



ISSN 0542-5492

FOURTH SESSION — THIRTIETH LEGISLATURE

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

26 Elizabeth II

Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Peter Fox
Speaker



Vol. XXIV No. 34

2:30 p.m., Wednesday, April 6, 1977

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): 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 Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING R. LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister advise the House if any members of his department have been charged with respect to appearances on the Griffin picket line?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot advise because I have no knowledge of any such thing occurring.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister please check with his department and advise the House?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is launching a complaint, I can do so. Let him give me the specifics.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General advise the House if any members of his department have been charged with respect to the incidents on the Griffin picket line?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I do not know at this time whether or not any individual member has been charged in my department.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable the Attorney-General undertake to ascertain that information and advise the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. It is with respect to the imposition of a fine upon the Manitoba Liquor Commission by the Anti-Inflation Administrator, Donald Tansley. The latest assessment was \$15,000; the previous assessment was \$300,000.00. In view of the obvious incompetence of the management of the Manitoba Liquor Commission, would the Minister consider the firing of the manager for such incompetence?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the error which was not one that was at all a significant one but was an error — and everyone of us from day to day certainly commit errors — this does not indicate any gross incompetence on the part of any person in management and certainly I have no intention to fire anyone consequent upon this. They have my full confidence insofar as their competence and ability in the operation of the Liquor Control Commission.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister. In view of the fact that the profits of the Manitoba Liquor Commission go to the General Revenues of the Province of Manitoba, this huge sum of money being lost to the Province of Manitoba through the incompetence I say again, of the management of the Liquor Control Commission, does the Minister not consider this a serious matter, serious enough that that person should be removed?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member is debating the question now. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to point out to the honourable member that the reference to the \$300,000 is not really a proper reference because that matter is still one that is presently under review. There are still appeals pending and I think that it is unfair and unfortunate to suggest at this point, until those remedies are exhausted. Insofar as the \$15,000 item, that was an error and the adjustments are being made accordingly.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I address the Minister another question on the matter. Is it not a fact that there are no appeals to the ruling of the Administrator of the AIB?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Well Mr. Speaker, there are further appeals beyond the ruling of the Administrator administrator to a tribunal.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to address a question or two to the Attorney-General with respect to the activities of the Chairman of the Liquor Commission. Seeing as how the Chairman has now been advised of his errors by the Premier and the Attorney-

General, can we now be assured that he will proceed with negotiations with the employees of the Liquor Commission and pay his full attention to the duties of the Liquor Commission at this particular time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I should, on behalf of the Chairman of the Commission, point out to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that the present chairman of the Commission has always put in more than full time in his duties as Liquor Control Commissioner probably an 18, 19-hour day from my observations in working on behalf of the Liquor Control Commission.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise at what point in time the Chairman is going to resign and assume his 18 and 19-hour days as an NDP candidate in this coming election.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether any instructions have been given by him to the Attorney-General and the members of the Attorney-General's department to prepare a detailed opinion on the legality of the Quebec language proposals.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for River Heights should know that the kind of discussion that goes on between two Ministers of the Crown is not something upon which I should be expected to comment on specifically.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, then I ask the First Minister: has or will his government be undertaking a detailed study of the legality of the language proposals, the constitutional question involved in the language proposals by the Quebec Government.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, naturally we would want to do so, so that in the event that there is a forum, probably a national conference on that and related matters, that we will be able to discuss it intelligently as a part of Canada.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether these studies have commenced and when they are going to be completed.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, certainly we have not been advised of the convening of any forum or national conference . . . provincial conference on the matter, but if and when we are, we'll be ready.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Highways. I wonder can the Honourable Minister or the government advise the House if they have any intention of relieving the Wellington NDP from his two candidate, Al Mackling, government positions, Chairman of the Manitoba Motor Transport Board and Chairman of the Manitoba Highway Traffic Board. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HONOURABLE PETER BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, in answering that question I might say that the person in question, I think, is capable of making his own decisions, perhaps more so than the honourable member who asked the question.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder can the Minister or the government . . . are they satisfied that Mr. Mackling's decisions and his judgment in dealing with applications before those two boards will be handled fair and without bias?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Labour. What action has the Minister taken regarding dismissal slips or lack of same to those employees formerly employed by Wescana Hotels Limited, now unemployed but are unable to get these through either the Receiver or the former Company.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I may inform my honourable friend and members of the House that two of the hotels in the chain have recommenced business with their employees, namely the two hotels in the Town of The Pas. In respect of the others the department and the employment standards section of the department, on hearing of the predicament being faced by the employees, attempted to get the payrolls of the other hotels including a city hotel here in order that they may make an assessment of the situation. Unfortunately, the hotels in question were locked up and the inspectors of the department were unable to get a hold of the payrolls, but are in the process now of getting them in order that they may survey the same and take the proper steps to obtain the necessary dismissal notices and other pertinent information in order that they may proceed to see that the employees receive their dues insofar as wages and other benefits are concerned.

I believe, at the present time, there are four inspectors of the Department of Labour, Employment Standards Division, working on the cases.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister responsible for Renewable Resources. I wonder if he could inform the House the government's position on the meetings that he's had with his counterpart in Ontario and other interested groups in the formation of a wilderness park in the northern part of Manitoba and Northwest Ontario to be known as the Atikaki Park area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources.

HONOURABLE HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland): Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no definite position on that particular matter at this time. We have had discussions with the federal government for the last couple of years while I have been Minister of this department with a view to finding out exactly what intentions the federal government have. They have promised, in my most recent discussions with them, to provide us with a written position on the park, and as yet I have not received that.

MR. BLAKE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could inform us if there would be many people affected in that particular area that is being proposed; people that are employed in that area now, or people that are living in that area?

MR. BOSTROM: Well' Mr. Speaker, the position that I have taken personally on this is that there should be no park if the people in that area do not agree with it, and that is the position that I've taken with the Federal Minister, and before there is establishment of any park there would have to be a thorough consultation with the people who live in the surrounding area and that would have to be carried out well in advance of any decision taken on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the question is directed to the Honourable the Minister of Renewable Resources and Transportation. Several days ago he was in receipt of a letter from the President of the Northern Manitoba Commercial Fishermen's Association with a specific request that a Mr. Peter Sinclair be seconded to that organization in order to help them with preparing their approach to the Minister's new concepts of fishing in the north, etc. Is the Minister considering making that person available to that Association?

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, that's an administrative decision. That particular individual is working for a program that comes under my jurisdiction, however, I've asked the senior management in that section to advise whether or not this individual would have the time to spend on the activity which they have requested that he work with them on.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister in dealing with the bigger question. The same organization has indicated to the government and the Minister their intention of opting out of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation on or about April 1st of this year or toward the end of April. Has the department a response to that situation? What is the department prepared to do in the face of that rather serious action that is being contemplated by northern fishermen?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, the position that I take on this matter is that we are either all in the corporation or we are all out of it and I don't believe that one group can opt out of the marketing area of the corporation, at least I would not be in support of such a move. I fully intend to bring their concerns to the attention of the senior people in the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and to the Minister who is responsible for that corporation, the Honourable Roméo LeBlanc of the Federal Government, so that I expect to be having meetings with that Minister very shortly in the near future and I will be bringing all of their concerns to his attention with the hope that there can be some amendments and changes made which will accommodate the problems that they have.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Labour which I am sure he is anticipating. In view of the fact that not many of us in this Chamber were at the meeting of the Winnipeg and District Labour Council last night so we were unable to hear him, I wonder if the Minister would apprise the House of the information that he conveyed to the Labour Council having to do with amendments to the Workers Compensation Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that it was most unfortunate that my honourable friend was not in the audience at the Labour Temple because he would have listened to some words of wisdom regarding labour matters prevalent in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: And it is true that I did indicate to the gathering that I was going to bring in some suggested legislation to clear up an area of grave concern in the legislation pertaining to workers compensation and I am sure my honourable friend had his columnist there. Now what I did say, Mr. Speaker, was that there is a grey area in legislation that whereas last year we did provide for a workers' advocate within the Department of Labour to look after the complaints of the workers in

respect of claims of compensation, that the grey area was in the field of a medical advocate and I indicated to the gathering that I intend or hope to introduce legislation accordingly.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion there is nothing in any of the Rules of the House that precludes me from expressing my intentions or my opinion. The Honourable — I don't know who is the Leader of the Conservative Party, the Member for River Heights or the Member for Wherever-He-Comes-From, Souris-Lansdowne — attempted to make a big issue over an innocuous piece of legislation the other day. Now I don't know if my honourable friend would want to go to the degree of forcing me into disclosing what my inner or outer thoughts were on any proposition dealing with labour. If either the Member for Fort Garry or the red-headed Leader of the Conservative Party think that they have that opportunity, I tell them now to go and fly a kite.

A MEMBER: Was that second reading?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I was just going to ask the Minister whether — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHERMAN: The Minister of Health says I have done enough damage. I think he's got a point. I was just going to ask the Minister whether he would be divulging details of the bill in the House or at the next meeting of the Winnipeg and District Labour Council?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicate to my honourable friend that it was by invitation extended to me to address the Winnipeg and District Labour Council on the labour policies of my party. I understand that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has the oracle of the Conservative Party in respect of labour matters has received a similar invitation, as indeed the Member for Assiniboia has received. Whether they have fulfilled or accepted the invitation or not, I do not know. However, it was because of that that I was there and I reserve to myself the rights and opportunities of disclosing what my opinions are, providing they are not subject matter before the House and not revealed through the proper procedures as contained within our rules.

MR. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister convey the contents that he is templating for the bill so that I can make my response, two weeks from now, when I am speaking to the Winnipeg and District Labour Council.

MR. PAULLEY: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend has any intelligence he would gladly support what I have in mind.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. While I'm not a weather prophet one could anticipate a very serious drought this year. I'm wondering if the Minister has any correspondence or discussion with the Minister, say ' of Mines and Resources in regard to our possibility of water shortages for the farmers and for the towns in the rural parts of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what I had made mention of during the course of the debate of the Estimates of the department wherein I indicated that we had set up an interdepartmental committee that would provide for contingency plans for such an occasion and it appears to date that we are still somewhat short of precipitation and it means that we likely will have to implement some of those contingency plans, which may involve additional drilling of wells, diking of ponds and streams' and so on, to hold back water supply, filling of dug-outs, etc.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, a second question to the Minister. In view of the announcement of the federal budget provisions, has the Minister had any contact with the appropriate federal department insofar as getting some assistance from the Federal Government towards these projects that the Minister has talked about?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, all of this is anticipatory and I would simply remind the Member for Rock Lake that the Minister of Agriculture for Canada indicated that people should pray for rain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Urban Affairs and perhaps I can direct it to the Acting Minister. In view that tenants of the Mansfield Court have been given notice to vacate by May 1st, and in view of the serious housing crisis in Winnipeg, will the government or the Minister responsible for MHRC or Urban Affairs offer any assistance to the families to relocate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I think that the government's general program with regard to providing housing is the program that would have to be looked to but there is the problem of people being given notices in various places at various times and the job of the public sector with whatever private stock is also available is to produce housing units, to make them available to people who need homes in Manitoba. And that program is a general program, it doesn't apply to specific . . .

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I understand the city health authorities also condemned some eighty-five buildings in this province and the people have to vacate, creating very serious problems. Again I ask the Minister, will the Minister responsible for MHRC or Urban Affairs offer any assistance to these people to relocate or find housing?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I much appreciate the support that has been given to the public at large to do what it can with regard to providing units for people who wish to live in them. And I'm glad the honourable member sees that that is a job for the public to do and I'm glad he is bringing it to our attention as well.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Again I ask the Minister will, you know, any one of the government departments offer any assistance to these people?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I've indicated that it will be the general policy of the government to try to meet the need for housing units in the province of Manitoba since that job has obviously not been looked after by the private sector.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view of the testimony of the President of Pan Arctic Oils and the President of Polar Gas before the United States House of Representatives subcommittee that a decision on the pipeline route has been made and an application will be made for next September to the National Energy Board, can he indicate whether the pipeline will or will not go through Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can indicate only what the basis is for the application that will be made to the National Energy Board and that, however, is just a little different than saying that that is what the ultimate decision will be. But the basis of the application is for a route that will traverse across northeastern Manitoba. However' it's not for me to make that announcement, Sir. I'm merely imparting information as I've been given to understand it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then I take it that the First Minister can indicate that he's seized of the information of the application to be made to the National Energy Board, but unofficially, by Polar Gas. In view of the fact that the statements have been made, that the decision has been made, and was made before the United States House, the decision by Polar Gas, can he now indicate whether with reference to Manitoba the pipeline will come down and join in the southern part of Manitoba, or will —(Interjection)— Yes, the pipeline will join in the southern part of Manitoba or will cut across and go through Ontario.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, on at least one previous occasion specific mention was made to Polar Gas of asking them to seriously undertake to consider the relative feasibility of two alternative routes west of Hudson Bay, the one that has been referred to by my honourable friend, the other which would follow an almost due south compass heading, and they undertook to do so.

Of course, what my honourable friend is referring to is a very preliminary indication for the first time, I believe, on the public record as to their initial intention and we certainly do have it in mind to make representations, both to Polar Gas and to the National Energy Board. It is the latter that will really make the decision. What my honourable friend is referring to is not a decision but an indication of intent on the part of Polar Gas.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate, then, whether any studies have been undertaken by the government of the cost-saving if, in fact, the pipeline will follow the transmission line and the right of way on the transmission line, in terms of the overall cost saving for the project and the justification for it to come through Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the request that was made to Polar Gas to do comparative cost studies, I believe was undertaken seriously by them. It is only a matter of days since I have been apprised of the fact that their intention now is firming up, and has to do with the west of Hudson Bay but northeast of transversal route. So we intend to get in touch with Polar Gas to ascertain what cost analysis they have made. And if we believe it is too casual a treatment then we will gear up to make presentation to the National Energy Board at the appropriate time.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister would be prepared to acknowledge to the House that based on the information that he has given that the wiser course for the Provincial Government would have been to prepare in advance . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is argumentative. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, because while I've seen all kinds of casual opinion expressed, for a considerable period of time there was serious doubt as to whether the line would be west of Hudson Bay at all, and that any kind of festering around by the province would not have been, in my opinion which is perhaps no better or worse than my honourable friend's, somewhat prejudicial to the ultimate outcome.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the Special Select Senate Committee on Beef Marketing will be

holding one or two hearings in the province shortly, is he or any of his officials going to make a presentation to that Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think I would remind the Member for Portage that we have already done so in Ottawa about three weeks ago.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A further question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the recent education of the Minister in respect to beef marketing, would he not update his information and present it again?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, in making the presentation to the Senate Committee, we were of the complete understanding that there is much to be done with respect to educating the community as a whole on the question and implications of any form of marketing legislation other than the present and that is what the Standing Committee is attempting to do. Not only are they attempting to receive information, they are attempting to dialogue, to discern for themselves what is the best course of action for Canada to take. And I might point out to the Member for Portage la Prairie that the former Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Gray, is doing a very good job in trying to present provocative questions to various people who are presenting briefs.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. I would like to ask him: In light of the questions asked by the Member for Birtle-Russell and the Member for Roblin regarding Mr. Syms and Mr. Mackling, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if Mr. Gourlay, the Ag Rep from Swan River who has announced that he will be running as a Conservative candidate, will now be able to discharge his duties in an unbiased manner in Swan River?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Member for Ste. Rose that I have never assumed that all people working for different corporations, whether they be Crown or private, always agree with the policies of the corporation or the government of the day. So that doesn't surprise me. I think there are provisions within the Civil Service Act which govern the conduct of civil servants. . . .

A MEMBER: We gave them freedom that they didn't have before.

MR. USKIW: . . . and further I think there are provisions which allow people to participate in the public affairs of their province or their country, so we would not take away from those provisions and it is my hope that people conduct themselves accordingly.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources Management. In view of the answer given by the Minister of Agriculture with regard to possible diking of streams where surplus runoff will be low this year and cause possible water shortage, can the Honourable Minister advise if his department has initiated any orders requesting diking to be constructed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there has been a drought committee set up which has been meeting for the past month and there are certain plans with regard to programs which will be announced in due course. I can't say whether certain orders have been issued but I know that a program has been laid out, an initial program, one which will be reviewed and augmented from time to time. I do not think that it would be wise to over-estimate what human beings can do with respect to a drought situation. Just as we couldn't solve all the problems created by flooding and probably would like to have some of them back, that we can't solve all the problems that are created by drought but there will be a contingency program and it will be announced to the people concerned and, of course, particulars of it will be made available to members of the House. Despite the futility, perhaps, because no one ever knows of what Mr. Whelan said, nevertheless in the last analysis the answer is the same answer that I gave to the Member for Pembina last year that the best answer to the drought situation is that the government is planning that there will be lots of rain. The best laid plans don't always materialize.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable Minister. Can the Honourable Minister advise, is it the intention to use these dikes to trap spring runoff water?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that is a specific which I can't deal with at the moment. I indicate that there will be an announcement as to what immediate steps are to be taken and I can also assure my honourable friend that the committee will be meeting continually to do what can be done from time to time.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Honourable Minister. Can the Honourable Minister advise the House when he anticipates the peak spring runoff should occur and the average date that is considered, and will the Minister still be contemplating what they will do when this peak occurs?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did deliver to the House several — to use a rather ironic phrase — flood forecasting reports. I will probably be getting some new ones at which time the information the

honourable member requested will be contained therein.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the loge on my left where we have a previous member of the Legislature, Mr. Elman Guttormson. On behalf of the members of the Legislature, we welcome you.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can confirm that about the middle of the month there will be approximately 350 people laid off temporarily in the Woodlands division of ManFor?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there will be layoffs at Crown-owned corporations from time to time in the same way as they occur in other establishments employing labour in the Province of Manitoba. I don't intend to deal with each of them specifically just as I was not asked a question about how many men Motor Coach Industries was laying off when they laid off people.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can indicate to the House and confirm that the sawmill at the ManFor operation will remain in operation in the next period of time?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am really sorry that my honourable friend did not grasp the meaning of my previous answer. He will be able to deal with matters affecting these corporations when the chairman of that corporation appears before the House to answer his questions which was never done while he was the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: To the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he can confirm, notwithstanding the layoffs to take place at ManFor, that the sawmill will remain in operation.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that my honourable friend understood my previous answer but he obviously didn't. I will repeat it. He will be able to deal with matters on a day-to-day basis and the operations of Crown corporations when those corporations report to the committee of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Honourable Minister responsible for the Civil Service. It relates to previous questions. The fact that Mr. Gourlay at Swan River may be a candidate and is a civil servant would, I expect, be covered under the Civil Service Act. I ask: Does Mr. Syms and Mr. Mackling come under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, in other words, are they permanent civil servants?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to raise a question of privilege affecting at least all members on this side of the House. That is simply, Sir, that we take very strong exception to the suggestion carried in the media today that you, Sir, our Speaker, my Speaker, have in fact become swollen up with the prestige of your position. Sir, we think of you often in many ways but never in that way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I won't speak to the matter of privilege. I would like to proceed to the . . . we will have to deal with the address for papers, Mr. Speaker, and then . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Roblin, THAT a humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence between the Attorney-General, the Minister of Corrections for the Province of Manitoba and the Solicitor General of the Federal Government or other departments of the Federal Government relating to:

- 1) the proposed new juvenile offenders legislation
- 2) the location of the proposed new Federal Penitentiary

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister responsible for Corrections and myself we accept the order with the usual caveats pertaining to inter-government consent.

MR. SPEAKER: The address for papers is so ordered.

SECOND READINGS — GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now proceed with the introductions of Second Readings, starting with Bill 27 and then Bill 47 and then proceed with the Adjourned Debates.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Very Well.

BILL (NO. 27) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HEALTH SERVICES INSURANCE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 27, the Honourable Minister of Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS presented Bill (No. 27) An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, most of the amendments incorporated in this bill arise from the administrative need to alter the fiscal year in which the Manitoba Health Services Commission reports to the Legislature. The Federal Government and several other provinces issue their reports on a fiscal rather than a calendar year. This is what will happen if this bill is passed. Provision by regulation would be made to accomplish this change to improve comparability of information with other jurisdictions. The definition of dependant has been altered to ensure that the same rules governing the residency requirements of the eligible beneficiaries apply equally to the dependants of Manitoba residents.

There is a section that also will be repealed since the cost of out-patient service and treatment is no longer supported by grants. These costs now are included in the hospital budget approved by the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

An amendment also will permit the release of information re service utilization of self-governing professional bodies in an effort to promote peer review.

And finally, there will be a section to permit some control over patient trust funds administered by personal care home staff.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL (NO. 47) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 47, the Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY presented Bill (No. 47) — An Act to amend The Department of Labour Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is two-fold. I think they are very obvious and they are technical in nature. They are intended for the purposes of clarifying the Act and simplifying its administration.

The first change, to subsection 10 of Section 11 simply makes it clear that the Labour Board may sit in two or more divisions of the board and that they may do so at different times or simultaneously. As presently written, that section could be interpreted to mean that when the board did sit in divisions, those divisions would have to sit simultaneously. The amendment eliminates this interpretation or implication by making it clear that one division may sit at one time and another at a different time.

The second change being proposed is because the as it is presently drafted, does not make provision that the board cannot use the system of sitting in divisions except when directed to do so by the Minister from time to time to deal with any matter or class of matter. For the board to operate efficiently it would seem that it would be more appropriate for the chairman of the board, instead of the Minister in consultation with the board, to decide what matters are to be heard and determined by a division of the board. Therefore it is being proposed that subsection 11 of Section 11 be amended to give the chairman of the board the authority in such matters rather than to have to have the authority of the Minister. It is one of those rare occasions, I suppose, when a Minister is prepared to give up some of his authority to the board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister just permit one question at this juncture?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member.

MR. SHERMAN: In sitting simultaneously would there be a natural level of responsibility that would devolve upon a member of the board to function as acting chairman in that case or would there always be an appointment for each individual situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have at the present time a vice-chairman so designated on the board and I would presume that the operation would be such that a vice-chairman would conceivably be the acting chairman of the separate division. And I also want to assure the honourable members of the Assembly that the relationship of the composition of the board would not change if it were split, that is representation in equal numbers between management and labour, the same as it is at the present time.

MR. SHERMAN: I thank the Minister for his information, Mr. Speaker, and I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 5, second reading. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand.

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

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

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on this bill. I know that the reason this bill came about was because there were some of the stores staying open on Sunday before Christmas and the Minister of Labour spoke as if he would be bringing in legislation.

I say that this present bill he has brought in is a cop-out. What the people were complaining about was business places being open on Sunday, not that they wanted the day changed to another day. And the people want Sunday as a holiday, they want it as a day of worship, they want it to be a day when they are with their families. They do not want it to be another day just like one of the other days. Now whether they are religious or not, this is their feeling. And it is a day when everybody can take it off together. And to say that he is respecting these religious groups that are in the minority, that also is a cop-out because these groups are in such a small minority that it isn't really helping them to recognize it as such because they wouldn't have anything anyway if they did have one of those other days, if it was a holiday, because they are so few. What the people are talking about is that they want Sunday, to have their business places closed on that day. To me there is no problem at all. Being a rural member, maybe it is somewhat different. We have never had a problem this way. The small little business places have always been able to accommodate somebody who was having a little bit of trouble or thought he was, like the little restaurant where you could go down and get a loaf of bread or a quart of milk or something. But it never was necessary for the people to buy stuff.

Mr. Speaker, the question that should come to our minds is this: Is this really necessary to accommodate the buying public? Are the stores not really open long enough now? They are open six days a week and many of them are open at night. People can have lots of time to do their shopping and surely they can keep enough in the house that they don't have to go out and buy stuff. I don't think that they are wanting it for the necessities of life. Probably they may be wanting it because they like to go out shopping together or for reasons like this but they really do not need more shopping hours.

I can remember out in the country when the rural stores used to open up early in the morning and be open until after 12 at night and the public were used to it and they did this. The stores started cutting down on their hours and now there are many of them closing up on Saturday afternoon and they are closed Sunday and they are closed Monday and the people have plenty of time to buy the things they want and they aren't complaining.

I think in the city here it is more of a dog-eat-dog attitude if you want to put it that way, but I don't believe it is necessary. I think with the hours that we have now to do our purchasing at all the different places and the evenings that they are open, that the buying public have plenty of time. And I certainly will not be supporting this resolution in second reading unless there are changes made in it. I am in favour of the principle of Sunday closing. I am not in the favour of having Sunday a day of business and unless there are changes made in this Act when it comes to Committee, which I am sure that there will be many people show up at and express themselves, at least I feel there is, and this is the way I feel about it and I really think this is the way most rural people do.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with the Minister of Labour's debate, I believe I recognize another member, a previous member of this Assembly up in my gallery, Mr. Jake Froese. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here.

The Honourable Minister of Labour will be closing debate.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I was going to suggest to you that if no other member wishes to

speak on that, that I would move for the adjournment of the debate, but I do so warning members that I will be, if that motion is accepted, then I will be closing debate at a subsequent session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't really contemplate on making any comments on this bill but on second thought, having listened to the Member for Pembina and my colleague from Roblin, the thing that I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker, that concerns me, is that we have legislation pertaining to The Lord's Day Act. Now I am wondering if The Lord's Day Act is not sufficient or if there is something that is wrong with it and I wondered why we had to bring this bill before us into the House.

I realize that probably there are problems in the City of Winnipeg that may be different to our rural communities. We have for instance, Mr. Speaker, The Farm Machinery Act that requires a business to be open if necessary for serving farmers if they need repairs for their harvesting equipment.

And I give you an example, Mr. Speaker. While I am, I feel, a Christian and abide by The Lord's Day Act, Sunday is not a day that I want to work but I would like to tell members opposite, being a farmer, that we have been faced, and many times in years gone by, where we have had in the fall of the year a wet spell that could extend for three weeks and has extended for as much as six weeks where farmers never turned a wheel in harvesting their crops. And of course it could have been the next good day was a Sunday and farmers had to go out and work in order to harvest their crops. Mr. Speaker, I relate those comments to The Farm Machinery bill whereby machine companies are obligated to provide farmers with services in getting repairs to them if they need them.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there are so many conditions and so many situations that we could talk about when we talk about this particular bill that is before us at the present time. I want to agree with my colleague from Pembina who stated that he is hoping that there are going to be some amendments to this bill. If there are not amendments forthcoming — I am not here to state what those amendments would be, I think that is up to the government. However, we are going to watch how this is going to be dealt with in the way of amendments if there any. And unless there are amendments, I am afraid I am not going to be able to support this because of The Lord's Day Act as we now have it. I would like to know from the Minister if he is not satisfied with that particular legislation. That being the case, then we would like to see . . . Maybe, Mr. Speaker, we should have amended The Lord's Day Act and it probably would have been a lot easier.

MR. PAULLEY: It's not our Act.

MR. EINARSON: Well, okay. The Minister says, "It is not our Act." All right, that is federal responsibility then. That's fine. Then if we don't have that responsibility, then possibly the Minister, with all the visits he attends in Ottawa, surely he could have talked to his counterpart in Ottawa to discuss with him the possibility of making some amendments.

MR. PAULLEY: I assure you that has been done.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour tells me that has been done. However there are situations and I have had letters from people who are running a small business in the City of Winnipeg who feel that they would like to operate their business sometimes when large chain stores are closed. Now we have in the rural areas, our municipalities, our incorporated towns have rules and regulations that they live by and they come to an agreement amongst themselves what days they are going to stay open, what days they are not, but they never involve themselves with Sunday as to whether they are going to stay open or whether they are not. And this is a foregone conclusion. People from the city like to go out to the country and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if there isn't a filling station open along the highway where they can get gas or where they can get lunch or what-have-you, they will complain to no end. And so, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be more flexible on this. —(Interjection)—

No, but Mr. Speaker, the point that my colleague from Pembina said, that if they are open Sunday, they have to be closed Saturday. —(Interjection)— Alright then, Mr. Speaker, I want further clarification on this whole matter.

And I, Sir, just wanted to make a few comments along those lines and questions that I am throwing to the Minister. I mentioned the Lord's Day Act, I mentioned the fact that there situations vary and different in the country as opposed to the city. And I can understand his position. It becomes difficult to try at first to bring in legislation that is going to be satisfactory to the majority of the people of the province as a whole. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't really intended to participate in this debate but something that the Member for Pembina said has been on my mind and I'd really like to discuss it because I find that I have a misunderstanding or at least a difference of opinion with him as to how people in the Province of Manitoba, whether rurally or municipally, think. There are various reasons that one would want to support a measure such as this now being introduced by the Minister of Labour. I would have no doubt that some people wish to deal with this matter on the basis of a religious conviction that Sunday is a day of rest and that there should be no commercial activities taking place on a Sunday.

There are other people who could support the same legislation with religious conviction not entering into the matter at all. And sometimes things come from different directions but approach the same end; there may be people who believe that there should be no commercial activities which are open for seven days a week because if they are open for seven days a week, this will create problems *vis-a-vis* the employees in that industry and urge perhaps to compete for the seventh day and that you would have people in employment seven days a week, or at least a tendency to push in that direction. So there may be some who deal with this question solely on the basis of a so-to-speak, and I would gather that that's why it's introduced by the Minister of Labour, as an employment law.

And there are others, and I am not arguing with them, who would deal with this question from the point of view of an article of faith or a religious law. I don't think it really matters, Mr. Speaker, why one would choose to support the bill whether on one ground or the other, that it's possible to arrive at the same conclusion, and that is, that one should not be in commercial activities for more than six days in any week. Where the problem arises, and I suppose where the distinction or the difference is, people start to move in separate directions, whether that day has to be identified as a particular day and some people wish to identify it as a Sunday. The Member for St. Johns said that he wants to identify it as a day on which there is reasonable probability that the family will be able to get together and therefore, he says, it's no use choosing Monday through Friday, which are normally school days or other days of the week, that the best chance is on a weekend; that on the weekend there are two days, Saturday and Sunday, that these two days happen coincidentally. And I believe that that's his position, coincidentally, to be the equivalent of those Sabbaths that are recognized in not only the Judeo-Christian religion but in the religion of the Seventh Day Adventists. But they happen, coincidentally, to be those two days.

Now the honourable member said that the rural people of Manitoba, they will accept only one day, that is Sunday. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have had numerous occasions to speak to the rural people of the Province of Manitoba — (Interjection) — no, I didn't defer to the Member for Rock Lake. If you have an argument, listen to your friend, the Member for Pembina. I did not get that impression from the rural people of the Province of Manitoba that they not only wish to dictate for themselves which day their Sabbath shall be but that they insist on dictating to somebody else which day his Sabbath shall be. I do not get that impression at all, and I spoke many rural people in this province. I find them to be much more understanding and much more acceptive of the views of others than is the Member for Pembina, or than the Member for Pembina represents them to be.

Now Mr. Speaker, I am not certain that there is any great feeling on my part, one way or the other, *vis-a-vis* this legislation being religious legislation or labour legislation. I do recognize that there is sufficient thought that such legislation is necessary, that a bill is brought before the House and that an option is made available. In other words, the Minister of Labour introduces a measure which provides for a greater rather than a lesser degree of freedom. And it is always confusing to me that some members of the opposition in particular, who are so freedom conscious, become so rigid and restrictive on certain matters. I, Mr. Speaker, can understand and I think that it would be largely the case, that people making the selection, and particularly in the rural areas, will select Sunday as being the day on which they are closed. I think that it is possible, although not very likely, that in the urban areas, some will select Saturday and be open on Sunday. But how does the one who is open on Saturday in any way affect the one who wishes to stay home on Sunday or go to the church on Sunday? Surely, the fact that there is a store open on Sunday does not mean that the religious conviction that my honourable friend is talking about is so weak that that store being open will result in the churches emptying and everybody going to the store. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the faith of those people who believe in a religious Sunday rests on that tenuous a ground. I think it rests on more solid stuff than what the Member for Pembina would have us believe.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if by chance, some people either — and I, Mr. Speaker, will recognize any of these freedoms — either wish for the reason not of religious denomination but because they would prefer to be open on Sunday for those who wish to go to the store on Sunday, who wish to do it for that reason, I have no disrespect for them. I have no disrespect for the one who says that for religious reasons I will shop on Sunday rather than on Saturday. I have no disrespect for them. I have no disrespect for those who say that religious reasons aside, I wish to shop on Sunday. I wish to stay open on Sunday if I can make arrangements with my employees to work on Sunday, and if I can't it will be because some of those employees, for religious convictions, will choose to work for somebody else or will not work for me. I have no disrespect for those people who say that, "It's not because I want the Sabbath." As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have no disrespect for those people who will shop on Saturday and on Sunday because there may be somebody open on Saturday and somebody open on Sunday. And really, I do not see how my view should conflict with the view of the Member for Pembina who wishes not to shop or stay open on Sunday. Why does he wish impose his view on me, when I have no intention of imposing my views on him? Why is it necessary that I be swallowed by him? I have never tried to have him or any members of rural Manitoba and by the way, I believe that the agriculture people, the people who live in rural areas, believe more as I do than they

do as the Member for Pembina does, that they do not wish to impose their view on me and they do not wish to be swallowed up by my views.

And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that for all of these reasons, that if we try to legislate this as a Sunday observance day, we are entering into the field of religion, and religion only, that there are dangers. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake may have pointed them out. There are dangers as to when the province, which has only certain responsibilities *vis-a-vis* the Lord's Day Act, tries to legislate Sunday observance, because that is a matter which is in federal jurisdiction. That the federal jurisdiction, once it enters a field, is the exclusive area in that field, and a province which tries to legislate may indeed find that their legislation entrenches upon a constitutional ground reserved to the Federal Government by virtue of its having pre-empted the field.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Rock Lake says, "Well, what about service stations and stores?" I believe, although I indeed have not done a constitutional study on this bill, I believe that what is attempted here is to legislate with regard to those matters which are now permissible under the Lord's Day Act, because the Lord's Day Act permits matters of necessities of various kinds to be done on Sunday. You see, if the honourable member would go to my religion and to the Orthodox, he will find that nothing that he now does can be done on Sunday. In the synagogue, they must turn on the lights on Friday night to have them on on Saturday because you cannot turn on the lights on Saturday. So in order to have them on on Saturday, they turn them on on Friday night. You cannot set a fire on the Sabbath. You could not drive a car on the Sabbath. Now there has been a considerable movement from that amongst people who practise their religion, but the fact is there are many who do it just that way. I tell the honourable member that there is a certain irony to it and I won't go into all of it since I was not Orthodoxly observant. I was asked by Orthodox people to do some of those things on a Saturday which they themselves would not do. And there is a term for it which I will not discuss with my honourable friend. —(Interjection)— It's not. Well, well.

Mr. Speaker, I have been thoroughly free with terms but I won't not be free with this one. I can tell you that if one is talking about the Sabbath and the observance of it, then I tell you that the Lord's Day Act has already made enough exemptions to drag many trucks through the notion that every person is going to treat the Sabbath in the way in which it was written in Genesis and in one of the Ten Commandments. Because it is not the fact. There have been numerous exemptions to it in all religions and the Member for Rock Lake is correct. There are certain commercial establishments which, if one wishes to say, as an Orthodox man would say, "You have sold your soul to the devil by keeping the garages open on Sunday," then the Honourable Member for Pembina and everybody else has sold because, although they like the Sabbath, they still drive their cars and they want to get the gas. And we have to look at it realistically. So, I make these remarks, Mr. Speaker, because the Honourable Member for Pembina says that rural people in the Province of Manitoba, they insist that I don't work on Sunday, that I don't buy on Sunday, and that Sunday shall be the day and my Sabbath be damned. I don't believe it! I have not talked to rural people in the Province of Manitoba who have said that to me and I don't believe it, Mr. Speaker.

I say that this bill as it is proceeding, leaves the option open, is more of a labour law law, as I see it, than it is a law of religious observance. If it were a law of religious observance, Mr. Speaker, I would have to look very carefully at it before I would try to tell people, who may not believe as I do, that they shall act as I say whether they believe as I do or not. That's not my style, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— No, that's not my style, Mr. Speaker. It apparently is the style of the Member for Pembina.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina has a question.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes. I'd like to ask the Minister if he doesn't figure that there is plenty of shopping hours in the week now for the public.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, whether or not there are plenty of shopping hours a week or not is irrelevant to what I have just said. The question is that if you are going to limit those shopping hours whether I have to choose his Sabbath to limit them on.

MR. HENDERSON: One further question. Does the Minister not believe that if there is shopping on Sunday and there is overtime paid, that it really adds to the cost of the goods and services that people get.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that may very well be and it may not be. It has often been said that the more production you have the greater the expense. That has not necessarily proved to be true. I am not suggesting that this is going to increase the cost or decrease the cost. I am suggesting that whether it is Saturday or Sunday will have the same effect on the cost.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, in this Chamber, a bill comes along that, I think, brings out an opportunity for individuals to express their own viewpoint more so than in other types of legislation. I think this piece of legislation probably falls in that category. I don't know whether

there's a hard and fast position to be taken by all members on all sides of the House, following party lines or not. But I still think that it is an excellent opportunity for an individual to express his own particular views with respect to the legislation that the Minister has proposed.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, that you have to go back to the circumstances that more or less precipitated this type of legislation. And when the Minister of Labour brought this bill in, I think it was as a reaction to a specific circumstance that existed in the City of Winnipeg, more so than the entire Province of Manitoba. And I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, that when you find government acting on behalf of special-interest pressure groups, I think in the long run that you will end up with legislation that is detrimental rather than beneficial to the province as a whole. I am not too sure that is going to be the case in this particular case but I think that is a general observation that is applicable and may possibly apply in this particular case. The Minister has brought it in as labour legislation but, as the Minister of Mines has pointed out, he may agree with that but there is a tie-in and a very close relationship with religious, or has a religious connotation to it as well. While the Minister of Mines says there may be a possibility of a constitutionality of the legislation because the Lord's Day Act is a federal statute, we also in this province have a Lord's Day Act which is a provincial statute. To my knowledge it has never been challenged, and it is exemptions, as the Minister says. But what it does do, what the legislation in Manitoba does — and the Minister of Mines has not really looked at it in this light — legislation in the Lord's Day Act in Manitoba is a delegate authority, the Lord's Day statute in Manitoba is a delegate authority which delegates the authority to the local governments. Most of the power of the Lord's Day Act of Manitoba falls in that category.

But here we find the Minister of Labour probably unwilling to delegate authority, and I suggest that the City of Winnipeg could have acted in this case had they so desired, but the Minister in his dying days in this Legislature would certainly like to have some more legislation to his credit on the books, and I think this is probably why we're seeing this legislation come forward.

But, Sir, I have another concern, which I have expressed on several occasions in this Chamber, and that is that we are, every year, putting on the statutes of Manitoba a proliferation of legislation that, to my mind, there may be a lot of it unnecessary. We have a Lord's Day Act, and if the legislation that is brought forward now was prompted by non-observance of the Lord's Day Act as it is now constituted, why in heaven's name wouldn't the Minister bring in amendments to the Lord's Day Act rather than bring in another piece of legislation? I think, though, the Minister is trying to take this piece of legislation and promote it as labour legislation. He's trying to promote it as being a piece of labour legislation that will, in a sense, circumvent the Lord's Day Act, and in that respect he may very well succeed.

But there are two or three things that prompted me to get into this debate, and they may be the comments of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources where he said he had no intention of imposing his views on the Member for Pembina or anyone else, but here we find no compunction on the part of the Minister of Labour — he's quite content to impose his views on the entire population of the Province of Manitoba.

Another thing that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said, that because of the option in this legislation, there will be a greater rather than a lesser degree of freedom. And those are the words of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, ". . . a greater, rather than a lesser degree of freedom." Well, Mr. Speaker, I say this, that any time you impose restrictions, is that increasing freedom? Any time you impose restrictions you are taking away from people some of their freedom.

Now the Minister of Mines has a very persuasive way of arguing, but I, in my own mind, cannot see how the restriction of freedom and the fact that there's a choice here gives you a greater degree of freedom having once taken it away. Those are the things that bother me, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we are going to be putting on additional legislation in the Province of Manitoba, which I think may be unnecessary. I think it could be accomplished by changes in existing legislation, or maybe the Minister of Labour, if he brings this legislation through is prepared to abolish the Lord's Day Act. I don't know? But I don't like to see a whole proliferation of legislation that is overriding one jurisdiction over the other, and causing more confusion than it solves. So, in that respect I voice my concern at this time, Mr. Speaker, about the need for additional legislation of this type.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member from Charleswood that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 22. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. (Stand).

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply to be granted to her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolsley.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker' before the question is put, I should like to rise on a matter of grievance.

Mr. Speaker, events of the last couple of days don't allow me to remain silent any longer pertaining to what I consider to be a very very serious situation that has arisen. We have a Minister of Tourism who is charged with the responsibility of promoting Tourism and retaining a public relations image and in my opinion if he doesn't understand his responsibilities and if he can't understand the word "promotion" then I think it's up to the First Minister to transfer him or it certainly is, in my opinion, the type of thing that the Minister is destroying tourism in this province and should resign. Because his failure to support —(Interjection)— well that's right, but his failure to support the Convention Centre in attracting conventions is a blow to this province.

You know the Convention Centre asked everyone to join in, the Mayor of our City, and others in the business community, the private sector, and the province and members on the other side, and all of us taxpayers pay half of the deficit for the Convention Centre. We only ask that, with this in mind, a person charged with the responsibility of heading up the Department of Tourism has the nerve to stand up in this House and says something to the effect that the concern of my constituents is far greater than that of the corporations. In other words he is engaging in some kind of red herring and class warfare, and his particular portfolio is here to promote conventions, to promote conferences. Everybody knows that conventioners bring many many things to this province. And the main concern that I have, and why I'm standing today, is because I want to help unemployment in this province.

A MEMBER: Help create, or help. . .

MR. WILSON: No, I want to help keep people from losing their jobs.

A MEMBER: Not like this government.

MR. WILSON: The Minister of Tourism certainly doesn't want to help the wage earners protect jobs with the attitude that he has.

We happen to have as number three, number three in the highest earner of export dollars happens to be tourism. And the former Minister of Tourism knows what I'm talking about. The value of those fresh new dollars to the province. —(Interjection)— Yes, he was a good Minister. He was pro-tourism. The present Minister should resign. He can't even hold a candle to that Minister. —(Interjection)— Well I boxed his ears the other day, so now I'm going to give him a little bit of a lift. But basically we know there's a balance, a trade problem.

Most Manitoba people, despite the First Minister and his "two-and-a-half times one" do take their winter holiday, and that's dollars that are leaving the province and if we've got a Minister who isn't going to help us protect jobs and bring tourism to this province, then we've got a problem.

A MEMBER: . . . bring those dollars back.

MR. WILSON: We want to bring them back. And there's many spin-off benefits. You've got the shops, from these conventioners, who benefit from the purchases, the boutiques, you have the new construction of all these hotels that have recently been built and I didn't see this government giving any support to the ribbon-cutting of the Holiday Inn which employed 400 people, but the Minister of Public Works sure has a great expense account when it comes to a ribbon-cutting ceremony for the first of one of his five buildings.

We talk about the Manitoba Telephone System getting a lot of revenue from conventioners in our town, and the taxi people and the printing people. —(Interjection)— That's right, they're not listening. That's right, it's typical of the last grievance that I had. No one would listen. That's fine. That government opposite doesn't seem to realize that they raise approximately five million dollars from taxes and just stop and think of some of them; the gasoline tax of these tourists and conventions. They even help pay for Autopac because two cents, two cents of the gallon of gasoline goes toward paying for Autopac. And we've got the sales tax from these visitors and the liquor tax and the room taxes. That Minister over there, the Minister of Tourism, has got to be made by the First Minister to think positive.

A MEMBER: He's got to be made to think first.

MR. WILSON: His staff morale in his department since the former Minister left is very low and some of the people that caused the very problem are no longer with the department. Well, there's a difference in the attitude of the present Minister of Tourism and his closet socialism when he talks about the phoney thing of his own constituents. Just a couple of weeks ago, where was he? He was off meandering somewhere in Ghana on a trip. Did he talk about his constituents then? Was he concerned about his constituents then? You ask him to take one trip under his own responsibility, his own portfolio, Tourism, and all of a sudden he is concerned about his constituents. Could it be that the Minister of Tourism felt he might not be able to stand up to His Worship the Mayor and didn't want to take a second seat? Well, I think it's time he took a positive attitude and shared in his responsibilities.

Well, just take the last couple of days' I asked a question of the Minister the last couple of days. I said, "Mr. Minister' are you going to present the Accommodation Awards for the Tourist and Convention Association Banquet and Annual Meeting?" He says, "I'll have to check my diary." And I said, "Mr. Minister, the convention's on today."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: The convention ended at 4:00 o'clock and by the time I'm finished, maybe the Minister if he was there will have time to get back. But I doubt if he was at the convention. You know what happened to these operators in Manitoba that won the accommodation awards? The Minister of Consumer Affairs takes 40,000 pictures a year but he couldn't even send out a government photographer to take pictures of the winners of the accommodations for the tourism industry. Nobody showed up. No news release, nothing from the other government. Doesn't that indicate — (Interjection) — well, it's my opinion that the government and the former Minister of Tourism supported TACM, this present Minister seems to want it to die.

You want to turn around and get a cross-fertilization of ideas from the private sector to share with the government who set the policy and there's no Minister. The Minister has no ideas. He has none. He's never around. That Minister is interested in competition and control. You will find out under his Estimates how he's got a new scheme of thirty-day leases where people used to have twenty, ten, five, five-year leases so they could go to a bank and mortgage money to help up-grade their accommodations. This Minister is going to control everybody by eliminating all of those leases. There'll be no more fun when you go to any of the resorts because the horse-back riding academy or something will be gone because they won't invest money for a lousy thirty-day lease. These are the things that are going to disappear. You think I'm kidding? Wait till his Estimates, he'll have to answer some of these questions.

Well, let me talk about some of the benefits. Some of the benefits and the positive attitude this Minister should be telling the world and telling, certainly when he was in Ghana, he could have told them where Winnipeg was, but he could tell them now that he's here.

I'll tell you something, the Manitoba Tourist Industry is a \$330 million industry and I can't tell you how many people that employs, and those are jobs. And that's why I'm concerned when the Minister stands up and takes a negative attitude to not want to bring conventions to this city. You've got \$86 million in lodgings, \$69 million in food, \$72.5 million in travel, shopping is \$66 million and you can go down the list whether it's janitors, clerks, drug stores, sporting goods, clothing, you name it, and even entertainment. There's \$20 million of the entertainment and tourist dollar. Why isn't the Minister giving every member of the House one of these nine dollar bills to read over and take a positive approach. He probably doesn't even have one in his office. —(Interjection)— Well, I really thought that the Minister should be lending his support to bring conventions to our beautiful new Convention Centre. —(Interjection)— That's right we've got a beautiful building and it has been a catalyst for development. You've got to admit we're moving forward.

All right let's think positive. The post and pre convention — everyone activities that goes out, whether it's the Brandon Winter Fair as a post convention activity, or whether they go to the Beausejour situation or whether they go up to the Dauphin Festival or whether they go trophy fishing, these are all benefits of post and pre convention activity.

And how about the University? He used to be in charge of that and that Minister lost money every year at the University because he didn't have the brains to follow the lead of other universities across Canada and get conferences in that university in the off-season and in the summer. Well, I'll tell you something, when we finish renovating Tache Hall, we'll have one of the most aggressive groups of people out at the University bringing conferences and we're going to recover some of that deficit and this government, when they're in power, will show you how to do it. —(Interjection)— All right.

Now where was this consortium sales trip going to go? They were going to improve Manitoba's image in Washington, New York, Chicago. They were going to take our brochures and they were going to go down there and they were going to tell people what a fantastic city and province that we have. Well, they were going to tell about our amenities, the Ballet, the Art Gallery; they were going to show brochures and film on our new hotels and accommodations to show that we're not the concept that some Americans believe which is we're all snow up here and Eskimoes and there is no civilization. One of the things that the Federal Government did find is that there is a poor image that American tourists have of Canada and this was a positive thing that was going to help to change that. And that's why the Canadian Government Travel Office was going to participate.

And what were we asking the Minister? What were we asking this government? Not even the cost of his Ghana trip, I bet. We were asking him for \$4,000 and plus to pick up a prize for every city that this group visited, the 15 of them visited these cities. They wanted to have a prize for a couple, American couple possibly, unless somebody else won it, they wanted to give them a holiday at Gull Harbour, the \$9 million monument to the former Minister of Tourism. And the monument that the Minister of Highways is going to have to figure out how to hide about \$2 million worth of highway

repairs to make it so people can get up there, in different budgets. —(Interjection)— These top executives that were going to go on this consortium trip, and you weren't paying them a cent of salary, were going to go on their own tick and they were going because they take a positive attitude to the future of Manitoba. They wanted a prize to give away on a draw for Gull Harbour. For just the average American couple. —(Interjection)— Well, I would like to give you the make-up of that consortium so you can have an idea of who these responsible, dedicated citizens of Manitoba are. The first one to participate was the Federal Government; they were willing to go. Eaton's was willing to go, the River Rouge, Venture Tours, that losing proposition was willing to finally get on something positive — the Minister of Tourism was the only one so far that's — as I say, the purpose of my grievance is maybe the First Minister can change his mind, he's invited — the Convention Centre executive; the Tourist and Convention Bureau and both newspapers — both newspapers, an executive of the Tribune and Free Press were willing to take a positive approach on behalf of this province. —(Interjection)— Yes, because the Chamber of Commerce was going, maybe that's why the Minister didn't go.

A MEMBER: Now you're talking' now you're talking.

MR. WILSON: Yes, maybe that's why.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: Well, I don't know if the Labour Temple was invited but I know three hotels were invited along and I know the Restaurant Association was invited along and some people have been criticizing His Worship but he was willing to come along and head up the group. —(Interjection)— Well, I'm telling you unemployment in this province is very, very important. —(Interjection)— Well, it's important that we don't have it become critical and it's not funny really because we've had some hotels close in the last week and the news media reported that several other hotels may close and what are you going to do if you don't bring any conventions in? Do you think we're going to stay open forever? What about the new C. N. Hotel that was supposed to go up? Do you think they're going to turn around and go ahead with their plans if they keep having the negative attitude of the Minister of Tourism?

A MEMBER: No, no way.

MR. WILSON: Believe you me, you don't have to have the Minister of Public Works build five buildings to create employment, you just have to show the private sector like the C. N. Hotels that we've got a viable, economic community and they'll build a hotel here. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WILSON: Well, I'm generalizing when I talk about all hotels, Holiday Commonwealth built. There's a number of hotels are interested in building here. You know, if you're going to jump on me, I can also tell you that everyone of these government buildings you're building is going to have a maintenance cost. Now it's all right to build buildings to create employment but you forget, even my Order for Return yesterday pointed out that the Woodsworth Building is almost going to cost \$500,000 a year just to maintain it. So every time you build one of these edifices of monuments to each individual minister, what you're — (Interjection)— doing . . . so he can cut ribbons . . . what you're doing is created a maintenance cost. —(Interjection)— Well, I'm still checking out the Order for Return because I don't think the Minister included the price of the rug in that Order for Return.

But I do think that the Minister cannot be allowed to cause further industry problems. I'm serious when I say his cavalier attitude by not even being here — I saw one of the fellows run out to get him — and he doesn't want to come and listen to what I have to say —(Interjection)— well, I know. Well to the Member for Churchill, you've got to admit, the Member for Churchill and the Member for Flin Flon, you know the Minister, isn't that a phony posture to stand up and say he's protecting his constituents? What kind of nonsense? Why isn't he protecting unemployment that's going to be caused by his posture?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: Right after you.

MR. WILSON: Because if he's talking about his constituents and the \$4,000, why doesn't he give up his Cabinet post and the difference in salary between his Cabinet post and his MLA salary would be more than \$4,000 to spread around his constituency if he's talking about his constituents. Well, I say that he'd better wake up and never mind whispering to the Member for St. Matthews for some radical socialistic view and get down to dealing in realities.

This fellow has got no public relation's image. The former Minister of Tourism has one. — (Interjection)— Well, I resent the fact that the Tourism portfolio is receiving such low priority from the First Minister.

A MEMBER: He messed up Education, now he's messing up Tourism.

MR. WILSON: Well, obviously there was a shake-up in the Cabinet reported in the news media and where does the fellow drift off to? One of the most important portfolios on the government's side. Tourism brings in the third highest amount of export dollars province and employs as many people as a lot of other industries and those jobs are in jeopardy unless that Minister is removed or unless the

First Minister intervenes. So I'll bring up these problems that I've got

MR. WILSON: Well, how could he ever stand up there and in Hansard try to make himself out to be some kind of radical socialist by pointing, like Joe Zuken does, to the CPR all the time. As far as I was concerned, it was a red herring. —(Interjection)—

Well, I'm serious and I can see that I shouldn't carry on because the Minister isn't here but I had two pages of problems and I'm going to talk about those two pages of problems in his Estimates and he's going to have to tell me why he hasn't done anything about road signage for the tourism industry; why he's building cottages to compete with the industry; why he's taxing the daylight out of the people; and why, in the Throne Speech, the First Minister stands up and talks about an increase in Tourism. For the first time in five years, the operators have got vacancies. Are they talking about people passing through? Where do they get these figures from?

A MEMBER: From you.

MR. WILSON: Well, the Minister can tell in the Throne Speech how wonderful and how healthy tourism is and the purpose of my grievance is to stand up and say it isn't healthy, with his cavalier attitude, his attitude that . . . well, his attitude that just doesn't seem to be doing the right thing. I really insist . . . in fact, I think you've got to get tough in a circumstance like this. I think you've got to be emphatic and say that that Minister has to be transferred. That Minister has to resign. You know why? here during his Estimates if he's still the Minister of Tourism. He should resign.

QUESTION put on Motion to go into Committee of Supply 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 — CONSUMER AND CORPORATE SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting that we stay in the Chamber because there's only 15 minutes. By the time you get started, you're finished so let's stay in the Chamber for today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 36(a)—pass. The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Chairman, I don't believe it would be considered advisable to go by this appropriation without answering some of the questions raised yesterday. The questions raised by the Members for Fort Rouge, Fort Garry, Churchill, Flin Flon and most of them pertaining to matters of communication . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I just wonder if we could have just a little less noise, just bring it down a few decibels please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge asked questions pertaining to the social and economic objectives for telecommunications in Manitoba. I would indicate that this question of social and economic objectives for telecommunication is one that has been receiving a great deal of attention lately from most governments in Canada. As the honourable member is no doubt aware, the Federal Government has recently introduced new telecommunication legislation and that legislation sets out no fewer than 16 objectives to guide the provision of telecommunications and broadcasting services in Canada. I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure that all Manitobans should be pleased, that it has not taken this province until now to establish objectives for the operation of telecommunications systems in Manitoba.

History shows that the basic objectives for telecommunication policy were set out back in 1908 when the Conservative Government of R.P. Roblin purchased the facilities of Bell Canada in Manitoba and established a first complete system of government-owned telephones in North America. The objectives then were two-fold: (1) To extend the best possible service to the whole of Manitoba at the lowest possible cost; and (2) to avoid the waste of capital and higher ultimate cost to the consumer inherent in the maintenance of competing telecommunication systems — and that's back in 1908.

These objectives have guided the provision of telephone services in this province to the point where, as members know, the telephone is available to virtually every community and household in Manitoba at rates that are generally the lowest in the world, leave alone North America.

Mr. Chairman, successive governments in this province appear to have accepted the view that telecommunications should be available to all citizens regardless of their location at reasonable prices and that's been pointed out last evening by the Members for Flin Flon, the Member for Churchill and certainly would be endorsed by any member of the House that is willing to speak on behalf of his constituents.

I believe that all successive governments in this province accept this view. Furthermore, we feel that this philosophy should not be limited only to the provision of basic telephone service, and that's very important, but to all telecommunication services, be it broadcasting, cable television, or computer communications, because these services can act as a catalyst for regional and local development in this province.

I should point out to members of the House, however, that the degree to which our objectives can be brought to bear on provisions of telecommunication services is limited by the provincial jurisdiction. For example, in a discussion paper published by my department back in 1974, it was suggested that the principle of cross-subsidization be applied to the areas of broadcasting and cable television — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge knows, he indicated that he had some part to play in that paper presented to members — and that some of the large profits made by cable companies in Winnipeg be used to subsidize provision of cable television and broadcasting service to rural communities. That was part of that paper.

However, because broadcasting and cable television are under Federal jurisdiction and the specific responsibility of the CRTC, we could only make recommendations in this area. We can't tell the CRTC what to do but we happen to believe that the Federal Government should because a Federal Cabinet appoints the CRTC and it should be responsible to the Federal Cabinet.

Thus far, it does not appear as if the CRTC will act on these recommendations in a major way although we have continued to make the case for doing so and will continue in the future. But I happen to believe that our case should be made to the Federal Department of Communications and not necessarily to the CRTC, although I have communicated with the CRTC on occasions when there has been a request for increase of rates but I prefer making my communications directly to the

Federal Minister responsible for communications.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, and I believe the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, talked about new technologies in North America. Several questions were posed of me in regard to new technology and policy consideration as they are affected by new telecommunication technology. At the risk of hearing from members opposite that such considerations are too exotic, I would suggest that my department, in conjunction with MTS, should take a back seat to no one in the adjustment of policy and legislation to take account of new technologies.

For example, the policy on cable television hardware ownership is designed precisely to deal with new technologies. When cable television systems were first established their sole purpose was to deliver distant television signals to the home. However, as cable technology developed it became apparent that the same cable could be used to deliver a range of telecommunication services including data, facsimile and even ordinary telephone service. The cable policy under which MTS owns the hardware and leases necessary channel to the cable television operator ensures that these other services will be developed consistent with provincial objectives, in a way that avoids, as R.P. Roblin said in 1908 and I quote, "the necessity of having a dual system in this province."

I would also point out to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that our cable policy has provided one solution for what most observers consider an important and emerging issue in telecommunications, namely the concentration of ownership of broadcast licences in the hands of a few large companies.

MTS ownership of cable hardware allows small local *entrepreneurs* or non-profit co-operatives to compete more equitably for cable licences. The CRTC will be holding a hearing in Winnipeg on June 7th to deal with cable licences for most of the larger communities in southern Manitoba. And at that time it will be readily apparent there is a real potential for diversification of broadcast media ownership in this province.

Also on the question of new technologies, the matter of terminal interconnection which was dealt with recently by committee is an effort to update provincial legislation to deal with the fact that new technology and new approaches to regulation in other jurisdictions is changing the environment in which our telecommunication carrier operates.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman' members may be interested in recent strides that MTS, in conjunction with other members of the Trans-Canada Telephone System, has made in attempting to integrate space communications more fully into Canada's telecommunication system.

The Trans-Canada companies have entered into a connecting agreement with Telesat Canada Limited which operates the Antik satellite. Over time this development should allow Manitoba to make greater use of satellite transmission. At the present time satellite costs are so high that satellite transmission is simply not cost-effective for intra-provincial uses in Manitoba. But you talk about new technologies, that happens to be, in my humble opinion, the latest that is quite possible to exploit in the future.

We talked, Mr. Chairman, last evening, of some parts of the agreement signed between the Federal Government and ourselves pertaining to ownership of hardware and the dual responsibility pertaining to legislative powers and equally the appeal procedure for those individuals or companies that are wanting to have their case adjudicated. And the agreement makes it very clear. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge left the impression that he wants a fair equitable deal for operators, or potential operators, in the province of Manitoba pertaining to cable television services. I happen to agree with him that we should attempt to have a fair proposition accepted by MTS towards, you know, by anyone who is interested to offer the service. But we have to keep in mind the large investment that was made by the common carrier and if those rates proposed by MTS are not satisfactory the adjudicating body is spelled out in the agreement. We have a Public Utilities Board in Manitoba that does apply to the Manitoba Telephone System, that will apply in regard to rates that are not found to be fair by those having their rates set by the Manitoba Telephone System.

So, that is the appeal available to any operator whether that be a private group, a co-operative group, or even in the future, if that's considered, by a non-profit municipal corporation, which is something that I would personally like to see. But I would not' Mr. Chairman, in any way want to start discussing cases from companies' private groups, or non-profit groups in the province that are negotiating with the Manitoba Telephone System' now, for rates in regard to closed-circuit cable television services in the province. This is not the place to have that kind of discussion. If the group in question is not satisfied with the treatment received from MTS, by all means they have access to me and I've always told them that. I've met with certain groups and I can meet with them again. That's their, you know' I believe their political right in a sense. And they can meet, certainly, with the Member for Fort Rouge and he can air his concern through me or directly to the Manitoba Telephone System with the Chairman or any other member of the Board, or at the hearings that are being held for that purpose.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge also raised the question yesterday concerning procedures for adjudicating MTS cable rates under Canada-Manitoba agreement. I would like to put

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

it on the record to the honourable member that his statement is to the contrary, adjudication of MTS rates is clearly provided and I site the article which is Article 6 of the said agreement. I believe that the member has a copy of the agreement. If not, it's a public document. It was ratified by the two Cabinets and is available to anyone in the province. I refer the member to the provision of Article 5 in which the province undertakes the necessary measures to ensure that such disputes will be adjudicated by its competent regulatory authority, and in this province that's the Public Utilities Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour for Private Members' Hour having arrived committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the Committee of Supply be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 10

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour. The first item is resolutions. Resolution No. 10 with the amendment. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the other day when we were discussing this bill I was discussing it for about ten minutes, and it seems to me that when you speak about ten minutes and if you haven't got your message across sometimes maybe you better quit. However, there are a few things yet that I'd like to add. And that is when I read this resolution where the Member from Radisson came in with his amendment and he said they're to be congratulated. Manitoba Hydro is to be congratulated in maintaining energy rates amongst the lowest in Canada, according to Statistics Canada.

Now how can he have the nerve or the gall' or whatever you'd want to say, to come up with statements like that when actually they have made such a mess of it. You know, they should be condemned for the mess they have made of Manitoba Hydro.

A MEMBER: The government, not the Hydro . . .

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, the government interfering with the Hydro people but some of the Hydro people must have had a pretty weak backbone' too, to be switched over like they were. Because when we think about it, Manitoba had low hydro rates and they had a great reserve of water and a river situation that would accommodate more turbines and more generators and here we went and muffed it. We talk and compare our rates to places like Nova Scotia and other provinces where they have an awful lot of trouble generating their electricity. In British Columbia we've got lumber, in Alberta we've got oil, in Saskatchewan they've got potash, and what Manitoba had as a natural resource and a lot of it, was good water — good fresh clear water. And we should have had cheap electrical power for as long as we have the province. By having messed around with it the way the government did' we're going to have high hydro rates for years and years to come because the money is being spent. They haven't increased the amount of power they can sell and in fact, we're buying power now. And they've done nothing but make a mess of it.

So what I really think is the Member from Radisson really ought to be ashamed to come in and bring in something congratulating the government on what a fine job they've done on hydro.

So here's what happened in Manitoba, too, a number of years ago. They had the Hydro officials going around selling electricity to rural curling rinks and skating rinks and other facilities like this. And the people thought at that time, well they'd just use them when the meters were turned on and when they were using the facilities and now with demand-reading they've got to pay on . . . It's based on the demand load at a certain time. So now they've got hydro and they're going to have to pay more.

Well, possibly, if you were heating a building today and you compared it month by month, hydro rates might be comparable to oil. I doubt if they are, but they may be fairly close. But if you were heating with oil you'd just heat during the winter and when it came to springtime you'd turn the furnace off and there would be no expense all summer. Well when you have your hydro meter and it's based on the demand load you have the bill coming in all summer. So there's no way you're going to be able to heat as cheap with electricity in the times ahead as you will with oil.

I have to think about Hydro. It's the biggest mistake that this government has made, to my knowledge or to my way of thinking, because when I see the figures that have appeared in the papers and have been quoted from time to time, that this government has put into Hydro and for all they've got, it's just an awful shock to everybody. And in fact I don't think the average person is aware of it, and they won't be aware of it until the bills keep coming in from now on but we see the rates are going up and they've got to go up more. If we'd done the right things we possibly could have been selling electricity now and possibly not even have any increases at all.

So I think Hydro has made a mess of it and I think that the Member from Radisson that brought this in was surely being used or else he just doesn't care what he says at all. Because . . . Sure they've made the mistakes and all this but to bring this here amendment along congratulating them on the fine job they've done, this is the thing that really burns me up because I think they should be condemned for the mess they've made of it.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Pembina is continuing the Tory campaign of the big lie. Mr. Speaker, on the matter of Hydro, the Tory Party has adopted the tactic of Hitler and the Nazis, and that is the tactic of the big lie. If you repeat a lie often enough . . . They assume that the people of Manitoba don't have the intelligence to recognize that they're lying. And Mr. Speaker, that concept will be tested when we get to an election. Mr. Speaker, I happen to have a far higher opinion of the intelligence of the people of Manitoba than the Tory Party does.

The Tory technique, of course, is a beautiful one. They say that Hydro and the NDP have wasted

\$6 million —(Interjection)— \$600 million, pardon me, Mr. Speaker. The charge is 100 times as outrageous. They charge that Hydro and the NDP have wasted \$600 million and they never provide proof, they simply repeat the charge. And of course, Mr. Speaker, the beauty of their position is that they say, "The NDP has made such a mess of things but the problem is there's nothing we can do about it when we're elected. We can't straighten things out. All we can do is carry on with the administration of the present program of Hydro." And that's a beautiful position, Mr. Speaker, because it means that when hydro rates increase they will simply blame it on the previous government. Now that's assuming, of course, a very big assumption, that they are elected which I don't think will happen. But it is a beautiful position, Mr. Speaker, and it is the technique of Hitler and the Nazis, essentially.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition state his point of . . .

MR. LYON: Well the point of privilege merely is that the analogy that my honourable friend draws to Hitler, and so on, is an analogy that is not fitting for any member of this House to make against any other person. We wouldn't make it against him even though it might apply. So I merely suggest that he use a little bit more temperate language. We don't mind being called many things by the honourable member. We don't really care what the honourable member says except when he uses allegories or allegations like that with respect to a person that he is perhaps too young to remember but some of us here can remember.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I may sympathize' or one may sympathize with the analogies that are used in debate but the fact is that similar charges have been made by honourable members on the other side with regard to Hitler, Nazis, and jackboots, and the muffled sound of jackboots, and the Honourable Member for Lakeside has referred to the same position, and the Member for Sturgeon Creek. Now I'm not a fan of it. I'm not suggesting that it's the best type of debate but the honourable member referred to a technique. He didn't refer to the honourable members as being the same as the Nazis. He is referring to a technique in campaigning.

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

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, the problem with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is that he has been absent from this House for eight years and he would like to remove . . . He would like to erase from the record everything that his party has done in those eight years. But the problem is, Mr. Speaker, that I have been in the House the last eight years and so have the members on the government benches and we remember . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JOHANNSON: We remember the debates of the last eight years. So the sanctimonious protestations of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition don't fall on very receptive ears.

Mr. Speaker, the Tories think they're going to make hay on this resolution. They think that they will get votes on it. And perhaps they will. I don't think so. But one of their whereases is really absurd and this is, of course, very characteristic of the Tory Party. They state that, "Whereas the Government of Manitoba has encouraged rural and urban communities to construct' rebuild or remodel recreation facilities without advice or indication that these facilities would be placed in an unfavourable financial position due to the increased hydro rates."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Tory Party has just admitted that the NDP has carried on a very good, very expensive program of building recreation facilities, upgrading recreation facilities throughout the province. We have, for example, built a beautiful new town centre in the Town of Churchill. We are then told that when we do this we are bad guys because it is going to cost the Town of Churchill money to keep up that facility.

Mr. Speaker, that is really a stupid argument, not only has the price of hydro gone up, but a great many other things have gone up. It will cost the ladies in the curling rink now over \$3.50 to buy a pound of coffee to make coffee when they are selling coffee in their lunch bar. If they have gas heating their costs will have risen over 100 percent in the last few years. Mr. Speaker, when we build a recreation facility in a town we can't guarantee that inflation isn't going to strike. Inflation has struck the entire western world.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Radisson presented a pretty good explanation of what has happened with demand billing as it has affected curling clubs and skating and curling facilities, and there was a letter to the editor in the Tribune of today from Earl Mills who is the public affairs man for —(Interjection)— He is the public affairs man, and was when the honourable members opposite were in government I believe, he is the public affairs man for Hydro. He states, and the Honourable Member for Radisson made this argument before, the honourable members opposite disregarded it, Manitoba Hydro serves 671 skating and curling facilities. At this time only 73 of these are actually on demand billing, and of this number only 65 or less than 10 percent of the total number have been on this system of billing long enough to permit a proper comparison of costs. Roughly half of those 65 have had decreases in the amount of their bills, the other half have had increases.

So the screams of anguish from members opposite aren't simply borne out by the facts, the facts

don't bear out their case. Mr. Speaker, the Tory party thinks that they are going to make political gain on the issue of Hydro and they have resorted to untruths, they blatantly disregard the truth in their campaign.

I have a Tory candidate in my constituency who is following their example, he has good models before him, the members of the Tory caucus. He started off, Mr. Speaker, by lying about where he lives, he has distributed material in my constituency which implies that he lives in my constituency. He has learned from the Member for Wolseley. I know he doesn't live in my constituency, but he has implied in a number of his pamphlets that he does. Now this is the sort of thing that a Tory will resort to in order to get elected. I would not, Mr. Speaker. Now that doesn't mean that I have any special merit, but I don't think that in the long run lying to the people is going to do the Tories any good. The Tory candidate delivered this piece of literature in my constituency, he has a second piece which has a number of interesting quotes, and this is supposedly from Dan McKenzie, and it is an endorsement of the Tory candidate in my area. "He is the kind of bright, young and energetic person who will do a good job for people in the West end. He lives here himself." Again implying that he lives in my constituency, which is again a lie. This is the Member for Winnipeg South Centre associating himself with a lie.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Yes, I fail to see what this has to do with the actual private members' resolution that we are discussing, it is not a campaign movement for the Member for St. Matthews. I'd like to see you have him get back to the bill.

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

MR. JOHANNSON: Yes, I agree, Mr. Speaker. The point is well taken, but there has been considerable latitude in this debate. The honourable members opposite have been straying some distance from the words of the resolution, in fact, the Member for Pembina . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I prefer not to have a debate on whether we stray too far or not. I said the point is well taken, I gave the honourable member some leeway, now if you will get back to the resolution we'll carry on.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, the resolution of course deals with the policy of demand metering that has been introduced for some curling and skating rinks, and the members opposite have been arguing their case against this particular policy. The member opposite maintains that because we have been messing around politically with Hydro this is the reason for high rates, and it is the reason for the introduction, supposedly, of demand metering, so that Hydro can get more income to compensate for the waste, supposedly, that Hydro and the NDP Government have been responsible for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution, as I said, the case for the resolution really hasn't been proven by members opposite. They have not proved their main point that a hardship has been created. The facts show that, in fact, of the 65 curling and skating facilities that have been on demand metering for a long enough period in order to have the pattern established, half of them roughly have had lower total bills than they would have had on another system of billing, and half of them paid more. So, the case for hardship really hasn't been proven.

Now, Mr. Mills also makes the point, in his letter, that almost without exception electrical users, including curling and skating rinks, are registering increased electrical consumption each year. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one reason why they are paying more in rates, because they are using more electricity, and that, of course, has nothing to do with demand metering particularly, it has to do with increased consumption, and obviously if they use more electrical energy they will have to pay more.

The Tories, as I say again, are trying to make political hay on this resolution, and I don't think they are going to succeed, I really don't think they are going to succeed. The Honourable Member for Lakeside may be elected again with the support he has in Lakeside, and perhaps he will use this issue and perhaps he may gain some votes by it, but I don't think overall it is going to gain the Tories votes in this province, it is not going to gain them votes in my constituency when they lie about Hydro, about the supposed political myths, political interference in Hydro.

You know, it is most interesting, Mr. Speaker, last year when Hydro and Mr. Bateman appeared before the Public Utilities Committee, specific questions were asked of the Chairman of Hydro on this question, and he made very specific and very definite answers. I would like to read them into the record because honourable members opposite, in fact, the Member for Pembina just said that we were messing around with Hydro, we were interfering politically, and I think he believes that I think he believes that.

Mr. Speaker, I am quoting from June 1, 1976, from Public Utilities Committee records: "Mr. Green: Mr. Chairman, a little earlier it was indicated that there was no criticism of Manitoba Hydro expertise, its officials, its staff. My understanding is that the Manitoba Government asked the Manitoba Hydro to calculate an allowance for the resource value that would be affected by the Churchill River Diversion. Other than that are all of the decisions that have been made to proceed in the way in which

you have been proceeding, entirely consistent with the officials, the expertise and the staff and the program planning of Manitoba Hydro?" "Mr. Bateman: Yes."

Mr. Speaker, in that same hearing, June 1st, Mr. Craik said the following, and I quote: "Has anyone suggested to you that there has been" (and there is an omission of a phrase) "unsound engineering go into the project. If there has been, Mr. Chairman, it hasn't come from the opposition." Listen to that, Mr. Chairman, has anyone suggested to you that there has been unsound engineering go into the project? If there has been, Mr. Chairman, it hasn't come from the opposition." (And again there is a gap and I'll quote again.) "The technical controversy, the technical criticism has been non-existent."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. JOHANNSON: "Mr. Bateman, the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro: Mr. Craik, I am pleased to see that you are not questioning the integrity of the engineering in Manitoba Hydro. Now, I think that the fact that you have come out today and said that you are not criticizing the staff of Manitoba Hydro, or the engineering technical competence of the people in it, I am pleased to hear that."

And one final quote, Mr. Chairman, from April 13, 1976, Public Utilities Committee. "Mr. Green: Well then, I want to put this quite plainly because I want to, and if it is wrong, Mr. Bateman, and if there are credible engineering authorities criticizing you it wouldn't be unusual, that is true in any profession, but again, are you aware of any credible engineering advice to the effect that we are wasting between \$200 million and \$400 million on the existing program for the development of the Nelson River?" "Mr. Bateman: No, I am not". No, I am not, that was the answer, that was the answer from the Chairman and General Manager of Manitoba Hydro, last year's Public Utilities Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Chairman, and General Manager of Manitoba Hydro was a member of Hydro in the days when members opposite formed the government, and he has, of course, been promoted and he is now the Chairman and General Manager. He says, Mr. Speaker, he says that there has not been political interference in the affairs of Hydro, and he says that there is no credible engineering authority that would substantiate the position of the Tory party.

Mr. Speaker, the Tories like to ignore — (Interjection)— Yes, they like to ignore facts. They claim, and this claim is made in a pamphlet that has just been distributed throughout my constituency, that by 1971 Hydro's professional engineers had spent 10 years preparing a sound plan for northern power development, and after just three weeks study Mr. Schreyer and his socialist engineer, David Cass-Beggs threw out the hydro plan. Mr. Speaker, that is another blatant lie, it is another blatant lie. The only result that the study carried out by Mr. Cass-Beggs was that there was a delay for awhile, there was a recommendation for a delay for awhile before the government and Hydro finally proceeded to make final decisions on the Nelson River Power Development.

Mr. Speaker, the 10-year Hydro Engineering Plan always included the components of the plan that is now being proceeded with, a review was recommended in 1969, and the program finally accepted by the Hydro Board took account of some massive studies, it took account of the Underwood-McLellan Report on the Churchill River Diversion, the Crippen Report on Lake Winnipeg Regulation, the Manitoba Hydro Task Force Report, the Report by E.D. Gillespie, F. F. S. . . and P.D. McTaggart-Cowan. These were massive reports, and Hydro is proceeding on the basis of massive reports, competent professional advise.

Now the Tories, of course, prefer to ignore this, they prefer to spread the big lie, they don't have to substantiate it, they simply point to hydro rates increasing. They forget to point out the fact that hydro rates are increasing in the rest of the country, they forget to point out that comparatively Manitoba Hydro rates are among the lowest in the country, because they would prefer to forget about the truth, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is beautiful to hear the Member from St. Matthews squirm and twist himself around and try to get out of the most embarrassing position that any government or any party could ever imagine in this province. It will likely go down in history, Mr. Speaker, as the biggest blunder of all time, maybe into the next thousand years in our history. And who committed the blunder, who is the government managing the controls? Those gentlemen sitting opposite, Mr. Speaker, and they can stand up here, they can call us liars, they can call us crooks, they can call us anything they want, but look, the man on the street has got the evidence in his hand today, he has the bill . for those goods and services. One of the newspapers, country newspapers, "Higher Electricity Costs Shock Rink Operators," shock rink operators. And he comes in here and tells us that we're using a big lie, that that is a big lie tactic. That's a fact, there in black and white.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McKENZIE: How stupid can that member be from St. Matthews? I just wonder if the people in that constituency actually know what kind of a creature they've elected because he doesn't have knowledge of what is going on, he's standing up trying to defend the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm sure the honourable member is aware that one of the procedures in the House is one does not reflect upon the personality of any member of the House.

The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, let's go back to the resolution. I have evidence here from Russell, if the members want to go out and talk to the Russell people and try and explain how they're going to get out of this box that we're in over this resolution. Here's Pine Falls . . .

A MEMBER: Read it.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . them and I'll read them if you want. The Red River Echo — here is evidence from the rinks in Altona, Winkler, where there's three or four communities — and you should read some of the information about the system. — (Interjection) — The Parks and Recreation Commission spokesman said: "Some community arenas in Manitoba may be forced to curtail recreation programs or even close down." — (Interjection) — It goes on: "Hardest hit by the new rate structures are arenas with artificial ice-making plants in small communities which don't have the budgetary flexibility to meet the increased rates without straining the local tax burden." said the recreational expert. And it goes on, down further, it says here, Mr. Speaker, "The new rates are not justified in my view as the arenas provide a community service. I feel it's unfair that they have to take it out on the small communities. Rinks may have to close down unless the province gives grants to help with operational costs" and it goes on and on. And it's all over the whole province. Mr. Speaker, I can't understand what's wrong with the New Democratic Party. Do they not talk to their people who are walking around with Hydro bills in their hands that used to cost \$5.00 now it's \$50.00. That's a fact; we can't argue. But the Member for St. Matthews says we're using the big lie tactic. That's not a lie, that's a fact.

Mr. Speaker, to show you how badly they've got themselves boxed in on this issue, I recall the day outside of every town and village in this province there was a beautiful sign: "Your Hydro — Use It" and everybody did. I recall the days when you put up \$65.00, you got the lines all built into your home and the day that you bought two major appliances and two small ones, then you got your \$65.00 back that you had to pay to get it into your home and the bill was roughly \$3.60 a month — \$3.60 a month. Show me anybody today that can afford the luxury of maybe one light, one 25 watt bulb, would cost \$2.00 or \$3.60.

The honourable member also mentioned inflation was the cause of this resolution having to be . . . And what causes inflation, Mr. Speaker? Government spending, wild-eyed left wingers wasting and overspending the taxpayers' dollars. We never had inflation in this province, Mr. Speaker, until this government came on the scene. There wasn't such a thing. There was no inflation when I came in this Legislature in 1966 but when you got these big spenders on the scene . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that there was no inflation in the years when the Conservatives were in power. Is he then suggesting that the budgetary increase from 1958 of \$80 million to 1968 of \$320 million was all increased spending and no inflation?

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Mines Minister may interpret . . . I never heard the word "inflation" mentioned in this Chamber ever until this government came on the scene. Inflation was . . . budgets were prepared; the Ministers of Finance came with their Estimates year after year after year, the word inflation was never mentioned in this Chamber in those days but when the days of these wild-eyed big spenders came on, Mr. Speaker, inflation then became part and it's sort of a disease of this province but the Honourable Member for St. Matthews says, "That's what caused these little rinks to have to close up — it's inflation." So I tell you, inflation can't be the cause of the problem. The problem is the mismanagement of this great resource - hydro.

I think that the average man on the street and the average rink operator who may be my age, in the country will recall the days that that great parliamentarian, Mr. D. L. Campbell, left the Hydro Board. That was the day that I sensed something was wrong and I daresay there's no statesman or no parliamentarian in this province that has more friends and more people's respect on hydro matters and other matters of state more than that gentleman.

A MEMBER: Twenty-seven years.

MR. McKENZIE: But then there was another gentleman that resigned over this issue and that was that engineer by the name of Kristjanson and he resigned over that issue. That was when the problem started, Mr. Speaker, and that's when the New Democratic Party took over, Cass-Beggs came on the scene and there's where the whole thing generated from that day. And I am sure history will show in detail, maybe not in my lifetime but the history will be written of this fiasco which is causing these little rinks to close up out in the country because they can't afford these energy costs. And that is too bad because this country had a great future with Hydro at that level when the signs were sitting out in all the towns and villages in the fifties and sixties: "Your Hydro — Use It" and it was cheap. Cheap, so cheap that it didn't hardly pay you to turn the lights off in those days, Mr. Speaker. And here now we have to put gadgets in to control this demand billing so that one light isn't on when the other one is on or if somebody's shaving upstairs, you have got to make sure the water pump doesn't cut in downstairs and I don't see how they can possibly manage their arenas with those kind of conditions.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, this is a very timely, a very worthwhile and important resolution that

the Member for Minnedosa . . . because the subject matter is on the tips of the tongues of nearly every recreational or sports person in this province. To think how this government could possibly manage or mismanage their affairs, and they know they're mismanaging their domestic affairs because they get the bill every month and they know how much their Hydro bills are. So do the members opposite know. I imagine the Member for St. Matthews, I imagine his bill has gone up the same as mine has from 10 bucks to 50 bucks all in the last year. Sure, I bet you his bill is as high as mine and still rising, and still rising.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the resolution that was presented by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. I cannot support the amendment as being presented by the Member for Radisson who was a member of the Hydro Board and should have resigned or should have told the people of this province or should have told the Legislature of these tremendous energy costs that the people are going to be faced with in their little rinks but he didn't — he's still on the board; he hasn't come out clean yet and told us why all this happened. If he does know, maybe he's scared to tell us but we know from our own way of researching where the problems lie, just mismanagement, NDP arithmetic, Cass-Beggs, inflation, political engineering, the list just goes on and on, Mr. Speaker. So I do say, Mr. Speaker, that I support the resolution. I think it's very timely. It's important for the people of Manitoba to understand why their recreational centres may have to be closed up and I don't see how we can possibly solve that with the New Democratic amendment.

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

MR. CHERNIAK: Would the Honourable Member permit a question? I don't think it should be difficult. Is the honourable member prepared to bring in his Hydro bills for \$10.00 increased to \$50.00 and do that within this session or maybe within the next week or two?

MR. McKENZIE: I don't see why not.

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

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess we're allowed to speak on the main resolution before us because that's all I heard the Honourable Member for Roblin speak about. I didn't hear the Honourable Member for Roblin talk about the amendment apart from saying that he would be voting against the amendment.

I would like to speak on the main motion briefly. First of all, we are talking as the honourable member indicated, approximately 160 recreational facilities in the Province of Manitoba and if we go back to some of the problems that are being experienced by those given communities and recreational facilities, I guess we can talk about participation financially by different levels of government in the last eight years in regard to those facilities. And I don't believe that you will find in the years prior to 1969 the same level of financial participation in the construction of those facilities. Approximately \$4 million in the last seven and a half years were contributed by the Provincial Government for the construction of these given facilities. If some are — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I'd like the honourable member to get up later if he wants to contribute to this debate.

If we talk of additional expenditures today in regard to some of these facilities, it is because prior to 1969 we didn't have them. We didn't have, say, a hockey arena in East St. Paul prior to 1969. We have one today. We didn't have a curling rink and a hockey arena in Oakbank, Dugald and those areas prior to 1969. Why? Sure there is cost today, Mr. Speaker. There is increased costs mainly because there is now facilities. Secondly, a lot of these curling rinks, hockey arenas have artificial ice, and it does cost quite a bit of electric power, and necessarily, the increased costs are not only reflected in the province here but reflected all over Canada. And if you compare the rates, and this is something, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite don't do, they don't compare Hydro rates in Manitoba to say, Ontario, to Alberta, Saskatchewan, British Columbia. They take it in isolation, Mr. Speaker. They just take it in complete isolation and bring it out as a big boogeyman, just awful to see these high Hydro rates. And you know what they'd do if we decided to subsidize these recreational facilities by means of Hydro? They would criticize us for having higher rates for residential and business rates, because we'd have to find the money some place you know. So, if we decided to subsidize recreational facilities and added it on, whether that be fifty, one hundred or two hundred thousand dollars a year' add it on to the residential and business rates, they'd criticize us for being higher than Alberta, being higher than Saskatchewan, being higher than Quebec. That's what they do! That's what they'd like us to do! But obviously, we won't do that, Mr. Speaker.

And that is why, Mr. Speaker the Member for Windsor Park decided to amend the resolution and congratulated Hydro but he could have went much further and congratulated other departments of government that have contributed to having these facilities where they are today.

I happen to believe that there is a problem, Mr. Speaker, but not caused by Hydro. It's not a problem caused by Hydro, in my humble opinion. It's a problem caused by increase and not by the New Democratic government. I believe it's caused by the Conservative Government because they didn't allow these facilities to be constructed prior to 1969. They just sat back in their conservative way and left things happen as they could happen.

I believe that we have facilities today and communities are having a lot of difficulty in raising funds

to operate these facilities. And if there is anything to be done, I happen to believe that it should not be done by Manitoba Hydro, by the Manitoba Telephone System, but it should be a form of grants to departments of government, to municipalities. It should be a sharing formula' and that is something that we can look forward to. But no! The Conservatives would like us to have other sectors subsidize the 160 recreational facilities, and then blame us for having higher rates. Because we'd have to. You can't just pull it out of the air. You'd have to add it to something. It's the same for telephones. So, you know, we can't have it both ways. You can't have it both ways.

And we can't, Mr. Speaker, even if we had thought about this problem, which I did, when I was in Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. I had meetings with these people on a regular basis and I indicated to them that it was a condition of the grant, whether it be a grant of 20,000 or 40,000 or 60,000 dollars for the building of a given arena, that the municipality had to endorse, and that the funds had to flow through the municipality even if the application came from a non-profit group. Why? Because we could anticipate that the rising costs of operation of these facilities including Hydro which is not higher than most provinces in Canada, and the honourable members on the other side know that, but they're not saying it. They are saying that it's an expenditure of \$600 million, it's a big giveaway, it's outrageous and so on, but they know, Mr. Speaker, that even if they became the government when they do in 1990, that they won't be able to collect one penny of these funds that we gave away some place. They won't be able to because we didn't give it away. We spent it on construction of facilities that are there today to meet the needs of today and tomorrow.

There are no giveaways in the amounts that were spent in regulating Lake Winnipeg and the construction of Hydro facilities up North. I don't know of one penny, Mr. Speaker, that was given away. I can't say that for other programs that were initiated even though we have to continue paying out initiated by the previous administration. You can't say that. I wish I could, but I can't. There are funds that have flowed outside of the province that we're still trying to get back. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa would like me and other members from this side of the House to forget all of that. Like the Member for Sturgeon Creek, "Forget the past; don't talk about that." But yet we live with decisions that have had been taken by previous administrations.

I talked about today in my Estimates, of things that happened by Grandfather Roblin back in 1908. We live by these decisions. We have to live with decisions that were taken by the Member for Lakeside, the Member for Souris-Killarney, prior to 1969. Those are facts of life. But yet, when they talk about the high rates of Hydro in this province, they don't compare these rates with other provinces. Did you ever see them bring that to the House? Well, Mr. Speaker, I take it upon myself to bring these to the House and have it on the record. And if any member from that side of the House has the gall or the audacity to get up and accuse us of giving away any portion of what they consider to be excessive in regard to construction of facilities for the needs of Hydro of today and tomorrow, let them put that on the record. Any waste, any giveaway. They haven't been able to do that, Mr. Speaker. Needless to say that there is a lot of members in the House that would like to speak on this resolution. I, by all means, will be supporting the amendment put by my colleague and necessarily, the therefore be it resolved, Mr. Speaker, leaves it open for the type of suggestion that I've made in my very short contribution in regard to looking at an alternative. Not using Hydro, for what I believe is not right, but using funds that are made available either directly through taxation or through lottery revenue to help these people that I happen to believe are in need. But not by means of Hydro rates. No, Mr. Speaker. That would be accepting a, how should I say, sense of having a suggestion made by the Conservatives to get us later. And I can't accept that. That's politics; that's politics by the Conservatives that I just can't buy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do wish to make a few comments on this resolution. I believe that the Member for Minnedosa should be congratulated for bringing it to the House, I really do, because it is a concern to many communities, many small communities that are having difficulties. And I listened quite closely to the Minister and he may be quite right that the government did help to build and construct many recreation facilities that weren't there. But, Mr. Speaker, what good is it if we have all these facilities and people may not be able to enjoy them because they can't pay the cost? So I think that there is a problem and I say on the resolution that I think it makes a good point.

I am not completely satisfied with the amendment by the Member for Radisson and I am not so sure, Mr. Speaker, that the demand metering policy of the Manitoba Hydro is the correct one because I would at least like to hear from somebody in the House, somebody on the government side, to indicate to us. . . Why not have two meters? Why not have a meter that would put the hydro on in the fall when we start using the facility, cut it off in May when we don't use the building for the next six or seven years, or the demand metering system which is averaging out for the whole year? And I would bet any money, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the demand metering —(Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, would you call order please?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making, I am not so sure that the demand metering system is the best for community clubs and recreation facilities because I am still inclined to believe that by averaging out through the whole year is perhaps more expensive than putting on the meter for the duration of five months or six months and cutting it off, say, when we don't use the facility during the summer. And that's the thing that I would like to hear from somebody that is experienced and I know that Mr. Bateman of Manitoba Hydro indicated that — it wasn't specific that it would cost less or not — but he indicated that's the system used to average out.

I know that the member moving the amendment, and it is certainly a very high school-stuff amendment when he says, "Whereas Manitoba Hydro is to be congratulated on maintaining the energy rates among the lowest in Canada." Well, perhaps he is taking the credit for all the water resources that we have been endowed with by nature in this province. Some of the other provinces have not been so fortunate so naturally our hydro rates should be lower than somebody else's. But even in the State of Florida where the hydro is a private institution and their rates are less than ours They are so, the household rates. I have a friend who is in the engineering department of Florida Hydro and I had an opportunity to talk to him quite lately. But surely in Canada where some provinces did not have the water resources, then naturally their hydro costs just as much. As most members in this House probably know, the people in the Maritimes have to pay anywhere from \$1,500 to \$2,000 for heating their homes during the winter, and that is average homes, anywhere between 1,000 and 1,200 square feet. So that is the fact.

But for a member to say that the government should take all the credit for the low hydro cost in Canada, again I indicate that to me he could have been more constructive and to me that is strictly a high school amendment, Mr. Speaker. I do accept that if the government can see to change the metering system to reduce the costs, I would be prepared to accept one of the "RESOLVED" sections of the amendment which will say that the government will provide subsidy to maintain recreation facilities. To me that makes sense. But I think the first two perhaps kill that last part. I would agree that if the government is prepared to do it, I hope they would put it into practice so that we can have some results and make sure that this comes to fruition because we do have problems, we have concerns.

Now the small towns, many small towns in this province, their only form of recreation is curling. Probably, if it is a very small community, then maybe the small hotel and the curling club are probably the two most important places in a town.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, we have debated and we have discussed about the physical fitness of many of our children, of the students in high school and of the Canadians and Manitobans as a whole, and that we are certainly not as physically fit as most other people in European countries or even the country to the south of us, the Americans, the United States, which indications and statistics prove that they are much physically fit. So what better way to sort of encourage and help and as far as I know, and I am informed that most students in the community and country points do curl. That is their one form of recreation so I think this form of recreation should be encouraged and it is a good form of recreation, it provides good exercise. So I think we should encourage that and perhaps curtail with the high cost. And I haven't checked out personally with many of these people but perhaps some members have, and if the newspaper reports are accurate that some of these communities will have to close and their energy bills . . . Or recreation communities will have to close and their hydro bills are as much as \$10,000 per season, or \$16,000 in a very small town, perhaps with one store and a couple of hundred people. Mr. Speaker, I can't see how these places can sustain themselves. They can't so there has to be some assistance offered and as far as I am concerned, I don't care how it is, either change the metering system or be it by way of subsidy or grants, but something has to be done because we are on a very dangerous collision course and I hope that some action will be taken.

So I say to the Member for Minnedosa by bringing this resolution to the House that at least we have some debate. All the members have an opportunity to have an input into this resolution, and perhaps come with some suggestions. But certainly the Member for Radisson is not making any suggestion from his seat.

So, Mr. Speaker, all I say, the first two parts of the amendment, I certainly cannot accept. The result part, I have no choice but to accept it because if the government will do something, I can't help but accept it and I hope that they will do and make sure that some legislation at least comes to fruition this session, that something will be done. —(Interjection)—

Well, the Minister says that you don't need any legislation. I would have hoped that one of the Ministers responsible would at least get up on his feet and say, "Look, we are going to do this and this is what we are going to do." —(Interjection)— No, no, but I said that I hoped that you would, that one of the Ministers would get up and say what will be done for these communities and recreation because I think it is important and something has to be done.

So, Mr. Speaker, the debate has taken place and I believe the ball is in the court of the government and it is up to them to react and answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

Wednesday, April 6, 1977

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. —(Interjections)— Order please. The hour being 5:30, I am now leaving the Chair. The House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Thursday.