

TIME:2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have some 15 members of the 105th Girl Guides Company. This group is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. On behalf of the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going to direct a question to the Minister of post-secondary education. Perhaps I can direct it to the Minister of Education or to the First Minister. I wonder if the government can confirm that it is their intention to require students applying for student aid at the post-secondary level, if it's going to be a requirement for them to have to submit their income tax forms or the income tax forms of their parents in applying for such aid?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HONOURABLE IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister for Continuing Education, I can confirm that that is the intention. The application form was reduced from 13 pages to 6 pages. I believe that income tax forms are now required for those individuals who do wish to receive financial support from the government.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether there have been substantive enough problems associated with student aid applications to have to take this sort of a measure?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, the point here is to make the application form easier to complete, which reduces the number of applications that need to be handled as exceptions. If the number of application forms for student aid that are handled as exceptions can be reduced, then the processing of all the applications that are made can be done much more efficiently, much more quickly. What the change means in effect then is that those students applying for aid, the vast majority of them will likely receive notification of their aid earlier than in the past.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether there haven't been any protests from potential recipients of student aid on the basis that it is an unwarranted invasion of privacy to take this type of measure?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, the point is, of course, that if individuals want financial support from the government they have to demonstrate need and, as I said, the submission of income tax forms has been the practice in some cases in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING R. LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, a question to either the First Minister or the House Leader. Could the First Minister or the House Leader advise the House when we will be receiving either legislation or white papers or other proposals with respect to the main thrusts that were indicated in the Throne Speech, namely: legislative changes re financing of hospital insurance, Medicare; post-secondary education; comprehensive accident insurance plan proposals; hours of overtime work legislation; City of Winnipeg amendments; Credit Union legislation and legislation on Family Law proposals, to say nothing of foreign ownership of land which was dealt with yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, some of the specifics referred to legislation, introduction of legislation is imminent — by that I mean a matter of a few days — some of it is sort of time-framed within thirty to forty days approximately.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister or the House Leader assure the House that we will not be faced with the same legislative debacle that we were faced with last year with legislation. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if that question bespeaks an answer but when it comes to late introduction of legislation, I think that the journals of the House going back over the last fourteen years would prove rather edifying.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, unlike the First Minister, I'm dealing with 1977, can he give assurance that these major pieces of legislation will not be brought in as they were last year in the last two weeks of the House.

A MEMBER: Who the heck are you to talk?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I can give an assurance that it will not be any worse than introduction of legislation that persona- I recall lly, such as for example in years like 1964, 1962 when my honourable friend had some responsibility for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker' my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can indicate to the House when he intends to table the report of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, it's ready and it will be tabled soon, within the next few days.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate when he first received the report in its completed form?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker' I think it was just a few days before I left for the Argentine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister, and ask him whether or not any enabling legislation would have to be enacted by this House to enable the Government to come to the assistance of the community of Lynn Lake? I understand discussions are currently under way.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussions in the sense that some of the problems have been brought to our attention by the Member of the Assembly for Churchill. Yesterday afternoon there was a rather lengthy and detailed meeting with representatives of the Local Government of Lynn Lake. Just off hand, it is my impression that it doesn't require legislation inasmuch as some aspects of the problem can be dealt with, indeed are already being dealt with through changes in the public school finance grants support; some of it through the general municipal grants; some of it, and here I'm speaking hypothetically, could be, I can't specify the extent, through the mining royalty and taxation special reserve fund for communities that are suffering problems of decline as a result of change in mining activity. I believe my colleague introduced that feature perhaps three or four years ago, 1970 or 1971 and so it does have a statutory base already but the details have to be worked out.

MR. ENNS: Specifically, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister, the reference to the reserve fund set up for this purpose is there any requirement, and I'm seeking answers for clarification, is there any requirement under the statutes that set up that fund that moneys withdrawn from that fund be accompanied by some enabling legislation in this Chamber or is it done by Order-in-Council?

MR. SCHREYER: I believe the latter, Mr. Speaker, but of course, the statutory base existing it still remains to work out a coherent and detailed response, and that is what will unfold in the course of the next several weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate to my honourable friend that when I answered him with respect to the Development Corporation Report' it was the printed report ready for tabling that I received just before I left for the Argentine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer. I wonder though if he could indicate to the House when the government received the completed report.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can't recall that date, there would be an audited report prepared which has been sent to the printers. I don't remember specifically whether I received that one or not, I would think that I did, but in any event the one that was prepared for me to be able to table in the legislature' printed, was just before I went to the Argentine.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to address to the Honourable Attorney-General. I'd like to ask the Attorney-General if his department is currently carrying out any investigations into the activities of organized crime in the City of Winnipeg? .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, first the question presupposes that there is evidence indicating organized sense in the usual sense of organized crime. In answer specifically to the honourable member's question though, the RCMP constantly carry out investigations as to crime of all types but that should not presuppose an answer that there is in fact existing in Manitoba at the present time organized crime.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question. Is the Attorney-General in relatively constant contact with the Solicitor-General of Canada and the RCMP with respect to activities of organized crime in this area?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are regular meetings that are held involving senior officials in the Department of the Attorney-General with the senior police officials of the City of Winnipeg and with senior officials of the RCMP in Manitoba.

MR. GRAHAM: A further supplementary question, then. Has the Attorney-General authorized the City of Winnipeg Police to carry out investigations into the activities of organized crime in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is no need for authorization like any other investigation of any other crime. If there is reasonable basis to warrant an investigation, the investigation will be commenced by the appropriate police agency.

MR. GRAHAM: A final supplementary, then. Has the Attorney-General received any recent reports from the City of Winnipeg Police in that respect?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't personally. If the honourable member is aware of such a report being referred to my department, I would certainly inquire into it. It may be that a report has been received in the last few days from the City of Winnipeg. If the honourable member is aware of one, then he should specify.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question: On March 9th, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister responsible for Renewable Resources about moose hunting on Hecla Island and he replied that such matters were the responsibility of the Minister for Parks. And a day or two later I asked the Minister for Parks a similar question and he replied that it was the responsibility of the Minister for Renewable Resources. Now, Mr. Speaker, I may need some guidance as to who to direct the question to, but my question is which Minister is responsible for deciding on moose hunting on Hecla Island, a provincial park? Could he inform the House if he is considering holding a special moose season, or will the culling of any moose be done by members of his department or personnel of the parks department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, not that I presume to be an expert on moose, but just for the general information of my honourable friend, assuming he is interested in information which I do, it is that with respect to hunting in parks the regulations are still those promulgated by the department generally responsible, but on the advice and input of the department responsible for parks if it has to do with an area that is designated as parks.

MR. BLAKE: Well, a supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker, addressed to the Minister responsible for Parks. Could he inform the House if he is considering a special moose hunting season on Hecla Island?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education.

HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, if there is need to do so, I will do just that. I have heard the honourable member's question. I have taken it as notice and I hope to have a reply for him within the next few days. My colleague in front of me asked me if this is organized sport. If it is, well then it is outside my jurisdiction but I do not think that it is so therefore I hope to have an answer for him in the next two or three days.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HONOURABLE PETER BURTNIAK (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, about a week ago the Honourable Member for Crescentwood asked a question of me and I would like to repeat the exact words that he used. He said, "My question to the Minister: Is it true that Autopac has made several serious errors in assessing insurance premiums this year, and if it is so, could he inform the House as to when Manitobans can expect the refund?"

Well I took it for granted, Mr. Speaker, that there were some really serious errors made and, of course, I asked the MPIC people to make a thorough check into this thing and I received the information back: Whereas the members will recall that we changed the wheel base to curb weights this year and there are about 535,000 vehicles in the province of Manitoba and, of course, of these only a very small number of incidents arose where a computer file carried insufficient detail and the undercharge was about \$14.00 at the most, in very few instances.

There was also some cases where the manufacturer supplied erroneous information as far as the weights are concerned and there was an overcharge of something like \$7.00. I might inform my honourable friends that in all these cases refunds have been processed. And if you take the number of vehicles that were involved, the error factor was less than one quarter of one percent, so therefore there was no real tremendous number of errors or large amounts.

TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have permission to go back to the Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

Tuesday, March 29, 1977

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like then, having leave, to table **The Annual Report of The Workers Compensation Board for the year 1976.**

Also, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased yesterday to receive a report of an Industrial Inquiry Commission —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, less six percent according to the AIB. Okay. I was pleased yesterday to receive the report of the Industrial Inquiry Commission looking into facets pertaining to the October 14th day of protest and I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, although it may be somewhat unusual to table this report, I do so in the spirit of open government that this government has always adhered to, to table the report that I have received at the first opportunity, and herewith, Mr. Speaker, table five copies of **The Report of the Industrial Inquiry Commission.**

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HONOURABLE RONALD McBRYDE (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Leader of the Opposition asked a question in relation to Minago Contractors and because the member failed to give notice and because I was only 99 percent sure of the answer, I took the question as notice. The province has guaranteed a bank loan for Minago Contractors in the amount of \$406,000.00. Mr. Speaker, this is a change in the method of financing in order to save on interest costs, so we changed from a lease-purchase agreement to a bank loan to finance equipment purchases.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my second question to the Minister was whether or not there had been any direct grants made as well to the same company, in addition to the loan.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition may be aware that the companies under the Manitoba Natural Resources Development Act do report to the Economic Development Committee for full review. The Minago Construction does receive, as do a number of other companies, some training assistance in terms of training people. And the method of financing their last contract, or payment for the financing came from two sources, the Department of Highways and from Winter Works' and so there was a dual financing of their last contract.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, do I understand the Minister then to be saying that there was the guarantee of the bank loan, No. 1, four hundred-and-some-odd-thousand dollars; and No. 2, that there were grants in addition from the Department of Highways and from one other department of government? If so, how much were they?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I think maybe the member did understand the first answer. The second part, there were payments for work done from two sources. There were also training grants available to Minago, as they are to other companies, and the exact figure and detail of those can be obtained when Minago Construction Board of Directors comes before the Economic Development Committee.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please proceed to the adjourned debates on second reading appearing on the first page of the orders.

BILL (NO. 3) - THE FARM INCOME ASSURANCE PLANS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Adjourned Debates - Bill No. 3. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Yes, well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a few comments on Bill No. 3, The Farm Income Assurance Plans Act. Two of our members have already voiced opinions of our caucus. I'd like to add a few more thoughts to the bill.

Once again we find that our Minister of Agriculture has not really got himself into a jam but he has placed himself in a position that he is trying to extricate himself from. He has a five year plan going for the beef producers of the province of Manitoba. He has about \$33 million in taxpayers' money invested and he is quite willing and trying to negotiate himself out of the dilemma that he finds himself in and he has found a very good opposite member in the Federal Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Whelan, who is also a very firm advocate of the supply management theory.

The formula laid out in the bill is very complicated. I expect when it comes into practice it will iron itself out and will not be quite as bad as it appears but to the layman it does seem to be a very complicated formula to arrive at a straightening up of the situation that we find ourselves in.

I would also like to take a look, Mr. Speaker, at what the reasons are that we are finding ourselves

in a bind on the livestock industry. If we go back a little while, in fact five years ago' where we found that the so-called experts were telling us that there would not enough red meat in the North American continent to supply the demand. And we found that within three or four years that we were in an over-supply position. I think that the reason behind this was that the governments of most countries put on promotional projects to try and increase the supply, and we were also in the position of receiving very large supplies of off-shore beef. And it seems awfully funny to me, Mr. Speaker, that our Minister of Agriculture over the past two years at no time has made any representation, to our knowledge, to the Federal Minister to possibly even has some consultation with the people who are mainly responsible, mainly the Australian and New Zealand suppliers, to see if some arrangement could not be made on a quota system or some method of stopping the heavy influx. We find that when the textile industry was affected in any way, it didn't take the federal people very long to start bringing in tariffs and legislation to slow up the supply.

We've also found that our Minister at no time during the latest discussion of bringing in herbicides and pesticides has made any statement on our behalf either. Basically the only farm organization that has stood up and questioned the Federal Minister of Agriculture was the President of the United Grain Growers. The reason given for the embargo on herbicides and pesticides is labelling. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that has got to be about the most ridiculous statement that you could ever hear of, because the Americans have for a long time been in the forefront of both the herbicide and pesticide business. They have basically been the people that have developed most of the products and I am quite sure that they are not turning loose on their farmers and on the general public there anything that isn't tried and tested.

We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture state a point of order.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I want to draw to the attention of you, Sir, that the member is dealing with pesticides and herbicides and that is nowhere mentioned in the bill before us, at this point in time.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the reason I was bringing in pesticides was because they are used for killing grubs and lice on cattle. So I think that possibly there was a reason for bringing them in. Maybe the Minister doesn't know that.

As I indicated before, Mr. Speaker, we are going to support this legislation mainly for one reason and that is that we feel that at least getting it locked into one place there will not be two places that governments could be making mistakes.

It appears now that there will be a gradual increase in the price of cattle and that indications are that we can look forward to at least a little better situation than what we have had previously. It seems now that . . . And I don't altogether fault our Provincial Minister. He did make a move but he made it for his usual own selfish gains which is supply-management and he always seems to have some little program on the back burner that he can drag out. When he was resoundingly defeated on his referendum the other day, why he wasn't very long coming along with the deal arranged between himself and the federal Minister of Agriculture.

However' we will be watching this legislation very closely and, as I say, the present Minister could take almost any program and between he and his Deputy if he couldn't foul it up or mess it up, well it just wouldn't be possible.

I don't really believe I have a great deal more to say on this but some of the rest of our people may have something to say on it. As I stated previously we will go along with the legislation and hopefully we can get some of the things straightened up in the cattle industry. I think there are many things that could be touched, weighing, bonding of buyers, brand inspections, etc. The Minister has given no indication that he will follow through with these. He is sulking like a spoiled child because his referendum was not accepted at face value.

So, hopefully, Mr. Speaker, this will be a step in at least in getting the stabilization, if we have to come to that. I really don't believe in the stabilization program. I think the industry can look after itself. I think the people that basically are requiring the most assistance are the people that were talked into the industry and really have no business being in it to start with but are in under false guidance that, you know, there was going to be a terrific market, and all the rest of it. The people that have been in it will take the ups and downs as they come along and I think that they are capable of looking after themselves. And that's all I have to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture will be closing. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to delay this bill, Bill No. 3, any longer. I'm sure my honourable friend will have ample opportunity this afternoon to close the debate.

But I repeat and reiterate the point that has been made by a number of my colleagues in the House to the effect that the Section 2 of this bill does carry with it the importing of very special powers of delegation to the Minister of Agriculture which I think, to be fair to him and to any other Minister, are

dangerous in the extreme. Dangerous in the extreme I say, Sir, because this Legislature, if this section is approved, is purporting to delegate to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, who in turn can delegate to the Minister, the right to enter into farm income assurance plans for the benefit of producers of any natural product as defined in the Natural Products Marketing Act, and we all know what's included there, and for that purpose the Minister may enter into agreements with producers, individually, or collectively.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what the Minister was attempting to get at here was the integration of the provincial beef stabilization plan with the federal plan which was announced by the Minister of Agriculture some months ago. That was forecast in The Throne Speech and that's acceptable to this side of the House. We see the need for the statutory authority for the Minister to engage in that kind of an operation to help the treasury of this province, to help him get on with the recouping of some moneys from the federal treasury, on this assistance plan. But I fail to see the justification' Mr. Speaker, to give this kind of extreme delegation to one Minister of the Crown to enable him — and this is the dangerous part — to enter into an agreement with one farmer. Now I realize that's an extreme position, one farmer or one group of farmers — a group of farmers say in Souris-Killarney or in the Minister's own constituency or whatever — and the only guarantee that we have that there will be a balance utilized in the decision-making process as to what special group of farmers will receive this kind of ministerial munificence is the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Now the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, of course, is the Cabinet of this province and I really wonder if the Minister shouldn't reconsider this section because it imports with it severe powers of delegation which I suggest this Legislature should not give up readily at all. This Legislature should remain sovereign, Sir, with respect to major votes of money. I don't have to tell you, Sir, I don't have to tell the members opposite that the main object and purpose of Parliament and the Legislature is to vote supply, that's why we're here.

But in the course of doing that, Sir, here we are faced with a piece of legislation by the Minister of Agriculture which would derogate from the powers of this Legislature to approve that kind of vote of supply for special assistance plans that may well be needed in the future. We know they will be needed in the future. We approve of the idea that government should have the elbow room to move with respect to farm assistance *ad hoc* farm assistance programs that are brought about by drought or by other natural conditions from time to time .

But I suggest, Sir, echoing the words of the Member for Lakeside that that kind of legislation does exist and that the Minister does not need this particular section which would enable him — and I'm not casting or imputing any motives to the particular Minister at all — but which would enable him or any of his successors on really a random basis to make a determination subject only to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council that they were going to enter into a farm assistance program with the beekeepers or with the vegetable growers or with the potato growers and so on; and this Legislature would be in the position then of having delegated that massive authority so that programs costing tens of millions of dollars could be stimulated under this kind of enabling legislation, could be stimulated without recourse back to the Legislature except ultimately to vote retrospectively for the supply that would be needed to fund the particular program.

So I suggest, Sir, that that is what's bothering a number of us in the House with respect to this legislation. The powers of delegation are extreme. I would hope that the Minister and his colleagues would take a look at that particular section before it reaches Law Amendments Committee in order that they might see the root cause of the fears that have been expressed on this side of the House and see fit to excise this particular section from the bill. Otherwise I don't think that the Minister will find too much objection in principle to what he is proposing to the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture will be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to respond to the statements that were just made by the Leader of the Opposition and point out to him that it is the intent of the government through this measure to place on the Statute Books a provision that would allow any Minister — into the future that is — to enter into any agreement with respect to the stabilization of any agricultural commodity. That is one of the main intents of this bill. It is not merely to accommodate a situation which we have on the books today, namely, the Beef Income Assurance Plan; but a provision which would allow for the entry into other agreements as between the province and the Government of Canada. So it is enabling in nature and therefore we certainly don't want to withdraw from that position.

I'm not surprised that the Leader of the Opposition would not want to have such enabling legislation on the books because perhaps maybe it reflects somewhat on their policy when they were the government, in not providing for the same but it certainly is a very important departure of provincial policy and I don't want to apologize for that, Mr. Speaker. I think it is commendable on the basis that it gives greater flexibility and will allow for the government to enter into . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. USKIW: . . . agreements without having to wait for the time when the House is in session, but

can negotiate agreements with producer groups and the Government of Canada whenever such need arises.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON: I wonder if the Minister would yield to a question. What I would like to ask the Minister, what was the authority that he used in order to institute the Stabilization Program for beef cattle last year or the year before? If that authority wasn't there how was he able to institute that program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris knows that that authority exists. What does not exist, however, is to give recognition to another authority and that is the Government of Canada in any payments that they may make to the same producer and in which case we would want to subtract a portion of our commitment in order to take into account of that. So that the means of tying federal and provincial programs together does not exist without the passage of this legislation. That is the major importance of this bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, members opposite have indicated that the government wishes to somehow extricate itself from a five-year commitment and I think that if they had read through my opening statement that they would not draw that conclusion whatever. Because it is indeed a five-year commitment. All this change, with respect to the Beef Income Assurance Plan, involves is a greater option and flexibility on the part of the producer. Certainly no more options on the part of the government.

We are committed to the full extent of every contract and there are some 6,500 contracts in place at the present time. So really this is giving greater flexibility to the producers who are now on contract with the Department of Agriculture.

The Member for Gladstone in his remarks implied that he doesn't believe in income stabilization programs, that producers can deal with the instability of the marketplace very well without government intervention or assistance. And I suggest to him in that connection, Mr. Speaker, that if he believes that to be the case then he should vote against this measure. I don't know why he has indicated to us that he intends to vote for this measure when in the same speech he suggested that there is no need for it and that he doesn't believe in this kind of a program.

So, Mr. Speaker, really there is not much more that one should say on this subject although one could carry on at length. I think it's a very straightforward proposition. It does guarantee the producers who are on the Beef Income Assurance Plan the continuance of the present contractual obligations as far as the province is concerned, but gives them added opportunity to adjust or opt out and to participate in a federal program.

It is our hope that we don't have to enter into other programs with respect to other commodities from time to time in the future, and the hope rests on the fact that it is indeed a national responsibility and always has been.

The idea of income stabilization of agricultural commodities has always been the responsibility of the Government of Canada. It is only through their inaction over the last three years — desperate years as far as the beef producers are concerned — that several provinces did get involved in provincial programs. But now that we have the Federal Government involved in those programs, I think it's a welcome event. I think we should encourage more fuller responsibility on the part of the Government of Canada and I wish to, in that context, Mr. Speaker, commend this bill to the House.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 4, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 5, the same member.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand.

BILL (NO. 7) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PROVINCIAL JUDGES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 7, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have looked over this bill quite closely, especially after the remarks made by the Member for Birtle-Russell. I would like to say at the outset we disassociate ourselves completely from the motives that he imputed to the Minister as to the reasons this bill was brought in.

I do have some questions, though, I would like developed and answered when the Minister closes second reading. For example Section 7(5) provides that the inquiry before the judicial council may be held in public or in private unless the Minister requires that it be in public. Now there is some criticism, I would think, of that. I think that there should be a requirement that the hearings be held in public. Why do I say this? Obviously the allegation or the charge that has been brought against the official, in this case the judge, is so serious that it is being inquired into, so therefore the inquiry wouldn't be launched if there had not been any evidence. In other words an inquiry wouldn't be

launched on hearsay and there would have to be some substantial evidence to cause an inquiry.

Now I am sure that any offenders who go before our courts daily in this land would like to have their charge conducted in private as well. The judge is a public official paid by the public purse and he should have to take his chances before an inquiry in public, the same as the people that have to come before that judge must do. So I question that very much but I am willing to listen to the Minister's explanation. If the Minister tells me that it is because if the judge is found to be completely free and is exonerated of the charges, that his reputation may have been impaired and it may impair his future work when he does go back to the bench, well I don't know whether I can accept that or not. I don't like it already that the medical profession and the legal profession can have self-governing bodies where inquiries are held, and even in matters of breaking the law before it gets out to the public. So I don't think that this principle is valid. The judge that has to appear before a judicial council should have to answer for his actions in public. ' Again, the fact that in Section 7

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member refer to the bill in general, please?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of a principle it entails and I am pointing out the sections. That particular section again gives the right to the Minister or the council to decide whether or not to make public the information, the documentary information, that the case is being based upon. I would like to hear the Minister's explanation as to why that should not be a right of the public to know, not a decision made either by a politician or by a fellow judge. I would like very much for the Minister to give us his thinking as to why he thinks that should be a judgement situation. After all, and I repeat, a judge is not a normal professional such as a lawyer or a doctor, he is a public servant and he is paid by the public purse and I believe the public have the right to know.

So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I again repeat that we completely disassociate ourselves with the Conservative argument where motives were imputed to the Minister for actions that were taken in the past and we will let the bill go in second reading and perhaps make amendments in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, since I was out for a moment when the honourable member was speaking, I would like to adjourn debate so I can read his comments in Hansard. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Radisson, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL (NO. 18) — THE RETAIL BUSINESSES HOLIDAY CLOSING ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, Bill 18 has commanded a considerable amount of attention and study by myself and other members of our caucus since it was introduced for second reading by the Minister some ten or twelve days ago in this Chamber. I know the Minister will recognize that there was an honest disposition on my part and on our part to study the ramifications of the bill very carefully because he in his own introductory remarks said that it was not a bill that had been drafted and proposed to the House lightly. He said that it had contained and commanded considerable forethought and study. It wasn't something that was just pushed into the House as an afterthought and I plead the same kind of consideration in respect to the time that we have taken and that I have taken to look at it since it came before us, Sir.

I must say that having given it the study and attention that I have been able to do in these past days, my position remains much the same as it was at the time the bill was introduced for second reading and I had my first look at it.

I would like to just emphasize at the outset that I do recognize the validity of the Minister's argument that a great deal of forethought went into the drafting of the bill. I wish that there had been some additional perspectives of thought introduced into it and I would hope that before legislation is produced in this Chamber on this subject that there will be amendments acceptable on all sides of the House that will make it a more viable and workable piece of legislation and one that I feel would be more consistent with the patterns of Manitoba life than that presently proposed.

The Minister says that the bill takes the form that it does in large part out of a desire on the government's part to recognize the religious diversity of Manitobans, to be fair to all religions, to avoid any legislative favouritism for the adherents of any particular religious faith. Well I subscribe to the Minister's ambitions to avoid religious favouritism and to his professed ambitions to recognize the religious diversity of the province. I think all of us on all sides of the House take a great pride in the Manitoba mosaic, cultural, religious, and ethnic, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the religious equality argument is a phoney argument. I don't think that that is an issue in the kind of legislation that we are considering. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: I think it would be a lot more credible if this government were consistent, if this government really believes that the kind of legislation it wants to propose and advance, is legislation

that is going to accommodate all religions and all consciences on an equal level, then I think the government should be consistent throughout its legislative program, Mr. Speaker. And it doesn't seem to feel as strongly about individual rights of conscience where, for example, labour relations legislation is concerned, where membership in trade unions is concerned, so I find an inconsistency in the Minister's using the religious diversity argument in proposing this legislation to us and in some of the other legislation that we have dealt with under his stewardship.

A MEMBER: Are you speaking as an Anglican?

MR. SHERMAN: I am speaking as a small "c" catholic embracing the rights of all individuals to pursue and practise what religious doctrines they choose.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think this religious equality argument should have been raised at all in this legislation. What it does is it injects an unnecessary and an emotional and I think a potentially divisive note into a subject that shouldn't be discussed in those terms at all. What we are dealing with here is a question of whether or not we believe it is valuable to have one day of economic rest, if I may put it in those terms, in our society and in our culture.

Now the argument can be raised, well then, that day should be available to everybody to choose for themselves and I respect that argument. But the trouble with that argument is that that defeats the whole purpose then of the one day of economic rest because if people are choosing at random what that day shall be, then every day becomes equalized right across the spectrum.

I believe, Sir, that there is a great deal to be said for conserving the concept of a day of at least nominal economic rest. There certainly is not a totality of economic rest and no one is asking for that on any day of the week, but at least nominal economic rest and a day that I would describe as a day of pause and a day for family life and a day for those who choose to pursue religious observances.

I don't see how we can conserve that kind of a day with the wide-open option that is contained in this bill. There is a wide-open option for the Saturday or Sunday closing and I would concede that on balance there would be many more retailers, many more businesses, that would opt to be open on Saturday than on Sunday. Still the opportunity is there for experimentation with Sunday. The economic sphere is so diverse and so various that there would always be different enterprises, different businesses, different areas of the community that were being tested for market purposes, there would always be the experimentation. There would be middle-range businesses, for example, who found it to their convenience to operate on Sunday because the major, dominant lines and chains were operating on Saturday and I think the net result, Sir, would be that Sunday would be leveled out to the equivalent of Saturday and every other day of the week as another commercial day no different in commercial activity than any other day in the week.

I say choose another day if you like. It doesn't have to be Sunday, the day that you want for that day of economic pause and economic rest, but I think that it is impractical to choose another day. The patterns of our society, the structure of our statutory holiday schedule is such that Sunday is the most practical day for a day of economic rest if there is going to be one. One has to consider the obligations of others in the family, the school year, the school week, there is a multitude of factors that have to be taken into account, and it is only common sense that if there is to be a day of economic rest, and I believe there should be, that that day because of the institutions and patterns that we live by should be Sunday.

The main issue for me, Mr. Speaker, is really a double issue. One is the question of family life and I think that there are enough stresses and strains assailing family life now without adding a full working Sunday to the list of those pressures. And the second is the position of small enterprisers, small entrepreneurs, who have extreme difficulty in meeting the overhead requirements of operating seven days a week and extreme difficulty in surviving against the economic giants in the retailing field. As a Conservative I have no difficulty, no difficulty whatsoever, in favouring a partially-closed Sunday on those two grounds alone. And I emphasize the term "partially-closed." No one is asking that we go back to a closed Sunday. There are many activities on Sunday which are acceptable and enjoyable and which I participate in and I think had we not got into this situation which occurred over the past year in the retail food business, we probably would have gone on operating as we have done without any difficulty and without any conflict. But we have been confronted with the situation now where a decision has to be made, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has proposed a decision . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. —(Interjections)— Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: The Minister has proposed a decision to the House, Mr. Speaker, which I view as a cop-out. The Minister is trying to be all things to all men here. He says he is making a decision. He is ducking a decision. What he is saying is that we are going to be very careful to sort of try and accommodate everybody here. There is going to be no principle involved except a phoney principle of religious equality which we are going to inject into the debate and if we can kindle any sparks of resentment or any sparks of divisiveness well, so be it. If that helps us win the case, it helps us win the case.

I think that that is a disservice to the people of Manitoba. I think the Minister cannot expect to be all things to all men on an issue like this, Mr. Speaker. I think, Sir, that the principle providing the wide-open option creates a loophole, as I said before, not today but in earlier comments, that will provide for the eventual elimination of that special one day in the week. It will reduce Sunday to the level of every other day, each day will be at the lowest common denomination and when that — (Interjection)— Well, when that happens, Sir, I suggest that our society and our values and our institutions will have been seriously impaired, seriously injured. I believe that there is a great deal worth preserving in that institution of that one day of economic rest insofar as it can be preserved as a day at least of partial economic rest.

There is a fine line for a free enterpriser and a Progressive Conservative to have to try to negotiate on legislation of this kind because I don't like government telling people what they can do and what they can't do. I don't like the idea of governments being able to tell people when they can do business and when they can't, and when they have to close and when they can't; when they can shop and when they can't. Sir, I think in this situation we are confronted with the lesser of two evils because if there isn't some kind of principle here, some kind of guideline, then that further destruction of Sunday, that further attack on family life and that greater difficulty for the small entrepreneur will only continue to grow and to oppress us.

The situation in terms of looking at a piece of legislation that would say that Sundays should be optional, Sunday business should be optional, is this, Mr. Speaker. The individual entrepreneur, the sole proprietor can exercise the option. He can say, or she can say, "Well, I want to work on Sunday so I am going to work." And I have full sympathy with that but the employee of a major enterprise doesn't have that option. If that enterprise says "We are going to be open on Sunday," the employee doesn't have the same option that the individual or sole proprietor does have. And when you consider in many families both partners to the marriage are working, you have to take into account the effect on that family life when one partner in that marriage has and has always had Sunday as the day off and the other partner suddenly finds himself or herself confronted with working, for example, Thursday through Tuesday, and not having the same time off that the other partner in the marriage has. I suggest to you that that will only lead to considerable difficulty and hardship in family life. And that is one of the strongest justifications, in my view, for taking a harder and firmer stand towards the wide-open Sunday than is being taken by the government in this proposed legislation which provides this wide wide option.

A MEMBER: Wide open or wide wide?

MR. SHERMAN: This wide option. There are two or three aspects of the bill that concern me in addition to the option clause for Saturday or Sunday opening, Mr. Speaker. I am not happy with the exceptions provided in total. I think that they are restrictive and limited. There will be suggested amendments that many of us will be considering in our caucus and maybe bringing forward either from an individual point of view or a caucus point of view. I think that the small enterpriser, to whom I referred earlier, must be given the widest opportunity to survive against the corporate giants and there must be a sufficiently flexible range of exceptions to permit that to be the case. If those exceptions operate to the disadvantage of small enterprisers then they are, in my view, too restrictive and I think some of them are too restrictive.

The people that I want to prevent from operating in a wide open fashion seven days of the week are the people whose activities would pose a threat to the two institutions I've referred to, family life and the small private enterprise. I would want to see the legislation framed in that way.

If the Minister insists in getting into the religious consideration field, I suggest that that could be handled in the exception section of the legislation. There could be an exception section written in such a way as to stipulate that where there was a demonstrable religious belief involved, where there was a legitimate exemption requested because of strongly held religious beliefs, that that applicant would be eligible for exemption.

In fact, in the Ontario legislation, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the legislation is drawn up in such a way as to permit the orthodox Jewish community to observe its own sabbath and under the wording of the Ontario legislation there are other groups such as Seventh Day Adventists and others who specifically are also able to apply. It is handled in the wording of the legislation, without opening up the wide open option that is provided in the legislation the Minister has put before us. My understanding of the way the legislation works in Ontario is that there are only about a half a dozen retailers, entrepreneurs, who are exercising that option in the Toronto area, but it exists anyway and it is there for them on those religious grounds. I don't see any reason why the legislation can't be framed and phrased the same way here if that is the intention of the Minister.

But I repeat that to inject that aspect, the so-called desire for religious equality, into a field in which there has never been in anybody's mind any suggestion of religious inequality or any suggestion of religious competition, I think is a disservice. I hope that won't become the fulcrum on which the debate on this legislation turns. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, I deny that and I resent that suggestion by the Minister that I am putting it there.

I only have to refer the Minister to his introductory remarks to demonstrate who put it there. The reason I am saying what I am saying is I am responding to his remarks which were rather inflammatory in that sphere when he introduced the legislation about two weeks ago. That is why I am commenting on that aspect of it. This was proffered by the Minister as the sole reason or one of the very fundamental reasons for framing the legislation this way. He said that was really the primary purpose of the legislation.

A MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. SHERMAN: Well I refer him to his remarks, they are on the record in Hansard and I checked them carefully before preparing my own remarks, Mr. Speaker.

In any event, I would only say in conclusion that I am speaking personally on the legislation, I am not speaking for my caucus at this juncture. Our caucus meers are assessing and adjudicating the legislation for themselves, we have not determined that we have taken a caucus position as yet. We may do so, but at this juncture I am not happy with the legislation and it would be my intention to introduce amendments to have the loophole plugged and to have the exceptions made more democratic.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if the member would permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Are you going to vote for the measure to go to Second Reading?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, the answer to the question, am I going to vote, is yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek wish to proceed on the debate?

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Yes I would.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my colleague for Fort Garry has outlined the bill very well and I don't intend to take up all that much time on the bill. But the Minister has put the Legislature of Manitoba into a very confusing situation with the way that he has written the bill and it is going to be very confusing for the members on the government side as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that in this day and age and in this country and in this province of Manitoba, that the day of rest in this province has been and has traditionally been Sunday. And I am afraid that people have expected over the years that the day of Sunday is one where families can get together, go to church together, and that is basically what happens in the province of Manitoba, the largest percentage. There is no question that there are other religious groups that have their day of denomination on other days but, quite frankly, if that strong a feeling is felt within them, that maybe there could be application made or something for them on that respect if they feel that strongly about it.

But where is the strength in this thing? The strength really rests, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that it is an economic thing, it is a way of making a living for people to support their families when they are in businesses or small businesses. So we do not have to look at the religious factor which the Minister put in when he introduced the bill and, whether he likes it or not, he did when he introduced it.

Mr. Speaker, why would anybody say that if I close on Sunday that I have to close on Saturday? Why wouldn't somebody say that if I close on Sunday that I have to close on Tuesday or Wednesday? Why has he said Saturday? The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is, if I happen to close on Wednesday, why can't I then choose Saturday? You see, this is the predicament that he is putting commerce in in the province at the present time, into an area of mix-up where nobody will know what store to go to when, when they want to do anything.

The Minister has really played games. He has said, well, in order to get these fellows that are staying open on Sunday to close on Sunday, I will say that they have got to stay closed on the busiest day of the week, Saturday. And he is really lowering the boom on them in that respect. That is really the thing behind this legislation. He has said, okay stay open Sunday but if you do that, you have to close on the best commerce day of the week which is Saturday. You know, it is an axe that he has thrown over their heads. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister would have sat down and just basically said that Legislation should be basically on maybe square footage — I am not prepared to tell the Minister, he is the one doing the survey — or square footage, number of employees, which he leaves exceptionally vague in this bill. Is it three people working that day or a total of three employees overall? That is vague in the bill. So, he has really thrown a piece of legislation on this Legislature that not only confuses, as he says the opposition side, but it has to put everybody on that side of the House into complete confusion too, because it absolutely, the way it is . . . The way it is, it has got to have some changes made to it.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister is sitting there playing games, he is absolutely yelling "Vote against it." He knows the number of letters that came into his side of the House, he knows the number of letters

that came into our side of the House, but the only difference between this side of the House and that Minister is we like to see that things are done right instead of damn confusing. That is all there is to it. Pass legislation for the sake of passing it just to get things off the hook and you throw the religious part into it and you ignore, you completely ignore what has been the practice in this province over the years, and throw an axe over people's heads by saying "You will close." Saying, "Okay Mac, you will stay open on Sunday but you will close on the best commerce day of the week." And that is what the game is that you are playing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will, as my colleague said, all take a look at this, we will come up with what we would and I tell the Minister right now, he'll know how I'll vote when I vote and it is none of his business until that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 20, the Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Stands)

BILL NO. 25 - AND ACT TO AMEND THE BUILDINGS AND MOBILE HOMES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 25, the Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin, I believe, adjourned this and Mr. Speaker, I have . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I didn't quite hear what my honourable friend said in respect of the — (Interjection) — Adjourned it for the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that's fine.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have examined this bill on behalf of the Honourable Member for Roblin and he asked me if I would take a look at it for him. What all the bill does is add a classification to the The Buildings and Mobile Homes Act which I have in front of me and it adds a classification which says, about mobile homes, that are built off-site, are built in a factory.

The other principle of the bill is that the other addition to the mobile home . . . it adds that those houses or mobile homes that are built off-site will have inspection the same as other buildings that are built on-site and a permit will have to be issued to do before they are sold.

I have had my arguments on many occasions regarding the regulations on the Mobile Homes Act with the Minister but I don't think that there is really any argument on this particular section of the bill because you are not dealing with any small unit of mobile home here, you are dealing with a large unit which certainly should have inspection the same as any other building in the province. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask my honourable friend, he mentioned the word "mobile homes". I'm sure that my honourable friend in his last sentence recognizes the fact and I want to ask him this question that it is also dealing with construction of homes, it may not be considered as mobile homes that are going into remote areas, that they should be inspected. Are you agreeable with that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, to answer the Minister's question, the basic that the building is built on another site other than where it is going, it has to have some inspection.

MR. PAULLEY: Okay, thank you.

QUESTION put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 26. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: Stand.

BILL (NO. 8) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General)(Selkirk) presented Bill (No. 8), an Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a provision was inserted into the Criminal Code permitting Peace Officers to conduct roadside screening tests, and as honourable members are aware, this roadside screening commenced as of December 8th, 1976. This roadside screening is commonly known under the term "Alert", and the Alert Program has been implemented for all of Manitoba. .

The Alert device is the only device which is approved and approved for purposes of roadside screening under the provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada. The device provides for three possible readings: pass, warning — when the alcohol level is near the legal limit — and fail.

Under the present legislation where a Peace Officer requires a driver of a motor vehicle to

undertake a roadside screening test in the Alert device and the device reads "warning", the Peace Officer must return the keys to the driver and allow that driver to continue in the operation of his motor vehicle.

The new legislation will permit the Peace Officer to require the driver to surrender his driver's licence for up to 24 hours when he has taken a breath test and the Alert device reads "warning".

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are also provisions in the legislation which provide that when an emergency situation is in existence in which there is a danger of the loss of life such as when an individual may be racing someone to a hospital or somewhere for medical attention, the Peace Officer has the discretion, regardless of this legislation, to permit that motorist to continue on his or her way rather than to remove the licence in that type of situation.

To do otherwise, Mr. Speaker, in connection with that area of warning which ranges from approximately 18 milligrams up to about 110 milligrams would mean that we would have situations in which motorists would be inconvenienced and valuable time of Peace Officers would be consumed while they are in fact, making arrangements to transport the motorist to the breathalyzer machine because the breathalyzer machine is the principal means of testing, and the setting up of the breathalyzer machine, and then the very strong likelihood that by the time the tests would then be completed that the person would be within the legal limit provided for under the Criminal Code of Canada. So that from the point of view of motorist and this certainly provides a very distinct advantage rather than being taken for a test under those circumstances.

We have had here situations in Manitoba where already a Peace Officer has stopped a motorist, a test has been taken, the test has indicated "warning", but the Peace Officer has no alternative but to allow that motorist to continue driving with the result — and I have one instance that's been brought to my attention by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police — that after allowing the motorist to continue to proceed, that motorist was involved in a second motor vehicle accident because of the inability to take this type of step as proposed in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is similar legislation in British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan, we are the last of the four western provinces to pass this legislation. The reports which we have received from the other three western provinces have been positive in respect to the effectiveness of this program, and Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that with the use of this legislation it will contribute to some extent — and it's always an uphill battle — but to some extent in reducing some of the deaths and injury that so often marks the highways of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL (NO. 21) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE REAL PROPERTY ACT

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk) presented Bill (No. 21), an Act to amend The Real Property Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there has been a marked increase in the construction of single family dwellings connected by common walls. At present the only way to establish the rights and duties of the adjoining owners with reference to the common wall is by party-wall agreement. An owner who is building a number of units on a tract of land cannot register proper agreements unless he conveys every second building parcel to some other person and enters into a party-wall agreement with that person.

Some mortgagees will not advance money until the party-wall agreements are registered. In some cases the owner enters into agreements with the mortgagee who will file a caveat. It is generally accepted that this is not a legally binding party-wall agreement where subsequent owners are concerned.

Another suggested amendment is designed to simplify the procedure of the establishing of the rights of the owners with respect to the party-wall. The declaration may be discharged and a new agreement entered into by the adjoining owner at any time.

Another amendment, Sir, is to clarify the statute forms in the Act and refers to dollars. However, the currency of certain other countries, most notably the United States, is also dollars. Some mortgagees have been accepted which were repayable in United States dollars. Recently a mortgage was submitted repayable in German marks.

It is important from the standpoint of persons dealing on the strength of the register that mortgages and encumbrances should be clearly stated in the currency in use in Manitoba.

Another amendment deals with subdivision plans which are handled by the Examiner of Surveys and his staff and the Register-General's approval is given as a matter of routine once the plan is

accepted by the Examiner of Surveys. The intention is to delegate the authority to the Examiner of Surveys and his Deputy to signify approval on behalf of the Register-General.

Another amendment is suggested, consultation with the Director of Planning, to eliminate the need for approval of a plan which delineates existing parcels. At present the regulations under the Planning Act provide for automatic approval of such a plan.

Another amendment provides that where certified mail is less expensive than registered mail, is being used successfully for mailing Certificates of Title and should be just as effective in getting those notices to the registered owners. The volume is high, so the savings would be significant in our view.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question.

MR. PAWLEY: Of course, yes.

MR. LYON: With respect to his comments about the use of Canadian currency in mortgages, could he explain why the legislation would purport to interfere with any private arrangements that the mortgagor and the mortgagee might have, vis-a-vis repayment in some foreign currency so long as the principal amount of the mortgage is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is now debating the issue already. If he wishes to ask . . .

MR. LYON: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I'm asking a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well, but . . .

MR. LYON: If you stop interrupting I'll get on with it. If the mortgagee . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let me inform the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that he still does not run the procedures in this House.

MR. LYON: I never have.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We can get along very well if the honourable member will follow the procedures. Now questions in respect to debate may be asked to clarify the points that have been raised. If the honourable member wishes to raise new points in respect to questions, then he'll have to take his turn and debate the issue, and that is the regular procedure. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: To carry on, Mr. Speaker. If the private arrangement is made for the mortgage money to be repaid in a currency other than Canadian currency, so long as that is expressed in Canadian currency in the mortgage, should this Legislature be concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, apparently this has created a number of difficulties insofar as the different people are concerned in regard to department and to the Land Titles Office where apparently there has been instances of misunderstanding and confusion relating to this very point.

Now I would suggest that we insure that the officials that are most concerned about this change be present in committee to deal specifically with the particular problems that they have encountered under the present arrangements, because it is from that source that main concerns have been expressed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Rock Lake, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL (NO. 22) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE PERSONAL PROPERTY SECURITY

ACT AND CERTAIN OTHER ACTS RELATING TO PERSONAL PROPERTY

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk) presented Bill (No. 22), an Act to amend The Personal Property Security Act and certain other Acts relating to Personal Property, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm just wondering what way the honourable members would prefer to deal with this. We have many many very technical amendments to The Personal Property Act here and I can run through them or I could provide honourable members with my speaking notes, whichever honourable members would prefer. I will, in any event, after reading them if that is the wish of honourable members, but they are extremely technical and involved, the amendments to this legislation. I just wonder what the wishes of the honourable members would be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of procedure.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think insofar as we're concerned on this side of the House we'd be happy to save the Minister the long dissertation through his notes. If he could file the notes with the Clerk of the House and have them included in Hansard, that would suffice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines on the same point of order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, on the point of order. Could the honourable member accept the notes without having them included in Hansard and anything he wishes to read into it, either at committee or Third Reading can be done, because I think it would be an imposition to put notes into Hansard. I just wonder whether the honourable member would accept that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in response to the House Leader the point merely was to accommodate the Attorney-General. Unfortunately people other than ourselves read Hansard and if the notes do not appear in Hansard in the manner that I have suggested, then perhaps the Minister should go ahead with the procedure of reading them into Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I mean, rather than establish a precedent of the Minister putting his notes as addendum to Hansard, I would prefer that the Minister introduced the bill in the normal way, read such part of his notes as he wants to, leave out such parts as he doesn't wish to, that's the way I would prefer to introduce the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the amendments to the Personal Property Security Act there are a number of amendments that are required because as honourable members know we're entering into a system by which there will be registration of all liens rather than the existing inadequate system by which all liens are not registered that for instance unconditional sales contracts and liens of that nature are not properly filed.

Now I would like to just, first we have an amendment which has been inserted because wage claims are treated by The Wages Recovery Act. This clause is inserted so as to prevent a large number of security agreements and corporate securities having to be registered when the debtor is a government or a governmental agency.

Corporate securities in particular are presently not registered under The Corporation Act when issued by a corporation created for any government or municipal purpose, and we have no desire to change that requirement when The Personal Security Act is finally proclaimed.

Also amendments dealing with no security interest attaching under an after acquired property clause in a security agreement to consumer goods other than accessions, unless the debtor acquires rights in them within ten days after the secured party gives notice.

Another amendment deals with any registered financing statement or a photocopy thereof, or other registered documents or photocopy thereof, shall be provided for inspection.

Another amendment where a person registers a financing statement or other document in respect of a lease or a consignment intended as security. The lessor or consignor, as the case may be, shall be referred to in the financing statement as a secured party and the lessee or consignee, as the case may be, shall be referred to in the financing statement as the debtor.

Another amendment deals with the financing statement that relates to a corporate security shall not be registered unless it is accompanied either by the certified copy of the trust deed containing security interest or where the security interest is not contained in a trust deed, by a certified copy of the bonds, or debenture stock containing the security interest until a financing statement disclosing an assignment of a security interest and disclosing the name and address of the assignee has been registered or a statement of assignment indicating the name and address of the assignee has been registered. The signee under the assignment is not the secured party of record and may not deal with the registration of any document regarding the security interest.

Another amendment deals with an amendment to a financing statement which releases certain collateral described therein from the security interest to which the financing statement relates, they would be registered without the signature of the debtor if it is signed by the secured party of record.

Another amendment deals with a renewal statement constituting notice of security agreement to which it relates to all persons claiming any interest in the collateral if it is registered the last two months of the period of effectiveness of the financing statement to which it relates, is effective during the period of three years following the period of effectiveness of the financing statement to which it relates.

Another amendment allows the Land Titles office to handle fixture filings in a similar manner to that employed for caveats, thereby negating the need for introducing new forms and procedures to the Land Titles office system.

Another amendment gives clear authority to the Land Titles office to clear the registers of expired registrations. Another change clarifies a point which is inferred but not stated explicitly in the Act as it now stands.

Then finally there is an amendment which makes the secured party responsible for discharging consumer registrations without a demand by the debtor, noting that it is believed that consumers will frequently not understand the importance of making demand in order to clear the files. The provision apart from its consumer protection aspects may help to keep the size of the registration system files to a minimum. I'd like to just ask the Clerk to arrange to provide the opposition parties with copies of

this because it's really much more detailed than what I dealt with, for their use.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY ESTIMATES - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins(Logan): I would refer honourable members to Page 41 of their Estimates Book, Resolution 78, General Administration, (a) Minister's Compensation — Salary and Representation Allowance. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, before I go into the formal introduction of the Estimates for the Department of Labour, I want to indicate to the committee, that I will be dealing at length in my introductory remarks to a situation that has been prevailing in my constituency of Transcona for some considerable period of time. I refer of course, Mr. Chairman, to the situation that is prevalent in regards to an industrial dispute that is taking place between management and labour in respect of Griffin Steel.

Before doing that however, Mr. Chairman, I do want to pay a tribute or two to members of the Department of Labour who have given me invaluable advice and services. May I first of all, Mr. Chairman, pay a tribute to my former Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. Douglas Cochrane, who retired on December 1st. Doug Cochrane was originally employed by the Conservative administration of Manitoba under Duff Roblin, and having been associated with him for a number of years while I was in opposition, I found him to be a very competent and capable individual. Despite the public announcements made by the present leader of the Conservative party wherein he would fire all of those that we had hired of the New Democratic Party, I found that contrary to that concept, that I looked at the individual works of the parties or the persons concerned, and I kept on as my Deputy Minister of Labour an appointee of the Conservative administration. I do want to say publicly how much I enjoyed the association with Douglas Cochrane, despite the assertions of the red-headed leader of the Conservative party to-day, that he did give to me his honest involvement in the position that he held.

I also at this time, Mr. Chairman, desire to pay a tribute at this time, to an individual who has rendered invaluable service to the Province of Manitoba for a long period of time, as a councillor, as a mayor of West Kildonan, as a member of this Assembly, and as my executive assistant. I want to pay a tribute to Mr. Arthur Wright, who unfortunately at the present time, is not able to be with me or with us due to a physical condition. I'm sure that honourable members of the House who know Art Wright will join with me in wishing him speedy recovery from the infirmity that he happens to have at the present time, because in my opinion, no man has rendered greater service on a non-partisan basis than Arthur Wright, my executive assistant.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the members of the boards and commissions of the Department of Labour who have given me of their expertise in various fields, dealing with such matters as the building code of Manitoba, the fire code of Manitoba, the code dealing with unemployment and Manpower minimum wages, the various commissions and boards that are part and parcel of the Department of Labour, and who represent the opinions of both management and labour. I pay a tribute to all these individuals who make their contribution, and I'm sure that members of the present official opposition will be satisfied that many of the chairmen are chairmen that they originally had on their boards, and I refer particularly to Professor Buzz Woods, Chairman of the Woods Committee. They are all doing a good service for Manitoba and for the Ministry and Department of Labour, and I thank them most sincerely.

I also want to thank the staff, the men and women of the Department of Labour who are performing their duties without partisan involvement and giving to me, as Minister, and the Department of Labour, their full involvement.

I think that it would be only appropriate for me, Mr. Chairman, at this time, to say that I welcome and I think members of this Assembly should welcome, my new Deputy Minister of Labour, a man who has had years and years of service in the labour movement, not only of Manitoba but of Canada as well, a man who I think will develop his so-called involvement with the field public on the same basis that he has in the field of labour, a man who in my opinion has established firm judgement and

sound reasoning over the years of his involvement.

These then, Mr. Chairman' are what may be construed as tributes to the individuals that I am associated with in the operation of the Department of Labour. —(Interjection)— I'll be discussing the Member for Fort Garry before I am finished my introductory remarks, —(Interjection)— yes, there will be a flowing tribute paid to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and, Mr. Chairman, may I assure the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that truth will out. And when the truth is revealed, I don't know whether or not the Honourable Member for Fort Garry will have the intestinal fortitude to accept the truth. But I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, I will be making some oblique references to the idiotic statements that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has made in this House as recorded in Hansard, but I'll leave him alone until after the dinner hours so that he may be able to humbly get down on his knees and ask forgiveness for all of his sins' as a good Anglican should. —(Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry says, it may be the last supper, and it could be conceivably so. He should remember what happened at the Last Supper when there was one traitor to democracy or to our Saviour, who —(Interjection)— No, Judas Iscariot, and I know enough about my scriptures to know that and it could conceivably be, Mr. Chairman, that my honourable friend who is a fellow Anglican, will go back to the days of the Last Supper and attempt to bring about repentment for his sins, which are many, and I am not unknowledgable of some of the events that took place. —(Interjection)— There you go, you see, I honestly believe, Mr. Chairman, that my friend, the son of a bishop, does not know the difference, he has forgotten all the ideologies that were practiced by his illustrious father and I will be referring to that. I warn him now that I will be doing so, so that he may be prepared. Apart from that, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that he is capable of repentance .

But I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I intend, and I warn this House and I warn all concerned with the industrial dispute that has been going on in my constituency of Transcona for some considerable period of time, that the bonds that prevented me from making a disclosure of my involvement in that industrial dispute have now been loosened and that no longer do I, as Minister of Labour in the Province of Manitoba, have to suffer the constraints that I have had to suffer in this House, through the media and elsewhere because of my involvement and knowledgability of what was going on in that industrial dispute. So I say, Mr. Chairman, —(Interjection)— yes, that's right, Mr. Chairman, and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is so true, that no longer do I have to suffer his barbs which were founded on untruths, which were founded on a lack of knowledgability. . . of what was going on, but because of my involvement in that political, and I say political advisedly, dispute that has been going on since September 18th regarding a trade union and an employer, that I am free now, because of events, to lay before this Assely and through this Assembly to all of the people of Manitoba the full facts of —(Interjection)— true facts, yes. Not emotionally. Not the emotional facts that my honourable friend for Fort Garry has been introducing into this House, and not only the Member for Fort Garry but other members as well, within this House and without this House, Mr. Chairman. But the true facts of my involvement in the industrial dispute.

You know, Mr. Chairman, a few years ago when I introduced on behalf of the Government of Manitoba changes in the Labour Relations Act, I'm referring to 1972 and I particularly refer to the business report of the Winnipeg Free Press, on August 22, 1972, when these new deals for labour and industrial relations between management and labour were introduced by this government, the Winnipeg Free Press at that time saw fit in a business report to issue a special edition, or a special section of its paper, and one of the captions at that particular time states: "Paulley's reputation on the line. Is Paulley a reformer or a dreamer?" And Mr. Chairman, I recall that when I changed with the compliance and support of my associates on this side of the House, that when I changed the ground rules by being the introducer of legislation into this House of labour-management relations, I realized that I was placing on the auction block my reputation as being a reformer or a dreamer. At that time, Mr. Chairman, we brought in to Manitoba a new concept of industrial relations that has had the support, basically speaking, of all concerned in industrial relations, with the possible exception of individuals such as the Member for Fort Garry who is want to go with the ebb and flow of the respective tides in labour-management relations in the province of Manitoba.

I want —(Interjection)— yes, I'm going to requote some of your phraseology and your asinine statements that you made as recorded in Hansard. So again I say, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friend for Fort Garry, it would be well if he humbly got down on his knees over the dinner hour and prayed forgiveness because he knows damn fine what is coming — if he doesn't know, he should and I'm giving him fair warning. I hope, I hope that he will be in his seat when he starts.

The hour being 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour, in accordance with Rule 19(2) I'm interrupting proceedings for Private Members' Hour and shall return to the Chair at 8 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Private Members' Hour Tuesday, first item is Public Bills. Bill No. 9. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Stand).

**BILL (No. 19) - AN ACT RESPECTING THE ST. JAMES-ASSINIBOIA SCHOOL DIVISION
NO. 2**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, before I proceed with the bill, I don't see the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek here, but I do want to thank him for giving me the privilege of seeing this Bill, he briefed me on it. I also want to thank him for giving me also the privilege of seconding this Bill. We have examined the bill, we are in agreement with it. I do want to say that I think it is an improvement. It certainly will improve representation for people in the small area of the St. James-Assiniboia School Division that I have the privilege and pleasure to represent in this House.

I certainly hope that they will, under the new division of election of school trustees of three to each ward, that in the area of Brooklands which, at the present time has no representative from their area. I believe that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek said that the majority of these members are in the middle portion of the present six wards of the City of Winnipeg. So I feel hopeful that this type of legislation will give to these people, who at the present time have no representation, the opportunity to elect a person to that board. I know I get quite a number of phone calls from the constituents of my area asking me who the school trustees are for that division. So hopefully this fall, when the elections are called and this bill is passed, they will at least have the opportunity to elect one person to this board. I think it's a good move, I wish to congratulate the board also because I understand, from what the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek said, that this is also a reduction of the board from 10 to 9. I believe that is correct. There will be equal representation for the three wards and we are prepared to let the bill go to Committee.

QUESTION put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 17. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. (Stand)

RESOLUTION NO. 9

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very short, to give my honourable friend more time, for a number of reasons, one of them being that we discussed the question of Day Care day care, I think we took at least two hours an evening last week and I don't think that it would serve any point in rehashing the whole debate again, Mr. Speaker. And secondly, my honourable friend, the Member from Assiniboia who moved this Resolution is not here.

Now, what I want to say, when this was introduced I didn't know where the members of the official Opposition were on this resolution. I recall the very few words uttered by the Leader of the Opposition during his speech on the Throne Speech, where he made a statement that certainly wasn't correct, that the government had abandoned and was backing down on the question of day care. But later, during the debate on my Estimate, the critic for the Party, for the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, then made it clear to me, just at the very tail end of the debate, that he agreed with me that this — with us, with me — that we should not change this and that Day Care should become part of the education program, or that necessarily more money should be spent or that we should be responsible for providing meals for these people. I think that we had come to the conclusion that if that was the case, well then everybody in Manitoba should have the same right. If you extended the period of education, if you start involving in the school curriculum, people below the age of six or below the age of five, well then it should be done for everybody and, if you start providing meals for these people then, also, it should be done for everybody.

Now there is only apparently one area where we did not agree and I think it was a general statement that sometimes are made in the House, that yes, that they agreed with the program, they felt that we had probably done enough, but we should spend our money more wisely. I think that I pointed out then that it is up to the community that knows the demand and that makes application and that we hadn't refused any of the day care centres.

Now my honourable friend though from the Liberal Party isn't here and it's unfortunate, because I'd like to tell him that I feel that this is a very irresponsible, very irresponsible resolution and the proofs are right in front of us, also. I don't think that he knew what it was all about when he agreed to let the resolution stand in his name, and I've seen at times in my close to 20 years in this House, where people have asked leave of the House to withdraw a motion to fix a technicality or something, but that motion, his first original motion was withdrawn and then he brought it back in the same way, except there was one of the whereas that didn't figure there any more. It was, WHEREAS the Provincial Government is not utilizing all the resources available from the Federal Government on a 50-50 cost sharing basis. So it's an odd way. He put that in and then he asked leave of the House to withdraw it,

so I think it would indicate the care with which this this Resolution was prepared.

Now, there has been a statement that resolution made a statement / that I refute very strongly. It says that the day care can not exist under the funding mechanism, under the policy that we have and this is absolutely wrong because there's 87, at least 87 percent of the day care that are quite capable of funding. Then there was a resolution that was pointed out, a resolution urging the day care people to prepare an asking budget, which was padded, and then there is no doubt that I'm not ready to believe that we should have a nutritionist, speech therapist and then a special expert attached to each day care. I don't think that Manitoba can afford that.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said there is no point in prolonging this belabouring that, I'd like to introduce a resolution. I don't think that the program is perfect, I think like many of those other programs we can improve it, but not at the expense of other programs, not at the expense of the older people or the cancer people. I think that there has to be some kind of planning, some decent prioritizing made and then these things could come up gradually together, and if 42 percent increase in two years is not enough, it's not very gradual, and if the people feel that you can make 100 percent increase, I don't think that we're ready to do that, I'm certainly not.

So I would like to introduce, seconded by the Honourable House Leader, the following Resolution: That the Resolution be amended by deleting all the words after the first word "WHEREAS", and that the following words be inserted:

The Manitoba Child Day Care Program has shown dramatic growth since its introduction in September 1974, and provincially funded day care centres now provide care for more than 5,000 children in 165 day care centres and 200 family day care homes; and

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has responded to the growing need for day care services by implementing one of the most generous funding mechanism for day care in Canada; and

WHEREAS Manitoba is the only province to provide day care centres with annual maintenance grants; and

WHEREAS the Federal Government's agreement to share in the cost of these grants is the direct result of the Manitoba Government's strong urging; and

WHEREAS the cost of day care services to Manitoba families has remained one of the lowest in Canada due to the government's maintenance grant to day care centres;

THEREFORE be it resolved that this House recognizing the need for continued efforts to improve and extend services designed to facilitate working parents, approves of the leadership and initiative which have been taken and which have made Manitoba the only province in Canada to introduce a universal component in the funding of child day care services, and urges the Federal Government to extend its cost-sharing to cover 50 percent of the cost of the universal maintenance grants.

QUESTION on the amendment put and carried.

MOTION on the Resolution as amended presented and carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 10

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs on the amendment by the Honourable Member for Radisson. Order please. The Honourable House Leader on a matter of procedure.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the previous resolution was the one that was slated for today.

MR. SPEAKER: No. 9 that's correct.

MR. GREEN: That is correct and we are adopting a correct procedure but if honourable members agree I would want to adjourn the House so that people who are expecting the next one to come up tomorrow, would be able to deal with it tomorrow. If not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. To the Honourable House Leader, we also have another particular problem. There is supposed to be . . . the Honourable Lieutenant Governor is supposed to come in for Royal Assent. The Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs.

HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I listened to some of the comments that have been made in this debate and as well the debate that is going on in Public Utilities Committee, or at least the questions that are being posed in Public Utilities Committee, about the matter of demand billing. I heard the Honourable Member from Lakeside speak last week, wherein he gave the position to members of this House that, yes, he supported, he on behalf, I presume, or at least on his behalf anyway, supported demand billing. That he was an advocate of demand billing but he did not . . . Mr. Speaker, the honourable member started with those very remarks and he's shaking his head to the negative, that he didn't say that. He said that he was a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his point of order.

MR. ENNS: Simply so that the record is in fact consistent with what I said on this occasion the last time, I appreciate it has been some time. My statement was that I can recognize demand billing as being a fair system of billing, not that I advocated it or that I promoted it. I simply recognized it as a fair system. .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At least I will accept his word on that. I didn't get that connotation from his remarks but I will check Hansard and in any event he agrees that the concept of demand billing as being a fair concept and that it has been employed elsewhere in this country dealing with customers of hydro-electric energy.

I think that the Conservative Party feels that it has an issue dealing with the increase of electrical energy and I think that like any increasing costs of any commodity, whether it be oil, gas or hydro-electric energy, if I am paying the bill, I worry about the increased costs. And they feel that because there have been increases in Manitoba in the last couple of years, that had they been in government, that there would have been no increases in hydro-electric energy. That is exactly the impression that they are trying to leave the people of Manitoba, that let the Conservative Party into government and there shall be no increases in hydro-electric energy, that the people of Manitoba have frittered away their cheap electrical energy. That is the statement. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite will go on on that campaign and they will say that the Government of Manitoba — I will use their words "the Government of Manitoba has frittered away its cheap hydro-electric energy and had they been in government, they wouldn't have spent a penny and the rates of our electrical energy would not have risen." —(Interjections)—
Now, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. URUSKI: . . . the members opposite, that is really their position with respect to . . . They started on this issue in the by-election in Souris-Killarney about the curling rinks and the skating rinks and it has been brought forward by the Member for Radisson that there is no doubt that the change, and I don't think it was unexpected frankly, but I want to say that even though the demand billing came into service and it has made a change, it has made a change in the way energy is utilised in some of the community centres, unlike the Honourable Member for Minnedosa who quoted a whole bunch of figures last week when he spoke on this resolution and said that everybody's bills are going up and he quoted lots —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, that is certainly the impression that he left in this House, that everybody's bills were going up and the bills that he had, although he would not quote any figures of changing consumption for whatever took place, but that bills had actually risen. There is no doubt there have been several increases in hydro-electric rates in this province so that anyone's bills, irrespective of consumption, the bills would have come on.

Mr. Speaker, however today and last week the Member for Radisson in his remarks indicated, and it was presented in Committee that of the 60-some customers who are on demand billing because of the size of capacity of those units of artificial ice and it is predominantly the ones that have artificial ice because of the increased voltage necessary to have that unit there that of those 65, that approximately half of them have had a reduction in their rates because of efficient use and financing on the demand billing issue. And granted enough, half of them had an increase. There is just no doubt about it. Of the total of 671 curling and skating clubs in the Province of Manitoba, only 73 are on demand billing. So there is approximately about twelve percent that are on demand billing and I presume the rest of them are not on there, either that they do not have the large electrical capacity or uses as some of them do or they have not swung over yet, but I would presume it is probably the latter, that they are still not on artificial ice, Mr. Speaker, so that there has been a recognition that demand billing not only And I have not been involved personally in our farming operation as to the net effect of it but we have a fairly large electrical outlay on our farm, the barns that we do have are very large consumers of energy, so the net effect of that I have not seen but I know by the actual costs of the figures that were presented half of the customers had a decrease and half of them had an increase of the units that are involved.

But the larger issue that is being portrayed by the Conservative Party, and I will go on repeating it, that had they been in government they wouldn't have spent the hundreds of millions of dollars on hydro-electric development so that there would have been no increases in our utility bills in the last number of years. And I don't think that is their position. They would have gone ahead with their development of hydro-electric energy in northern Manitoba. They would have gone ahead and flooded South Indian Lake and they would have gone ahead, and had they gone with their original plan —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, we didn't flood South Indian Lake. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, does he not realize even the concerns that have been raised with the low level diversion and now by the reserve bands of Nelson House, the community of Thompson, the concerns about the amount of flooding that may take place in those communities now with less than half or approximately half the diversion rate that would have taken place under their program? Can you imagine what would have happened to those communities, Mr. Speaker, and the area of the Ruttan Mine and Leaf Rapids would have been virtually, not virtually, completely under water, completely inundated, that the community of Leaf Rapids would have been totally under water had their proposal gone ahead. —(Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside says, "Not true." Mr. Speaker, the Honourable

Member for Lakeside says now if there is going to be five or ten times more flooding, that is less flooding than now. That is the same position as their advocates and their members placed before the committee hearings, or meetings to the Water Commission when we dealt with Lake Winnipeg regulation, Mr. Speaker.

Those are the very kinds of statements that were put on by members of his party that came before the meetings and said, "You are going to flood us all out along Lake Winnipeg. You are going to flood us if you regulate Lake Winnipeg." In fact the mayor, I believe, of Winnipeg Beach came to those meetings and said, "Look, I have been told that you are going to flood us out, that you are going to regulate Lake Winnipeg and you are going to cause our sewer system to back up."

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter was when he was questioned during his presentation to the committee about the amount of flooding that would occur on the basis of Lake Winnipeg regulation, the levels of the lake, and at the time of the meetings, were higher than the regulated levels would have been and I asked him whether his sewers were being flooded. He said no, that at that time they weren't being flooded.

So that is the kind of nonsense, that is the kind of propaganda that the Conservative Party and members — George Johnston appeared before the committee. The Honourable Member George Johnston appeared before the committee and virtually made the remarks that I am making, that everyone along Lake Winnipeg is going to be flooded. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, that if you have — you know I don't even know whether they know anything about drainage or hydro — that if you have one ditch going out of a lake and you put in another ditch, that is going to flood everybody? Maybe somebody downstream but certainly not somebody in the area of the lake when you double the capacity of the outflow that somebody is going to be flooded.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, that is really going to be the issue and at least I can understand, and I think most people do, that if you are going to invest hundreds of millions of dollars for future development of renewable resources for Manitoba's future, that those costs will have to be repaid and there is no doubt about it. And if the Conservative Party — and I think they will continue, I presume they will continue their debate indicating that had they been in government bills would not have increased — that is basically the position of your party, that had we been in office, the resources of Manitoba wouldn't have been frittered away, that we would not have spent \$300 million to \$600 million on hydro-electric development, we would have not wasted any money on development and your bills wouldn't have gone up. That is a nonsense position. I think most people in Manitoba realize that. They realize that the Conservative position is sheer nonsense, that anyone that would want to believe that their hydro-electric bills would not have gone up had the Tories been in office, well, Mr. Speaker, I would think that they would have to have their heads examined. And I think the Tory Party will have to have its heads examined, to make statements to that effect, that had they been in office, their bills would not increase.

I agree that at any time there is an expenditure of money and an increase of costs for the development of the future, that bills will have to go up. Mr. Speaker, I would say that the rationalization of the rate structuring likely, and as has been proposed by the amendment of my colleague the Member for Radisson, will continue and the government will have to look at ways of trying to minimize and review the situation as it relates specifically to the resolution that has been put forward, but the fact of the matter is the larger issue is the issue of the development of the resources of northern Manitoba and the rate question in this province.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I can now understand why the Honourable House Leader made the suggestion that possibly we would like to call an end to the private members' resolution hour today after the performance of our Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. It is quite obvious that the Honourable Minister was not prepared today, from the comments that came from across the floor, and I see the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs is trying that old St. John shift again with his defence of their mistakes with the whole development of our hydro in the north and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that nowhere have I ever heard any of my colleagues say that the hydro bills would stay down, would not rise, if we had been in power and could have developed the hydro of our north. What was very clearly said was that we would not have accepted a 21-page report that took some three weeks to prepare to throw out a professional report that had been developed through a period of time, through a period of many dollars, to give us lowcost power that we should deserve as Manitobans.

In the province the people of Manitoba will long remember Mr. Cass-Beggs. They will long remember him and regardless, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MINAKER: . . . regardless of how the Honourable Minister stands up or anybody stands up on that side and tries to accuse the Progressive Conservative Party that they caused that wastage in

the north, then I would like them to come out in my riding and say that. —(Interjection)— That's fine. When we look at our hydro bills we see the wastage, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs is sort of taking the same approach as the Honourable Member for Radisson took, that he said, "Really, there are only 73 curling clubs or 73 recreational facilities that are involved. So there are only a few; it doesn't matter." That is basically what they are proposing, that there are some 73 or 65 that are involved in this and it doesn't matter. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs state his point of order?

MR. URUSKI: My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my closing remarks that we will have to look at that situation and there is concern on this side as presented by the amendment of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. MINAKER: Okay that's fair, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to speak to the amendment put before us. Look very carefully at the way it is worded, that any public recreational facilities should be receiving a grant. Well, Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon one of the members said that in the last election there was a cartoon out about the government with its arms around the Manitoban . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We will now have Royal Assent.

ROYAL ASSENT

His Honour, F. L. JOBIN, Esquire, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the THRONE:

MR. SPEAKER: Your Honour, we, Her Majesty's dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of this bill

(No. 23) — An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March, 1978.

MR. CLERK: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this bill in Her Majesty's name.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

RESOLUTION NO.9 CONT'D

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James now has fifteen minutes.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the visit of the Lieutenant-Governor I was indicating that yesterday the Honourable Member from St. Matthews indicated about three years ago or four years ago in the election at that time there was a cartoon of the government reaching out with its arms to get control of Manitoba and he said that even they claimed — the Progressive Conservatives — he tried to claim that we were saying that they were going to take over the churches.

Well I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in this instance with their action of peak billing on recreational facilities that they are trying to take over curling clubs now, because they very clearly say it in the amendment that it has to be "publicly owned." And if the honourable members will recall in the past few years I've talked on the subject of the problems of curling clubs, which the government classifies as privately owned even though they may be serving a community and a large population within a community, their problems of trying to find moneys to pay for the education taxes because of their assessment. Now, there seems to be an object of this government to cripple them with the hydro cost. Because in the City of Winnipeg this was overcome to some degree by the City buying the curling clubs and leasing them back. But now again these clubs will have the burden of the high cost of electricity.

I'd like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I've had the opportunity to be professionally involved with analyzing peak billings, when I was in the consulting engineering field we spent several months doing a study for the University of Manitoba that directly related to peak billing, similarly with the complex of the Manitoba Health Science Centre. And what I would suggest to the honourable members and particularly the one who spoke so highly of the peak billing method, is that this is a misapplication of peak billing in this instance — the demand billing, because if the Honourable Member from Radisson is aware of, tied into demand billing is what they call "load factor." I don't know if the honourable member knows what load factor is but to explain it very briefly, if you had a hundred light bulbs and you could turn them on and leave them on for twelve months of the year, that would be 100 percent load factor. If you could turn on ninety and leave them on continuously that would be ninety. But what happens in this particular instance is that you are dealing with a facility

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MINAKER: . . . who probably has a load factor somewhere in the order of 10 or 15 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

A MEMBER: Keep meathead quiet.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, this is where the problem arises.

A MEMBER: Mr. Speaker . . . on a matter of privilege

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his matter of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's a rule that we have amongst us that we refer to ourselves by our constituencies and I distinctly heard the Honourable Member from Pembina refer to the Honourable Member from Radisson as meathead. I object.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I realize that members want to be facetious and unfortunately for those who do, the eye of the speaker is going to be blind. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, after the many interruptions from the Honourable Member from Radisson I will again attempt to explain to the Honourable Member from Radisson that this is misapplied. This is the basic problem that the community clubs and the curling rinks are being faced with because the peak demand that occurs when they are operating the facilities, they are billed when they are not even having one light on in the summertime. And the principle behind peak demand billing is that if they are using a large quantity and you can continually use it, then you can save money, but once you step below a certain load factor, then it becomes more costly than if you were on a straight rate basis. And that's the problem.

And, Mr. Speaker, the other problem is that . . . My understanding of the hydro's origination of demand billing was that a facility like say Manitoba Rolling Mills that has a peak occurring in the middle of winter when the system peaks, that's when there's a problem because they have to provide the generation, they have to provide the distribution system to provide this in times of need when it's cold weather. But in the instance of a curling club, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that they peak in demand not in January, not in February, not in November, it's in September and October when the system doesn't peak.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MINAKER: This is where the whole basis of peak demand billing applied to the curling rinks is wrong, and Hydro knows it. Dead wrong. Because they're not considering the load factor that a curling club or recreational facility uses.

Now, the Honourable Member from Radisson said, "Well they can learn to conserve energy." Well I suggest Mr. Speaker, let's analyze how a curling club could save energy. I could see it now. You could put that automatic demand limiter on, and I could see it now; the Honourable Member from Radisson would be in the hack, he'd get his rock back and the lights would go out. And it probably wouldn't make any difference to the Honourable Member from Radisson, but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MINAKER: . . . it might make a difference to the Honourable Member from La Verendrye. And this is what this honourable member tells us, that we can put on a demand limiter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MINAKER: I guess we could look at the idea we could turn the heat off, or we could turn off the chiller. And one of the things the honourable member doesn't realize, that in most cases curling clubs will have two compressors. Two that will operate in the middle of September—October when the greatest load is trying to create artificial ice but in the middle of winter when it's forty below outside when the hydro system is peaking, in terms of demands, they might not even have any of those compressors on. They might even be at a low in terms of energy consumption.

Mr. Speaker, this Honourable Member from Radisson says, "Let's look at conserving energy." Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member from Radisson, if he thought about it, there isn't any way really that a curling club can cutback on its peak demands, because when they occur, they occur because the lights are on and the chillers are working. I suggest that that occurs in September—October, or in the early spring, and that the rest of the time that they are being billed for energy they are not using. And it's wrong. This is why it's not the answer to give them a grant. The answer is to look at the system and change the type of billing that they are being given. And this is why the Honourable Member for Minnedosa put forward the resolution. He's not asking for grants. He's saying, "Look at what you're doing. Why are you billing this way. And change it." This is what they're trying to point out.

And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if this government isn't prepared to make a change that they are trying to drive the ownership of these recreational facilities out of the hands of the local people that are running them. And I would suggest it's going to become more costly to the Province of Manitoba if we start having the Honourable Minister of Curling Clubs or Recreational Facilities, and I suggest maybe it might be the Honourable Member from Radisson, if they can institute it before the next election. Because knowing this government, this is exactly what they will do; they will develop a big bureaucracy to run their curling clubs and run the recreational facilities. And it's not too far-fetched.

There is the Minister of Peak Loads right there in the front row, Mr. Speaker. . .

Mr. Speaker, it is not too far-fetched because the same approach has been taken with the City of Winnipeg that the cost of the operation of Assiniboine Park . . . The province said we won't give you a direct grant as such, we want to be involved in it. We want to have the name or something involved. We won't just give you a grant, a general grant and you people put it where you want. No, it had to be assigned directly to that type of operation. And similarly it would appear that the government is trying to now take over the operation of recreational facilities that they so proudly built — so they have put it.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is just one example of where the hydro costs are putting a burden on the people of Manitoba. In our constituency, in our St. James-Assiniboia School Division this year alone their budget has increased by over \$500,000 because of increased energy costs and 70 percent of that is electric charges. Increased \$600,000 in one year in our division. We've got 70,000 students, Mr. Speaker, and that means it is costing us \$32.00 a year more per student because of electricity. This is what is happening. It not only applies to the recreational facilities but also to education. Now, these curling clubs that have to pay that education tax are getting it in both ears now. They are not only going to have to pay for more hydro costs because of the new billing method, but also they have to pay increased education costs, taxes, that they don't even benefit.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, and the Honourable Member from St. Vital has asked "How much are the taxes going up in St. James this year?" I would suggest in education alone it would be in the order of five mills, five to six mills. So there's another \$30.00 or \$36.00 on a \$6,000 assessed home, not a very big house.

And, Mr. Speaker, I won't have to tell you again that we know it has gone up some 230 percent in the last three or four years in St. James, so we know how much costs and taxes have gone up.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to recap very clearly that the problem with this whole application of peak demand rates is that it is being misapplied. That is the basic problem. Demand billing is a fair system, there is no doubt about it but the wrong people at the present time are being billed in this manner because they have not considered the load factor part of the whole business of demand billing. And I would ask that this government and particularly the member who is representative on the Hydro Board realizes this. To give you an example, the University of Manitoba, which is a pretty big compound or operation, its load factor is somewhere around 60 percent. So you could imagine what a curling rink or a skating club will be that doesn't even operate for five or six months of the year, what kind of a load factor they are going to be faced with. Not only that, there is no way that a curling rink can really shed any power. I guess they could put in insulation but this government won't even let them have an exemption on sales tax. This is why we cannot understand this government. They talk on one hand about conserving energy and trying to conserve electricity but they won't let them buy energy conserving materials, or energy recovery equipment, sales tax exempt. —(Interjection)—

Yes, I would if I was part of the government. We would, Mr. Speaker. If I was part of the government I would fight for that principle because it makes sense to me. It is good for the province and the five percent that we would charge, that might discourage people putting in some more, is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs talked about sewers backing up because of flooding and so on. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that sewers will be backing up because the people won't be able to turn the pumps on, or they will be cutting them off and then they will back up because the pumps won't work. So you've got it both ways that you are talking about in this instance.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this government is lighting their way to defeat by keeping in policies like this that are closing down our recreational facilities, some are privately owned and some are publicly owned. But this is what is happening and when you start to affect the skaters and the curlers and so forth, then it is just another element of society that you've turned against you and another element of society that is now with the Progressive Conservative Party. So if you want to continue to light your way to defeat then pass this amendment that you have put forward and we will watch you slowly light your way to this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? All those in favour of the amendment please say "aye," all those against the amendment please say "nay" . . .

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Pembina wish to speak on the amendment?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, we had this discussion in Public Utilities and we are having it again here. No doubt there is a lot of overlapping in what is said but there is no doubt that if the people were to go out to the local communities where they are running these curling rinks, they would know how it was. Now we were told this morning that it is different in Winnipeg than it is out in the rural areas but in my particular town we have a curling rink there where we have four sheets with artificial

ice, we have electric heating and, of course, everything in there is electric. We only use it during the curling season of the year and the rest of the year it is closed up because we don't use it at all during the summer, there isn't a hall in connection with it.

Now we are told under demand billing that we can regulate the different apparatuses so as to keep our peak down. Well I would like to know how you would have a bonspiel and run it only eight hours a day so you don't use a lot that day or how you don't have to have it warm when the people come in. And I don't know how you can do away without your lights and I don't know how you can do without your ice plant on. So there might be something that you could do in the way of cutting off the hot water but they don't flood the ice at the time when the people are curling and it is done at a different time of the day. So I don't know where we would really gain on the hot water tanks because the flooding don't go on at the time when people are curling.

You know, it has actually got so that when you go on peak loading, demand loading and you consider the peak, that if the curling rink chooses to serve a banquet at the time of a bonspiel and the demand meter is going to go up so much higher, that the way it is going to affect the cost when they average it out through the whole year, is that they may even lose money by putting on that banquet. They may raise \$100 at the banquet that night but then again their hydro bill is paid for the balance of the year, they could be losing that \$100.00. And I am sure that at a town like the one I have, particularly Manitou, that they are going to pay an awful lot more.

Now I know part of the reason why our hydro bill is bigger is because of the general rate increase and, of course, this is something that really bothers everybody too, because a great deal of us and I am sure that a great deal of the people in Manitoba know that we shouldn't have had this rate increase. And I have to go back to the time of our debates on hydro and what happened at that time. And really, if we had went ahead with the procedure the way we should have, we probably could have been exporting power out of Manitoba these days instead of buying it in. And that is an awful lot of difference, when you can sell something rather than purchase it. And if they had went ahead with the diversion of the Churchill River at a reasonable height instead of listening to somebody that they brought in from another province just because of his membership, brought in as we could say for a political purpose, we wouldn't have had this increase in rates. So it is a combination of the two.

We realize that the mistake has been made, it has been a terrible mistake, one that the province of Manitoba ... Well, no matter what happens we can't recover from it because the money is spent. We've been spending all this money on regulation of Lake Winnipeg, in the neighbourhood of \$300 million now, and what have we got? What is it doing? It isn't helping this year because it didn't rain so it didn't help in any way. All the regulation of Lake Winnipeg is doing is regulating the flow out of it but it doesn't add to the flow that is going in it. When you diverted the Churchill River into the Nelson you were adding to the flow and that way, by putting in more generating stations, you could get more power all the time by just diverting the flow. We did not divert a flow in Lake Winnipeg, we just are regulating it and when the water didn't come into the lake we couldn't even regulate it. — (Interjection)—

We didn't have one cup of water, that's true and then on top of that, we haven't even been able to get our Russian turbine working out there and we don't even know when it is going to work. We are paying over 40 cents on the dollar on interest now. We were told that it might be a wee bit less but could it expect it more because when these other things are put in place, then all the interest that is accumulated on the installation is going to be added to the capital cost and we are going to be paying that interest. In fact, I gathered from what they said at the Public Utilities meeting the other day, that out of every dollar paid in this next year we may be paying 50 cents of it towards capital debt.

h Now this is just something that most people don't realize, that if the hydro had been taken in the proper direction we probably could have been exporting power today if we had moved ahead the way we should have. Instead of that we are in 40. So there's the difference because it is something like a balance. If you take it off one side and put it on the other, it doesn't take much to make a difference. And here we are importing and having to pay for coal when we should have been exporting. So that is another one of the reasons they are up and so you can tell the people of Manitoba that our rates are comparable to other provinces if you like, but you are comparing apples with oranges, because Nova Scotia and these other places, where they do it with oil and it is much more costly for many reasons,

is no reason that you should say that Manitoba's rates should be comparable to theirs. We had a natural resource of plenty of good water in Manitoba, it was our natural heritage you could say. British Columbia has got its lumber, Alberta has got its oil, Saskatchewan has got its potash and what Manitoba had was a plentiful and good supply of water. —(Interjections)— **MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. **MR. HENDERSON:** So, one of the things that we should have had in Manitoba for years and

years to come was a cheap source of electrical power and now we are always saying compare it to what is happening to the other provinces. And that's the part that is ridiculous about it.

And then to think now they are going to come on and bring in demand billing and they say it is fairer. They say it is fairer and that it will cost less. Well we know that they have this debt and they are going to try to recover it and they must figure that demand billing is going to bring them in more money or they wouldn't have changed. They must feel that in the overall they are going to get more money or they would have never changed to demand billing.

So, I am sure that as we get our bills in the next year or so ahead that people will realize more and more what has happened. By the way I have phoned the office of Manitoba Hydro several times trying to get bills in relation to what it cost to pay the hydro bill in different towns. And you would be surprised at the runaround you get from the Manitoba office, the office of the Manitoba Hydro, when you phone. First one says, "Well we will refer it to another person," then refer it to another one. I got referred to about four different places and then finally I got told, "Well, it is policy, we don't like to give this out without the permission of the local town." Well I can understand this if you were talking . . . the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, if I wanted to know his own personal bill at his own house or something like that. . .

A MEMBER: Free hydro, free hydro.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, I don't know but if I wanted to know some other individual's bill, I can see that it isn't my business and that I should have your permission for it. But if I want to compare Manitou's bill, what it was now and what it was three years ago and what the rate increase has done there, I think I should be able to get that. They say that you have to go out to Manitou or you've got to go to Carman to get that. Well, when you are into things here, things come up quickly occasionally. The secretaries of our local rinks are not paid people. They are volunteers and occasionally they change from year to year and you phone out and you find out that he is out working, he's working for a living so that he can pay his hydro bill. He's got to earn money to pay his hydro bill and help pay for the rink. —(Interjection)— Pardon? He knows that his bill is a lot so he has to get out and make a few extra bucks.

So, when you phone out you can't get in touch with the individual then and then he is a busy person and you say, "Well I would like this for tomorrow," if you do find him. He says, "Well I will try to get it." Then something else happens so it is very difficult. But I think that when we phone over to Manitoba Hydro and we ask the bill for some public place like a curling rink in a town, that there should be no holding up on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Hour being 5:30 I am now leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. in Committee of Supply.