeping in.

As I say, this is a perennial plaint I suppose of all members in this Chamber who have

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) at any time represented a municipality such as the one I represent where there is a major provincial capital plant established for which a government grant is paid the municipality in lieu of what would normally be taxation revenue. So I would just like to underscore the appeal that I've made in the past and ask the Minister whether a study of the grants in lieu of taxes formula is not now called for and whether some modernization and revision of it is not overdue.

I would like to congratulate the Minister on the assumption of his additional portfolio, his additional duties, and I would like to congratulate the government, Mr. Chairman, on the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. It seems to me that this department fills a void in our public life and it's a void that has been increasingly important and increasingly noticeable at provincial and federal levels in our public affairs for the past two or three decades. This is the age of the rise of the urban complex in Western Canada - in Canada at large in fact we're constantly reminded of the fact that we're moving in a direction that will find us in a few short years as Canadians concentrating on the overwhelming preponderance of our population in twelve, fifteen or twenty urban centres.

As a consequence of that sociological trend the government's responsibility in the field of urban affairs is a vivid one, and the creation of a department to attend to urban affairs, urban problems, is an important step in modern administration at the provincial level as indeed it would be in my view at the federal level. Certainly urban affairs is one of the vital areas of modern life and modern governmental responsibility and I wish the Minister well in his challenge in this field. I would hope that he will work to try to make Winnipeg, Greater Winnipeg, the Metro area, a more beautiful city - in particular, a more beautiful city downtown. I would hope that he will work to make it a place where life can be enjoyable as well as exciting and rewarding.

It seems to me that particularly here in Winnipeg, which fell upon perhaps more difficult days in terms of depression in terms of delay in growth and development than some other Western Canadian cities have done, particularly here there is a tremendous challenge now to rebuild and reshape an urban area that will be the envy of our fellow Canadians in this part of Canada and in the country at large. I would hope that in the downtown area, in the central core of Winnipeg, there can be gratifying green areas and natural areas, not simply monuments of concrete. I view with alarm, for example, the replacement of the center strips on Portage Avenue, the center strips of grass, with concrete which now will be presumably painted green. I understand the reasons for the change but, to me, it will be a retrogressive step in terms of the beauty of the downtown area and I hope that in the over-all plan for urban renewal the Minister, in concert with those other officials provincial and municipal with whom he's working, will fight to retain areas from which buildings and other commercial properties are demolished, for grass and trees and natural beauty such as is found in many cities in Europe and Latin America, which seems to be lacking to all too great a degree in many of our North American urban centres.

I was pleased, as I said the other day, Mr. Chairman, to note that the Minister and his colleagues had accepted the recommendations of the Greater Winnipeg Electoral Boundaries Review Commission with respect to their one-city plan. The views that I and others on this side hold with respect to the one-city proposition will doubtless be given a more thorough airing and a more active advancement during debate on the one-city bill itself, but I didn't want to let these estimates pass without commenting that I think the acceptance by the Minister of the recommendations by that commission is a constructive and a helpful one. It seemed to me, through the public hearings that were held on the one-city plan, that there were some ears on the government side that were deaf to the application of the old principle of "rep by pop" and, with the views of the Review Commission defined in their report accepted by the Minister and now scheduled to be applied by him in the plan, I'm gratified to see that a commitment to the idea, to the concept of rep by pop is honoured in the way that it is. I must say that I think the Minister has come a long, long way from where he was a few months ago on this question, or perhaps I've come a long, long way from where I was. I think that the Minister perhaps still has further to come, but he has come a long way and the responsible criticisms of the public or of many segments of the public where the one-city plan was concerned have apparently been acknowledged by him to some substantial degree now, and I do want to note that point and acknowledge the fact that he has been receptive to some of these criticisms that have been raised. I appreciate that.

I've believed, and I've said in this Chamber last year and in 1969, that some

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) rationalization of the multi-city glut in the Metro Winnipeg area has long been needed and is overdue. I've never argued otherwise. I've never argued other than that 12 or 14 municipalities, a multiplicity of municipalities in this area, was illogical and in fact indefensible, not only financially but socially. I don't go as far as the government does in the rationalization proposal that's been put forward in the one-city plan, but certainly I endorse the concept of rationalization to a degree and an elimination of the overlap and the wasteful duplication of services that have existed in the Metro area at large for all too long. I think the one-city plan as proposed by the government goes too far and flies in the face, Mr. Chairman, of some of the contemporary lessons we're receiving in urbanology. I think it flies in the face of the picture of urban breakdown that is daily conveyed to us from the great cities in the United States and indeed some of the other great cities of the world, and I would caution against what appears to me to be a trend in the direction of expanded size for the social unit of Metropolitan Winnipeg. But nonetheless, 12 or 14 different identities on the level of municipalities constitutes a grave error in the other direction, and surely there is a happy medium that I hope can be reached. As I've said, most of our comments doubtless, Mr. Chairman, on that subject will probably be reserved for debate on the one-city bill itself, and I will have more to say at that point. Going into that particular exercise in the House, I wish the Minister of Urban Affairs well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister Without Portfolio.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a few comments on this department. I think this is another instance of something that the New Democrats have talked about for a number of years and in the last election, and are now bringing about what they have promised to do. I also think it's very appropriate that the most urbane member of the government should be chosen as the Minister of Urban Affairs. Perhaps more than anyone else he represents the urban man and the man of the city, the child of the streets who rose to the heights of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister is really, I think, introducing in this what might be called department, a very modest measure. It was quite possible for the government to move by throwing caution to the winds and introducing a very large and full-blown department, but that approach was not taken and I think that the idea was in effect to put together a small competent team of experienced people who would go about, in effect, working with the new urban government, because really I think what this amounts to is a reorganization of the provincial government to complement the new urban government. This could not really have been done as effectively under the system prior to the introduction of this legislation, but now I think coordinating the departments and coordinating the government's energies, not only in relation to the new urban government, but also in relation to our federal big brothers.

I must also compliment the Opposition for their constructive suggestions made on this measure and I was a bit concerned, Mr. Chairman, that there might be a very long and rancorous debate on the new act for Greater Winnipeg but I now deduce though, listening to the soft and gentle suggestions flowing across the Chamber, that we can expect the same type of approach, a rather business-like complementary and constructive form of debate.

Mr. Chairman, I might also say that some of the concerns by the Member for Rhineland will in fact be remedied by this legislation. He spoke very much in favour of the new form of government and he was concerned about some of the problems of the city. He called for more industrial development, more manufacturing, and I think this will be a natural consequence of the new Greater Winnipeg Act.

So I think, Mr. Chairman, just briefly then, that it was essential that the provincial government take this step and that it's very pleasant to see the Opposition in agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 103(a)--passed. The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, maybe we ought to try on for size the name "Uni-City". One of the problems we've had -- well, the suggestion made by the Honourable Member for Charleswood is that we call the new restructured Greater Winnipeg "Cherna-City". That's an awkward sort of a name, but I, you know I -- no, many suggestions are coming but I must indicate that it sort of appeals to me and may to my wife and my children and those who follow me, to have the name "Cherna-City" - it sounds like an awfully awkward name but -- who am I to fight the will of the Legislature if indeed it decides that Cherna-City is a good name? It sounds peculiar to me but I'm willing to buy it. We did have the problem about whether one calls it Winnipeg, the City of Winnipeg, or City of Metro Winnipeg, or City of Greater

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) Winnipeg, and I can indicate that we are open to suggestions. But the word "uni-city" has been used already so much today that I'm beginning to wonder whether that wouldn't be indicative of the kind of city and the kind of urban life that we are looking forward to: a united one; one in which all citizens, all residents, work together in the interests of each other's comfort and quality of life, as was so nicely depicted by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. And I really would like to think that maybe we can get more support for this name Uni-City. It sounds compact; it sounds right to me; and I think it's worthy of consideration.

The Member for Lakeside seems to find the term Uni-Sex as one appealing to him; not for me, but chacun au son goût, I hear. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources is now apprehensive to find that there is another bilingual person on this side of the House to compete with him, but I can tell him to rest assured that I won't try too much to compete with him in that language, although I wish I could.

I really do welcome the expressions of support for the creation of the Ministry of Urban Affairs, all except the Member of Charleswood, who I don't think heard the introduction that I gave or the contributions made by the Honourable Members for Lakeside and for Sturgeon Creek, because they, as the Honourable Member for Charleswood heard this evening, supported the idea of having a Ministry for Urban Affairs but the Honourable Member for Charleswood stood up and said this department is just another level of bureaucracy. I wish he and his colleagues could get together and they could straighten him out and start thinking, and thinking in terms of what it is that the future holds in store for us in this province and indeed in all of the areas of the world where the urbanization problem is present or imminent. I am glad he was present and could listen to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry because he gave me a pretty good picture and I should think the Member for Charleswood would also have a pretty good picture of what a uni-city could be and what it could try to do and what it could become if there is a real effort made. Now, the Honourable Member for Charleswood wanted to ask a question.

MR. MOUG: Would you agree that I said I hope this is not another top level of bureaucracy?

MR. CHERNIACK: I didn't hear those first few words the first time he said it, but to that extent I hope the same and, assuming he said that, that it means he too supports the Ministry for Urban Affairs, which is very gratifying and which indicates that this government is again setting the pace as I indicated it was doing, and that I did have the honour of being the first Minister of Urban Affairs in Canada. I'm glad that the Opposition is in agreement with it.

There were comments made and, like the Honourable the Minister Without Portfolio, I am appreciative of the suggestions that were made, but, more important than that, the questions that were asked along with the suggestions that were made, really show the importance that this Ministry can have and should have, and one which I hope we will develop in time to come.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry spoke of the fact that he does endorse to a degree the direction in which this government is going in the creation of a uni-city but he thinks that one city is going a little too far flying in the face of urbanology, and points out that the big cities to the south are a bad example. Well, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what we've been talking about. The City of Chicago has, I think it's some 100 jurisdictions. The City of Toronto has a number of jurisdictions. The City of New York, which is one of the biggest problem cities in the world, has a number of jurisdictions - and Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the future, not the present. The future is what we have to prepare for and we are indicating to the House that a city of 500,000, with the growth expected of it, is one which should prepare and plan for its future, and I submit can only do so by working together in a unified way.

The Member for Rhineland referred to the growth of the city and talked about his fears that, with the growth and development of the centre, then the outskirts might suffer. Well, Mr. Chairman, let me make this clear that this government is not looking for great population growth for the City of Winnipeg. I think we are looking more for population growths in various areas in Manitoba, and that a city of 500,000, 600,000, is a large city, and I don't think that the people of Greater Winnipeg would like to have a million people in this city, or a million and a half people in this city. I would like to think that we would learn to structure Greater Winnipeg in such a way that it will be well developed and still be limited in size so that it can

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) take full advantage of being an urban centre and yet with room to breathe and room to live without the cramping and other problems that take place in a rapidly growing city. I would like to think that Altona will grow, and that Steinbach will grow, and that Brandon will grow, and that Thompson will grow, and that we'll have a number of . . . cities in this province, each forming part of the province and each growing in a direction which is planned and coordinated each with the other. And if I can skip for a moment -- the Honourable Member for Swan River wishes to . . . ? The Honourable Member for Swan River feels that that is a growth area and I would agree with him. It is. And I would think that that is important.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West did mention the confusion he gets from the title, and of course I know - at least I'm pretty sure he wasn't present when I introduced my estimates this afternoon, but I stated clearly that the task assigned to me starts with the major job of restructuring Greater Winnipeg but that indeed the Ministry of Urban Affairs will be involved in other urban centres of Manitoba which have those problems peculiar to the urban cities, and of course Brandon is the second city in size in Manitoba and would certainly come under the responsibilities of this ministry as it develops slowly and without being a too big -- a bureaucracy, a level of bureaucracy which the Member for Charleswood fears. So if the two members for Charleswood and Brandon West would get together and plan for themselves how they would develop this ministry, I think they could well agree that we should not start with a greatly expanded, immediately developed, full-scale department, but we should grow in size and in extent and in responsibility slowly and carefully in a way which will be consistent with good planning.

Dealing then with some of the points raised by the Member for Fort Garry, he asked: isn't the revision of a grant formula overdue? He wants equity. And Mr. Chairman, what is it that we've been talking about for the last number of months since we developed our proposal? We've been talking about equity, we've been talking about tax base, and we've been talking about a proper equalization of tax base, and surely the grants in lieu play a role, because today the Municipality of Fort Garry is limited in what it can receive from the University of Manitoba grants in lieu, by its own tax level, a limit of five percent.

Well, Mr. Chairman, our proposal is exactly in accord with the suggestion by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and indeed we agree that a revision is overdue and in this case our proposal provides that the full amount of taxes or grant that would be paid in lieu of taxes will be paid for the University of Manitoba, and we pointed this out time and again that, by creating an equalized tax base across Greater Winnipeg, then the formula applied to the greater assessment area of Greater Winnipeg and its tax base will immediately, within the five percent formula, bring the full tax payable by way of grant from the University of Manitoba into the Greater Winnipeg income. Apparently he didn't know it and I'm glad that, now that he knows it, that he is coming even closer to an acceptance of our proposal; and I would think that it won't be long before he accepts our proposal providing he does it on a non-political basis and on a basis of proper evaluation of what this plan that we have presented will develop to be, because he said that he hopes that we will build Greater Winnipeg and especially the downtown core, and clearly he was speaking as a citizen of Greater Winnipeg and speaking just as a citizen of the present City of Winnipeg would speak, because he recognized the importance of the centre core of the City of Winnipeg to all of Greater Winnipeg, and that recognition also is implicit in all our proposals, a recognition that we are one city; and I might repeat and suggest to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that if he were in the City of New York today and someone asked him: "Where do you live?" the chances are very good that he would say "Winnipeg", but if he were in any part of Greater Winnipeg and when asked that question, the chances are he would say "Fort Garry" if indeed he lives in Fort Garry. (I think he does.)

Well, Mr. Chairman, it is clear to me that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is thinking in terms of what is best for Greater Winnipeg and therefore what is best for Manitoba, and as long as he thinks in those terms, non-parochial terms, as long as he thinks objectively and not politically, I think that he will be won over to our proposal. Now, I do admit that I was hurt when he came out some time ago in, I think it was the St. James-Assiniboia newspaper where I first read it. I think he's the editor, or assistant editor of that newspaper, where he accused this government of a gerrymander - and I was hurt, I admit. I felt it was unfair. I suppose it's fair politically to make that accusation but I took it personally. I guess I shouldn't have but I still haven't learned -- The Honourable Member for Charleswood wishes to speak and to interrupt me so . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Would you answer a question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes.

MR. MOUG: Wouldn't you consider that the first government proposal on the reorganization was gerrymandering to a great extent?

MR. CHERNIACK: The Honourable the Minister for Mines and Resources isn't here, so I'm safe to say "Honi soit qui mal y pense," in reply to the Honourable Member for Charleswood, and let me say to him it is absolutely untrue. The fact that it is unfair is your political problem; the fact it is untrue is my knowledge. We asked that a plan be prepared based on certain guidelines, and those guidelines were spelled out and a plan was prepared, and although I assume full responsibility for the plan that was presented, I can say that it was not drawn in accordance with my instruction or my participation or that of any other political person, but did follow the guidelines -- and I'll say to my Honourable Member for Charleswood, who is giggling away in his chair making it clear that he doesn't believe a word I say, so maybe I shouldn't address him; I'll address the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. No, I'd rather not. I really will address the Chair and through the Chair direct my remarks to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, who made the accusation but is still not one who is shaking his head and laughing at what I am saying at this moment -- that the guidelines, indicated at first in the proposals made by this government, were the same guidelines that we gave to the Electoral Boundaries Review Commission, and they came up with variations to our proposal mainly because they had the advantage of updated figures -- the figures used in the original proposal were 1969; the figures used by the Boundaries Commission were 1970. They accepted the guidelines and applied them, and I don't think they rejected the original proposals but they varied them. And one of the values of going out to these meetings, these 15 or so meetings that we held all over Greater Winnipeg, was that we had an opportunity to listen to people, to hear what they said, and to pay attention to it.

Now, there were members of the Opposition came out in print and a public statement saying no, they didn't do that for any purpose; they just did that for propaganda; they're not listening. But the Honourable Member for Charleswood was present at the very meeting where I realized that there was question there in Charleswood and Tuxedo as to whether or not they really ought to form the same community group with Fort Garry, and he was there -- I don't know if he was listening but he was there -- he's standing again, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Would you submit to a question? At the meeting in Charleswood you make reference to, one man stood up, a little too late, I admit, but at 10:30 at night he stood up and he said, "Owing to the fact that several occasions at previous meetings, and this is the tenth one of 14 to be held," and I think this is the correct figure -- if I'm wrong on that it's immaterial -- he said, "Just so that the press and news media doesn't get wrong in the day following paper, would those opposed to the government's proposal please stand up," you and your wife didn't, the rest of the people did. Is that correct or not?

MR. GREEN: I didn't stand either.

MR. MOUG: Oh, I'm sorry. Now just a minute. Just one minute please. Just one minute please. I didn't finish my question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, he has lost the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: One is that he had sat and I stood and he said obey some rules, not all, and in addition to that -- (Interjection) -- we'll let that go. The other reason, Mr. Chairman, is that he wanted to ask a question and he was not very fair to you, Mr. Chairman, because he wanted to make a statement, not a question, and I was dealing with the question of rearrangement of boundaries and he wanted to inject something completely different and extraneous, and I'm prepared to deal with his interjection although the manner in which he did it is not deserving of recognition, nevertheless I'll try and get around to him again if I have time and inclination. But dealing specifically with the point regarding the rearrangement of boundaries, it was at that very meeting in Charleswood where I for one came to the realization that there was some doubt about whether or not it was a good idea for Charleswood-Tuxedo to be related in the same community group with Fort Garry, and that's exactly what the Boundaries Commission itself found. And they found that there was a much closer relationship between Charleswood, Tuxedo and the southwest corner of Winnipeg, the River Heights area, than there is with Fort Garry, and they found it and they were right.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

Now, how the Honourable Member for Fort Garry thinks that there was a correction in the principle of rep by pop, I don't know because the fact is that we ourselves stated that we thought there ought to be representation of ten to twelve thousand people and that we thought that exceptions should be made in certain cases where the community committee grouping would not provide that kind of proportional representation in those communities where, by applying rep by pop, you would only have two members in a community committee group.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the Minister not concede, Mr. Chairman, when he says that how I think that the Boundaries Review Commission deferred to any kind of inclination to alter the boundaries, I'm not sure that I have his reference precise but, in answer to the question implied in his reference, would he not concede that on the basis of the recommendations made by the Greater Winnipeg Boundaries Review Commission, the representation on the proposed council, for example, from Fort Garry is brought up to a level higher than it was before and thus makes it consistent with some of the other proportional representations that were included in the original proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before the Minister proceeds, perhaps it would be better to allow the Minister to complete his address to the remarks that had been posed to him, and then honourable members can have an opportunity to add additional comments when he's complete. The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your attempt to keep order although I personally don't really mind this. It makes it more interesting for me - I don't know if others find it But isn't that a peculiar situation, Mr. Chairman? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry - and let me say this, first and foremost; the report, the recommendations of the Boundaries Review Commission, I think produced a better ward distribution than did our original plan. -- (Interjection) -- No, what he said was -- if the Honourable Member for Lakeside wishes to speak standing up, I'll be glad to sit down to answer a question. If he just wants to speak, then it's his privilege to do as he likes until he starts disturbing you, Mr. Chairman. He can't really disturb me very much.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry now says there is better rep by pop because Fort Garry got three councillors. Mr. Chairman, the Fort Garry situation, like the Transcona situation, like the West Kildonan situation, are the exceptions to the rule of rep by pop, and if he really wanted to have rep by pop, then indeed Fort Garry would revert to two members as would Transcona, as would West Kildonan. So that if he talks but now he's happy that rep by pop is brought in, then he is happy that his particular municipality is getting preferential treatment. -- (Interjection) -- Yes he is. It's preferential treatment along with Transcona and West Kildonan, and that means that 75,000 people approximately, out of half a million, are getting a better proportion of citizens or electors to elected people than the rest of the 425,000 and he praises it. So that's fine if that's the way -- (Interjection) -- All right, now

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Ah, now, Mr. Chairman, we're getting somewhere, because the Honourable Member for Fort Garry did read the proposals we made and did read the Boundaries Commission Report and did recognize that there was growth to be expected, that there was development, that there was a rearrangement that should take place - and that is the important feature. That is the important feature, because since we indicated in our draft bill that we've distributed there should be a review frequently and one before the next election, then it really means that growth areas will be able to be recognized in a proper way and that

MR. SHERMAN: . . . not, Mr. Chairman, it means ultimately that on the rationale applied by the Commission, ultimately you move into a situation of rep by pop.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Once again I wonder if it would not be better for the Minister of Finance to complete his remarks rather than an argumentation back and forth point by point. The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, that I'm provoking the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. I'll try not to do so. But yes, we are now recognizing that there has to be some change and it'll develop with growth areas, and what is more important is that the bill that will be brought in will provide for constant periodic reviews to recognize growth areas, because the fact is that the southern portion of Fort Garry is more likely to develop, to grow, than the northern part of Fort Garry, and it won't be enough just to say these boundaries are fixed forever because indeed gradually we'll find that the southern ward in Fort Garry will be larger than the northern ward, and probably there should be a move in the line between them to

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) accommodate, and the same should develop in even the center core of Winnipeg where the Honourable Member of Fort Garry is hoping that we will have more development, which I assume means more people, more residential accommodation of a center core type which will again require re-evaluation and adjustment. So, as I was saying, although the Honourable Member for Fort Garry did hurt me at one time by his accusation, I'm glad that the final outcome is one that satisfies him and satisfies me; what's more important, satisfies the Government of the Province of Manitoba, in that the ward system proposed by the Electoral Boundaries Review Commission is acceptable and will work.

Now, the Honourable Member for Brandon West. I must say to him that I have not studied the Brandon Boundaries Commission Report. I admitted to him earlier that my task as assigned to me was to concentrate on Greater Winnipeg and that this ministry is not yet in a position to start going beyond Greater Winnipeg to look at other urban centres, and therefore the matter of the Brandon Review Commission still rests with the Minister for Municipal Affairs, and in due course I assume he will respond to questions that the Honourable Member for Brandon West would like to ask.

I'd like now to move to comments made by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, who was asking if the City of Winnipeg would get special treatment, and I thought that he was afraid that it would, but by the time he wound up I think that he recommended that it should, that there should be special treatment for Greater Winnipeg, and then he said yes, but if you give it special treatment which is good then you should give that treatment to the rest of the province of Manitoba, which of course means to me that it won't have special treatment because then it'll be ordinary treatment and how he relates the two I'm not sure but

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance. Order.

MR. CHERNIACK: He says that the only way that people of the province outside of Greater Winnipeg can get any kind of treatment, is if the City of Winnipeg gets special treatment. That has not been the historical way in which grants have been developed within the Province of Manitoba; nevertheless I promised him that we will pay attention to his suggestions relating to special treatment. I don't believe that there should be special treatment except in recognition of special problems, and there are special problems in various areas. The Pas had a special problem; we're dealing with it. There are various areas in Manitoba that have special problems and thus receive special treatments to the extent that the uni-city has special problems and probably we should look at them from that standpoint.

He asked whether there would be change in assessment. The answer is "no." The assessments in Greater Winnipeg today are being prepared and fixed by the Assessment Commissioner for Metropolitan Winnipeg. That means there's one assessment body for Greater Winnipeg that would continue under the new city.

Change in rules. I don't know what he meant, but I wrote it down hoping that I would later understand what he meant by "if there are changes in rules." But if he meant — and again he seemed to express a fear that there would be more development in the center core in the inner area and no development in the outskirts. Well, I hope he's right, Mr. Chairman, I for one think that before a city grows in the outskirts, it should be viable and strong in the inner city, and I for one think that urban sprawl is one of the problems that has occurred and that there should be a hemming in of the growth of the urban development and not a spreading out which brings with it the cost of all the infrastructure, the sewers, the roads, the water lines and power lines and all the rest that go with it.

Good planning involves making the full use of what you have before you start growing outwards, and therefore let me tell the honourable member that one of the great drives and one of the great sicknesses in the growth of Greater Winnipeg has been the fact that we have twelve municipalities and more, and that they were all competing for a tax base, and because they had local tax base they found it necessary to try to develop their area and very often you had urban little growths occurring in various areas, without plans but with only the desire to have a good tax base, which means a greater proportion of commercial and industrial taxes to pay for the high cost of residential demand. And by eliminating that need, by eliminating the need for Transcona, which years and years gone by practically gave away its land along with tax concessions to attract industry, and other areas that did the same thing for the same purpose, we found that there was growth and tax forgiveness deals were made in order to encourage development that was not in the best interest of the areas of Greater Winnipeg; and by creating one equalized tax base, we eliminate the need for that kind of wrong competition for attracting industry and commercial development. And that is a very important feature of what we are

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) proposing.

The honourable member asks a specific question as to what happens with pollution control and I would now like to deal a little bit with some questions of others as to the role of this department. I think some members weren't present when I introduced my estimates but I must have made it clear because the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek both agreed with the concept that the Ministry for Urban Affairs was not to be a delivery department, was not to be a department involved in the delivery of services, but rather a coordinating department, one which would be able to bring together the services of the various departments of government in order to assess their impact on the urban centre and attempt to bring about a better cohesion amongst them, and the problems of pollution still come under the Minister of Mines, Natural Resources and Environmental Control. But the proposed bill, the bill dealing with the uni-city, is one which provides that that new government shall have such responsibilities in pollution control as may be delegated to it by the Environmental Department.

I should say to the Honourable Member for Rhineland that if he thinks that there are some other -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Oh, he mentioned tax deferral and that too is not a matter that comes within my responsibility. The Minister of Municipal Affairs is involved in that. The tax deferral he's talking about must be the one that we talked about where the problem of East St. Paul was the one that came to mind. I know it is a problem all over but it is not the problem so much of the urban centre as much as it is the problem referred to earlier of urbanization. Sprawl has created a level, a market value and an assessment value which is too high for many people who live in the suburban areas beyond the Greater Winnipeg area itself, and that is being dealt with by the Honourable the Minister for Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, we had some interesting discussion from some of the members about the beltway and I still don't know to what extent members opposite are in favour of the beltway or not. They've been very careful. They ask questions: what does the government think about it? I'd like to know what they think about it, and the Member for Assiniboia said oh he believes in a beltway but not where it's proposed. The Honourable the Member for Charleswood said - he started talking and I was sure he was in favour of the beltway, I really was - and then he sort of veered off and started talking about a bridge, not a beltway. So he confused me and now I don't know where he stands. I have a feeling that he would like a beltway in Charleswood but not in St. James-Assiniboia because the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek probably doesn't want a beltway in that area. And -- (Interjection) -- no, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek did not mention it at all, so I really don't know what he wants in terms of a beltway and that's fair enough, because the Honourable Member for Charleswood just insists on speaking. Would you like to ask me a question if the Chairman will permit it? Mr. Chairman, would you permit the honourable member for Charleswood, he's got something boiling within him that seems to need explosion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Can the Honourable Minister responsible for urban affairs permit a question? I would like to phrase my question thusly: Do you agree, Mr. Chairman, that the Chairman and the Minister of Urban Affairs should get together with the Minister of Highways and either abolish the inner beltway -- (Interjection) -- That's a good suggestion but I would say either abolish the beltway idea or go out there and purchase the land. Let democracy rule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Charleswood is catching on to what this is all about. Exactly the thing I've been saying now for some period of time starting from this afternoon, is exactly what he is proposing, and that is that the Minister for Urban Affairs should get together with the Minister for Highways and start making decisions about the urban area, and what we are talking about is exactly the need for a Minister for Urban Affairs to talk to other Ministers that have a service delivery that affects the urban area and start coordinating that. And that is the important thing, and all members of this government are in accord in the idea that there has to be a greater interplay between departments.

I'm trying to remember which member had already mentioned -- yes, it's the Member for Assiniboia, who didn't have the concept - and I guess he must have been talking earlier to the Member for Charleswood - of what this ministry is about, because he wants this ministry to -- he says that there's not enough money in the estimates to provide for the needs that he thinks the ministry ought to do and, according to him, this Ministry of Urban Affairs should

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) take over housing, urban renewal. I presume he ought to say highways, bridges, industrial development in the urban core. He should say health and social development; he should say recreation. Actually, Mr. Chairman, there are many aspects of government and of the departments that provide a service to the inner core and, as I indicated earlier, it is not the intention that the Ministry for Urban Affairs take responsibility for all that goes on in the provincial government program that affects the urban area. Its purpose is to integrate and coordinate the various programs, and therefore, in answer to the specific point he made, housing comes under the Minister of Municipal Affairs who's involved in the -- he's responsible for the Housing and Renewal Corporation, and his work, too, has to be integrated certainly with the Honourable the Minister for Highways because where you have a housing development you have to have a means of bringing people and goods to and from that. Certainly it should tie in with the Social Development Department; certainly it should tie in with the Recreational Department and all those aspects. So I hope that the honourable member will understand that we do not plan for the Ministry of Urban Affairs to take on these other responsibilities.

I note that I'm still on the Honourable Member for Charleswood who still hasn't made it clear to me as to what he thinks, what contribution he'd like to make to our consideration of the beltway. I don't know. What he says is either decide to go ahead or not to go ahead. Does he have any idea? Does he have any suggestion to make that will help us review this problem? Does he want to help us or would he rather just attack us and feel that he has now completed his responsibility as a member of the opposition? So I'd like to hear from him. I'd also like to hear from him -- (Interjection) -- No, not now. I've heard enough from him today. It'll take me a little while to adjust to the next time he wishes to speak. But when he does speak, when he decides that he wants to make a positive contribution, he might tell me who it is that pays for the paving of roads; who it is that pays for the sewers that take the run off water rather than open drainage sewers which he says the people of Charleswood want. They want the open drainage; they want gravel roads, they like that. Who pays for that if not the people who front on those areas? And he knows very well, I assume, that if his people want it they can petition for it and get it, and if they don't want it they can oppose a petition and not get it. If, however, they are on what we call a Metro road, then he knows they'll get it anyway and then they'll only pay for it along with all the other taxpayers of Greater Winnipeg. So what his problem is I don't know, and you know, Mr. Chairman, I don't think he knows it either except that he's against. This much he knows, he's against. But no doubt he'll be able to give us more information of what his thinking process is.

So I can leave him with the feeling that I have not heard the end of him, or the last of him, and move on to comments made by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia, who says that -- oh yes, he said that the estimates show a program which is not good enough for him; he would like to see more money in these estimates. He wishes that it could give more meaning to urban affairs -- he fears that it's only for Greater Winnipeg. I trust he now understands that we don't need money to do a job if we do the coordinating work and other departments do deliver the service. I trust he now understands that the concept of this ministry for urban affairs is not limited to Greater Winnipeg except for the immediate task. Just help us. Just, Mr. Chairman, help us, and I'm appealing now to the opposition, especially the Member for Assiniboia, to deal with the problem of Greater Winnipeg. Help us with uni-city. Let's do it quickly and then I assure him that the government will be able to direct the efforts of the ministry of urban affairs into other areas. And he spoke of the danger of alienation between the city and the country. He fears that. You know, it was a peculiar thing, Mr. Chairman, that during the last election campaign, the by-election campaign, his leader -- I don't mean the one who sits in the House, I mean the one that sits outside the House, and his candidate, or that of his party in Ste. Rose, and you know, Mr. Chairman, time flies so that I confess honestly I don't remember the man's name but I remember he was the Liberal candidate for Ste. Rose. They, along with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, out in the rural areas were saying that this government of Manitoba was going to build a Greater Winnipeg area at the expense of the rural areas. And he warned them you people are going to pay for the development of Greater Winnipeg, the high cost, -- (Interjection) -- Eighteen million was the figure used. Well, whatever -- I don't know if they used it on that occasion, but they were out there warning the people of Ste. Rose: "This government is going to charge you in order to --" and the Member for Charleswood pitched in today too and said something, that they are here to help --

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) that they are going to help Art Moug.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the same time -- the same time that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party were out in the rural areas threatening the people, the Liberal candidate, I think it was in St. Vital-- and I forget his name too - he was there saying, "We demand a better break from this provincial government for the urban area. We are not getting a proper share of provincial revenues for the urban area." He was. He was. I have the clipping somewhere. I know I didn't throw it out; it was too precious. But he did say - whilst his running mate up in Ste. Rose was saying one thing, he in St. Vital was saying another. And you know, Mr. Chairman, they didn't believe the man in Ste. Rose, they didn't believe the man in St. Vital, and that's why we have two new members sitting on our side of the House. Because, Mr. Chairman, it is only this kind of idle threat, of talking about alienation of country and city, this talk about back to our kindergarten days, about the city mouse and the country mouse, that kind of talk is what does not build a province and does not recognize the importance of -- (Interjection) -- Just a moment, I'm almost -- I want to finish my sentence. And does not make it possible to recognize the importance of the urban area of Greater Winnipeg to Manitoba nor the importance of the urban area of Greater Winnipeg to Manitoba nor the importance of Manitoba to Greater Winnipeg. One is as much dependent on the other both ways and to talk in those terms is only to attempt to create an alienation and a feeling of distrust. Now the Honourable Member for Assiniboia wanted to interrupt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question? I know he likes to hear himself talk. Yes, I have a question. You know, if he wishes to discuss the election we can do that, and we'll take the time of the House to do that, but was it an unfair question to ask him if the Urban Affairs Department was strictly for the City of Winnipeg or was it for the Province of Manitoba? I don't think it was an unfair question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, in reply I think it was a perfectly fair question. It was only unfair to the extent that the honourable member didn't hear my introductory remarks last night. I explained it but he was probably absent for good reason. But, no, it's not an unfair question. What is unfair, Mr. Chairman, is the attempt again to bring in a competition or a confrontation between the -- and I wrote it down so I can use his words -- "the city and the country." That was unfair and that was beneath him, I believe. I think that that was not the proper way to talk in terms of the problems of the urban area and the position of the rural parts of Manitoba.

He asked whether 12 to 15 employees were involved in the estimates. The answer is no, and if I have time I will -- well, I will, I will have time if not today then tomorrow or the day after, I'll be able to spell out more precisely what the estimates are about. But we don't contemplate that number at all for this coming year.

He asked for an explanation of the grants in lieu and I'll do that as well, and then he asked about the convention centre policy. I can inform him that there is a joint committee of the province and the Metro Corporation studying the convention centre. This committee has instructed that preliminary plans be reviewed and cost estimates be produced, and let me tell him that this government is still anxious to make sure that a convention centre is not built as a convention centre alone but forms part of a greater plan. A year ago I had occasion to stand here and say that we want it to be a stimulus to growth and development and that's an essential part of it so that we're not blindly rushing ahead with a convention centre just for the sake of a convention centre, but only as part of a planned development, and we've committed ourselves to that along these lines with this prerequisite that it has to be within our means and part of the general growth and the fact is that studies are still going on.

He asked about urban transportation and surely that is one of the great problems that faces any city and faces Winnipeg. Not to the extent that it is faced in larger cities where congestion is greater. I don't think it's so bad yet, and I know now today that it takes me ten minutes to get from my home to this building, and I would think it takes most members not much more than ten minutes to get from wherever they live in Greater Winnipeg to this building. But the problem is coming and we now have a joint committee of the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, the Metro Corporation, the two railways studying the rail rationalization study which involves transportation, we have set up our own committee in government here to study the transportation problems of Greater Winnipeg. This is a serious problem and let me tell the honourable members that the costs involved are tremendous and that is why it is so essential that we study and we should debate some time or other in this House - any time,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) today, tomorrow - to discuss the problem of urban transportation and whether public transportation or private transportation has to have some sort of relationship one to the other and whether you need rapid transit or whether you need freeways. These are problems that have not been solved by all the great exponents, the great experts on urbanology - a term used by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. There is a great deal of difference of opinion and yet it is a serious problem.

I did write down the Honourable Member for Assiniboia said he wants to see some real teeth in this department, and you know, Mr. Chairman, I asked for a few teeth, just a few teeth, at the beginning of the session. I said I'm bringing in a bill, a transitional bill, I'd like to have a few teeth, a little bit of measure of control over budget, and the opposition has seen to it that -- you know, we've been in session for some little time now. This morning, it passed Law Amendments Committee. So that if he wants to see some real teeth, let him give us a little bit of cooperation and support and we'll try and help him out.

I'm still not clear on what he proposes for the beltway. I do know that he says it may be a good idea but not where it's proposed, so he said he wants to know where it is. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of speculators in this city who would love to know exactly where and when the beltway will be built. They would just love to know it. And I for one would not be inclined to make that information that free and that clear, that quickly and that openly. And I think the Honourable Member for Assiniboia should agree because he must know how many speculators operate.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with remarks made by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek who was preceded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, who said a few nice things about what we are to do. But you know that, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, who is apparently the Chairman of the Urban Committee of the caucus of the Progressive Conservative Party, made some comments -- (Interjection) -- Well, somebody ought to tell the Honourable Member for Lakeside just who is the chairman of that committee. It's none of my business, but if the Honourable Member for Lakeside said it was the chairman from Sturgeon Creek and now the Member for Charleswood indicates that he's the chairman, I wonder if they know that there may be two committees in caucus and each one has a chairman. Regardless of that, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek teed off - he was the first spokesman; and, you know, Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear the Progressive Conservative Party's proposal on how to cure the ills that occur in Greater Winnipeg such as described by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry acknowledged that the situation as it exists today is not good, that there has to be change. He thinks we're going a little too far. At least, he's indicated we have to go in a direction, but the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek had no proposal. Now, the Progressive Conservative Party may still come up with something - the Liberals did. I don't think it's worth much but at least they did. But the Progressive Conservative Party, I think, to this day has not indicated its proposals for restructuring of Greater Winnipeg. I do recall at the very first public meeting we had in River Heights, which was attended by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that I asked there because he was questioning our proposal, I asked him if he had one and he said - and I'm paraphrasing him - he said, "Oh yes, we have it and we will yet reveal it." All I've seen revealed from them is a proposal that the Electoral Boundaries Review Commission should be given the job of studying all the other reports and then bringing in a report to this House. I hope we will yet hear from the Progressive Conservative Party, who can't be completely bankrupt of ideas as to what their proposal is, in a positive way, not a negative way.

But the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek did make the point that we are, in Greater Winnipeg, we are better off than most. Exactly at this time, when we are better off than most, is that we have to prepare to be not as bad off as many, because the time is coming when it'll get worse and worse, and we have to prepare for it now while we still have the opportunity and not when the crisis is upon us, and I am happy that we are better off than most and I hope that we will become even better than that and achieve the level that was described by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry; the Honourable Member for Assiniboia said I love to hear my own voice. I must say that I'm gratified by the attention I seem to have from certain members across the way, but I really am not through and I really feel that I want to talk a little more about the point made by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on the loss of

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) identification and the loss of local participation, because one of the exciting things about the job assigned to me was not that we were going to go into amalgamation - and if the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek thinks that we've been talking amalgamation all along he hasn't been listening - we are talking exactly about the need to maintain a sense of identification, to maintain an avenue for local participation, and that I promise you, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to deal with, because the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek seems to require the need that this be done.

Now, I therefore want to concur with the -- I think the Member for Lakeside is usual, which is to be as rude as he can be and he's succeeding very nicely and continuing to do so - that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has already had, I think, a couple of weeks to study the draft bill that has been distributed, and I've already indicated to him that the great bulk of that is in the main a re-typing of existing legislation and I commend to him the parts which I indicated earlier were the parts that require particular study and they're not so difficult or complex for him. But I want to conclude on the question of the hearings of the Boundaries Commission Report and state to him that if this government had no idea and no plan and no concept, then it would have to listen to more discussions, but once this government formulated a proposal and that proposal was one which it was prepared to take to the people, a step which no previous government to my knowledge has ever done in Manitoba, taking this proposal for discussion amongst the people affected, when we did that, we did that on the basis of our having concrete proposals and those proposals were the ones which we were prepared to support, not have hearings on proposals made by a Boundaries Commission which we would not support. We made it clear that we would not support that commission report, then why hold hearings on a matter which we were not prepared to support? The fact is that we had great hearings, we had a great deal of discussion and debate all over Greater Winnipeg on our proposals and they were useful, they were beneficial and worthwhile.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)--passed? (2)..passed? Order, please. Perhaps honourable members would like to peruse Rules 41, 42 and 37 in that order before the committee meets again. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is now adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon (Tuesday).