



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. 25

2:30 p.m., Wednesday, March 23, 1977

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 21 members of the Political Science Studies of the University of Manitoba. This university is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. STEVE DEREWIANCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition of the Winnipeg Bible College praying for the passage of **An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Winnipeg Bible Institute and College of Theology.**

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

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Minister proceeds, I should like to say on Monday, March 21st, 1977, there appeared on the Order Paper in the name of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia a motion for the introduction of a bill, No. 36, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act. Prior to its introduction, the Honourable Minister of Labour rose on a point of order regarding the admissibility of the motion. He pointed out that the Throne Speech contained the following statement: "Legislation will be introduced to deal fairly with the matters of hours of operation and overtime work which have created problems for the employer and employee in the province." He referred to our Rule 31 which states in part as follows: "No member shall anticipate a matter appointed for consideration or of which notice has been given."

Since I was not in the possession of the bill proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, nor am I aware of the scope of the legislation to be introduced by the Honourable Minister of Labour, I agreed to take the matter under advisement.

On Tuesday, March 22nd, 1977, I asked the Honourable Member for Assiniboia to provide the House with an explanation of the purport of the bill. He stated that the main thrust of the bill dealt with hours of work and overtime. In searching the journals of the House I find that on April 1st, 1968, the Honourable Member for Swan River in his capacity as Speaker of this Assembly ruled out of order a motion by the Honourable Member for St. Johns who proposed for the first reading Bill (No. 56) An Act to amend The Election Act. In presenting his ruling to the House, Mr. Speaker Bilton said:

"In my opinion he is anticipating a matter already appointed for consideration by the Speech from the Throne which reads as follows: 'Certain amendments to The Election Act which have already received the attention of the Legislative Assembly will now be brought before you for further consideration.'"

Reference was made to our Rule 31 which remains unchanged, also Citation 131, Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, and Page 403 of the May 16th edition. Mr. Speaker Bilton went on to say, "In the light of this information it leaves me no alternative but to rule the motion out of order." The ruling was accepted by the House without division.

Citation 69, sub 2, Beauchesne's Fourth Edition states:

Speaker's rulings, once given, belong to the House which under Standing Order 12 is free to reject them. If they are accepted without appeal or confirmed by an appeal they become precedent and form part of the Rules of Procedure. The Speaker is not vested with the power to alter them of his own accord. If they have been given under misrepresentation, the House itself and not the Speaker should take the initial steps to avoid the consequences or implications.

In view of the similarity of circumstances between the situation as it existed as mentioned in 1968 and the motion as presented by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I am of the opinion that I am bound by the customs and procedures of the House and must, therefore, rule the motion as proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia out of order.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Highways.

HONOURABLE PETER BURTONIAK (Dauphin) introduced **Bill (No. 35) An Act to amend The**

Highway Traffic Act (3).

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George) introduced **Bill (No.39) An Act to amend The Planning Act.**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY introduced **Bill (No.37) An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate Heller-Natofin (Western) Ltd.**

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer this question to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Mines. I wonder if the First Minister could confirm that Mr. Jim Gordon, the General Manager of Leaf Rapids Corporation recently resigned his position, very recently?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, as recently as ten days ago that wasn't the case. If it has been more recent, I am not aware. I'll have to take the question as notice.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would also take as notice and let the House know if the Assistant General Manager also resigned with Mr. Gordon?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Would the Minister confirm or take as notice to be answered tomorrow, the fact that his friend Mr. MacKay has received \$100,618.94 since he became Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I have a supplementary question then, would the Minister confirm the law firm of his friend has received \$89,000 up to the end of 1976 and would the Minister undertake to give the House up-to-date figures?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): Mr. Speaker' if the allegations being made by the present Member for Wolseley, and I advisedly suggest the present Member for Wolseley, because I am sort of a foreseer into the future' however, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my honourable friend that if that law firm did receive moneys, that would be found in the Public Accounts of the Province of Manitoba. If my honourable friend would use his ingenuity he could find that out from there.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Corrections and I would like to ask the Honourable Minister if he has received any invitation from the Solicitor-General of Canada to attend a conference of provincial Ministers to deal with proposed legislation in the juvenile offenders field?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

HONOURABLE J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been ongoing discussions in this regard. The Deputy Ministers are meeting tomorrow in Regina. Subsequent to that time the Ministers will meet.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question to the Minister. Has he received or will he be conversing with his colleague, the Attorney-General, to provide the legal input into those discussions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: The Attorney-General and I discuss problems on a daily basis that are of mutual concern. His staff is well apprised of what is going on in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside:

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing reports of a potential drought situation, is the Department of Agriculture drawing up any contingency plans particularly with respect to the livestock industry in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, we have been involved in public works over the last several months with regard to the livestock section of our industry and that is in the supply and development of water sources. There are other measures that may be undertaken pursuant to a three-department committee or task force which has been set up at the officials' level to consider the future contingency plans.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, more specifically, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the department pursuing or considering any possibility of setting up a fodder bank for

the livestock producers of this province.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is quite ironic because Manitoba producers did, in fact, sell quite a volume of feed hay supplies to the United States last year and perhaps even some this year, so that that's the nature of our problem. We do have a situation where everyone produces for his needs, and whatever is surplus they usually market the surplus to wherever the market may be found, and therefore it is very difficult to try to pull together that kind of a program. It also implies if there was a reserved feed bank on hand for the feeding of livestock that there would have to be continuous depression in feed prices because of that particular supply being available at any time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Education. Can the Minister indicate whether the Provincial Government or its representatives in meeting with school board officials from St. Boniface and Norwood over the past two weeks provided any specific direction or guidelines concerning the implementation of the Français programs in the past two weeks in the meetings that were held with school board members from St. Boniface and Norwood. Could the Minister indicate what those discussions were about and whether in fact, there was any recommendation or guidelines being provided to School Board members at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HONOURABLE IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the meeting that the member refers to, of course, were held and they were in the nature of consultative meetings. I think reference during these meetings was made to the Public Schools Act, Section 258, which in the situation that we are looking at in Manitoba in both St. Boniface and Norwood is very clear in its wording in giving to parents certain rights. And I think that was the basis of the discussion and that no further direction, as the Member for Fort Rouge puts it, was given because quite simply the Provincial Government believes in the idea that local school boards have autonomy and the local trustees should exercise their decision-making powers.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in consideration of that answer then, can the Minister indicate when he plans to issue the paper that he said that his Department of Education was developing that would be offering recommendations or guidelines concerning the pedagogical or teaching aspects of Français programs? When might we expect this and what might that White Paper contain? What are the guidelines in it?

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, this matter, of course, was discussed in exchange between myself and the Member for Fort Rouge during the date on my Estimates. The policy paper is being developed and it certainly will be released. The paper, of course, will attempt to clarify for those who apparently need it, the existing statutory law with regard to instruction in French and in English in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to hear that there will be a White Paper clarifying statutory law. Will that paper also include any statement of provincial government policy in this matter of French language instruction. **MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education. **MR. TURNBULL:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge is now injecting a term such as White Paper, and the White Paper terminology, of course, has a certain connotation that I do not wish to impart to this question-and-answer series that we're having right now. I am talking about a policy paper. It may well be very brief. It will likely outline those provisions of the existing Act that apparently various individuals will not interpret in the manner in which the Act was passed unanimously by this House some many years ago. **MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Final. **MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just have one final supplementary, then, concerning this position paper, if we can call it that, that the government intends to issue. Would that include any position regarding financial assistance that would be given for the alternative programs that may be available and would we expect any new provisions in the terms of financial assistance that might be offered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, the matter of financial assistance was discussed also during my Estimates. I do not envisage any great change in the arrangements that are now provided for financial assistance to school divisions. Indeed the financial provisions that are now provided have been developed by the Department of Education, I am told are the best in Canada, and indeed serve as a model for other provinces in this country. So I do not see, at the moment, any need for change and certainly I do not envisage change being incorporated in the position paper that I am now preparing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. And I'd like to ask the Minister if any members of the Independent Cattle Producers have discussed with him or any officials of his department in regard to the deficit — I understand it is about \$3,000 because of their election campaign — if they have discussed with him any financial assistance in being able to take care of this debt?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EINARSON: My second question, Mr. Speaker, is if there is any representation would it be an indication . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please: Question. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and it has to do with the Beef Marketing Board vote that was held last week. Will the Minister release the results of that vote regions? by

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I can do that. I'd have to check.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the vote was conducted by government auspices and at a cost to the taxpayer surely the Minister could make available this information the same as in any other election that is conducted at the taxpayers' expense.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate that I wasn't sure that it's available in that form but I will check.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN(Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, about a week ago I was asked a question from the Member for Assiniboia. He wanted to know whether parking is made available to employees and the fees paid for.

Parking is available to employees under the following circumstances: First, where government-owned parking is available, usually associated with government buildings. Second, where parking stalls are provided as part of a lease agreement. And third, when public works cannot provide parking accommodation in conjunction with leased accommodation and a requirement can be justified, departments may request and receive approval from Management Committee to lease commercial parking space. Then this is paid out of departmental appropriations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HONOURABLE LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Member for Portage La Prairie asked a question with respect to a supposed meeting I was supposed to have held in West Germany or was supposed to have had in West Germany with a group of West German business people who might be interested in Flyer. I would like to inform my honourable friend that I have no recollection nor am I aware of any arrangements made by myself or my staff for any such meeting in West Germany with West German business interests respecting Flyer Industries. Since no meetings were scheduled, there were none to attend so really, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is talking about a matter that never existed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could tell us: As a result of the referendum held on beef marketing recently, I wonder if it is his intention now to hold a referendum on the marketing of hogs in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur was Minister of Agriculture for a short period of time, up to and part of 1969. He should know that there is a provision in the Natural Products Marketing Act for that question to be reviewed if it is requested by producers, something in the order of ten percent of any given commodity. No such request has ever been made.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY(Transcona): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would kindly . . . oh, first there is an Order for Return.

ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

ORDER NO. 38

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Pembina,

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing information with respect to staff turnover in the following hospitals:

1. What was the total number of staff positions at the Selkirk Mental Hospital in each fiscal year since 1969?

2. What was the total turnover in staff at the Selkirk Mental Hospital in each fiscal year since 1969?

3. What was the total number of staff positions at the Brandon Mental Hospital in each fiscal year since 1969?

4. What was the total turnover in staff at the Brandon Mental Hospital in each fiscal year since 1969?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to accept this order and give my honourable friend all the information that we can get on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Order for Return is so ordered.

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 2, proposed by the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

BILL (NO. 3) — THE FARM INCOME ASSURANCES PLANS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 3, Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments in regard to Bill No. 3 which refers to the Farm Income Assurance Plans Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is a complete new bill that is new legislation and Mr. Speaker, in listening to the comments from the Minister of Agriculture when he was explaining this bill, some of the things he had to say were rather of interest to me. I know that he has said in recent years that he was critical of the Federal Government for not getting involved in providing some kind of assistance to the beef producers of this province and other provinces because of the economic squeeze they found themselves in, namely the price of beef that is being received by farmers in the past few years, also the continued increase in inputs that farmers have to face. This is another attribute insofar as the dilemmas of the beef producers are concerned. But one of the things, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister stated and I was rather surprised to hear him say it, that in 1975 he was very eager to get into a program of assistance to the beef producers, not on a one year basis or even a two year basis such as I understand has happened in some of the provinces to the west of us but, Mr. Speaker, it was a five year program — five year plan Mr. that when we found out about it and it wasn't legislation brought into this House, it was merely an act of he and his colleagues in Cabinet, which made it legal for them and the Minister of Agriculture to draw up a contract between himself and all the individual farmers that saw fit to enter into agreement with his program.

Mr. Speaker, I said at that time that this was a five year plan, that it was a carrot in the first year that the Minister was throwing out to these farmers in order that he could lock them into the program for another four years. Mr. Speaker, a number of farmers accepted it in the first year — in 1975 — but he wasn't happy with the number of farmers that responded by December 31st, 1975 so he extended the program for another month or at least it went until the 16th of January, 1976. And having done that, Mr. Speaker, he decided that he was going to put all the agricultural representatives throughout the province to work plus giving instructions to each one of them to hire one, two or three or more people in each respective community to go out and sell his program across

to the taxpayers, to sell something that maybe some farmers didn't want. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it did promote his cause to some extent in the first year and by the time the second year had come around and completed, I think he had somewhere in the neighborhood of 6,400 farmers in the province engaged in that Beef Assurance Program.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the assistance that farmers have received under that program but what a lot of farmers objected to was the conditions under which they signed that contract, Mr. Speaker, and that theory which, we on this side of the House were critical of this Minister. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture has seen fit to bring in a new piece of legislation and in so doing, Mr. Speaker, he is indicating to the farmers who have been engaged in this program, some 6,400 of them, if you want to join the federal program which is now in existence, you can opt out of my provincial five year plan. Mr. Speaker, the strings that were attached two years ago are not the case today. The Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is now saying to all those farmers, "If you want to opt out of the provincial plan, enter into the federal plan, you don't have to pay back . . ." — which was a maximum of approximately \$5,400 in 1975 plus I think it is somewhere around the neighborhood of \$3,000 in 1976 — "because the number of calves that you have to hold over for the government in order that you fulfill the . . ." — contract to be kept over and fed through and that is the situation in 1977.

He was also critical of the Federal Government not covering the total plan as he had it established in Manitoba. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government are saying we will accommodate those farmers who were in the provincial plan to the tune of 50 percent and those who did choose not to go into the plan, we will cover 100 percent. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister gave us a couple of tables that we could follow and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go into all the mathematics of these examples that he gave us because as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the people

who are going to be involved in working out the provincial program and complementing with the federal program — it's going to take some work because I understand a number of them still aren't clear as to what it's all about. The Minister of Agriculture did indicate to us that while it is complicated, I suppose time will tell it will take to assess the whole picture and fine find out where farmers stand.

I am also given to understand, Mr. Speaker, and it is not by letter, but in the provincial program the maximum number of cows that any one farmer could enter into as a contract with the Minister of Agriculture were 70 cows but in the federal program he uses the formula of 100 cows less 5. And the reason for that is, Mr. Speaker, as I am given to understand "the less 5" is because any farmer who has one, two, three or four cows cannot enter or does not qualify to enter the federal program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point I wanted to make is, and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong on this, but I understand the directive has gone out to the various regions whereby the agreements are being asked to go around talking to the farmers who are in his provincial program and who only put 70 cows as the maximum number. Because Mr. Speaker, in a number of cases farmers had more than 70 cows some of them had 100 cows, some of them had 125 cows and some of them did enter the actual number of cows that they owned while they could only collect on the 70.

Now I understand, Mr. Speaker, they are being asked to go out and ask the farmers to put in the exact number of cows that they have so that if, say, to give an example, if one farmer put in his application for 70 cows but has 100, by so adding on another 30 it is going to relieve the caucus or the Provincial Government some of the cost of this program. And so, you know Mr. Speaker, I understand that I suppose this is all right, but the Minister engaged in a five-year program and I criticized him for it. I didn't think it was right. Had he gone in on, say, a one or two-year basis, because it is hard to project what is going to happen in, say, three or four years hence, things can change.

You know, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it in Saskatchewan and Alberta they have had a one-year program and it is not causing any difficulty for them to work into the federal plan. And so, Mr. Speaker, with the kind of money that has been put out by the provincial treasury to the farmers in the Province of Manitoba is one thing. Insofar as the the farmers are concerned I think that it has been a help insofar as their economic situation is concerned but — and here again, the Minister says that is why, as I understand it — he has had to go into that program, because the Federal Government were not prepared to act and were dragging their feet.

Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of this bill. I say in Section 2(a) it is a section in this bill that I don't see why the Minister is required to have that section in there at all because as I understand it there is legislation at the present time whereby the Minister can enter into an agreement with the farmers and other commodity groups on a group basis or on an individual basis. And so I don't know, I would like the Minister to explain why he needs 2(a) in this bill. This to me, Mr. Speaker, gives me some concern because if the Minister figures he is going to be the Minister of Agriculture after the next election, I am wondering where this will lead us as to how far he is going to go insofar as changing the whole system of our hog producers, of our dairy producers, and I can name all the rest of the commodity groups that are in operation today.

So, Mr. Speaker, with some of those comments I don't think that my colleagues and I are going to say vote against this bill because I think this bill was brought in to save the Minister of Agriculture from the kind of embarrassment that he found himself in, not only with the vote that was just completed last week and the results thereof, but also with his counterparts in the City of Winnipeg and as far as the taxpayers in this province are concerned. And I say, Mr. Speaker, he could still have done a real service to the farmers and the beef industry in this province if he would have gone on, say, a one-year basis and hoped that the Federal Government would come into their plan and now which they have done.

I believe that the problem is going to be solved but I also want to say one other thing, Mr. Speaker. This integration that the Minister is talking about in this bill and working under agreement with the Federal Government, I think we all know, Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Agriculture has had ambitions and he had hoped to have a marketing board with the kind of powers that he was saying to the producers in this province that they would have, not what they wanted but what he would say that they would have, and in this way to integrate

the Provincial with the Federal Government and eventually to establish a supply management program, Mr. Speaker. I think that this is something, it is an ambition that the Minister of Agriculture has in the back of his mind and hopefully this is what is going to happen. Well I hope, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the farmers of this province, and the Minister accused me here some weeks ago — I thought I had suggested to him that I spoke for, say, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 95 percent of the farmers in this province — I think he will have to agree now that I am much closer to that percentage than he ever thought he was.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this is the first round on this side of the House as far as this bill is concerned. We, on this side, are concerned as to just what can happen or what will take place insofar as this bill is concerned and the motivations that this Minister may have insofar as the future of other commodity groups is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments and with the comments of other colleagues on this side of the House, we are going to wait and hear what the Minister has to say insofar as further explanation is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, there was one other matter I wanted to mention before I sit down and that is, he indicated that the pay-out to the farmers in his provincial plan has been in the last two years in the month of December and now because of the federal plan coming into play and his negotiations with the Federal Government, he has to delay this from December 1977, to January 1978. I just throw this out to the Minister and I am wondering if he is able to make any changes or amendments to that, that if not all, but if a portion or, say, a larger portion of that payment could be made in December of 1977 and the balance in the following year. You know, Mr. Speaker, the reason I ask that is because maybe not for all farmers, but for some farmers it can have an effect on their tax structure because if that income that is normally scheduled for 1977 isn't received by the farmer until 1978, it is like a wage-earner who will have his wages for two years put into one and he is sort of being double-taxed.

Now I know the Minister of Agriculture can say, "Well, the farmer has one advantage, he has a five-year average that he can resort to on his income." If he does come back at me on that, Mr. Speaker, I can say, "Yes, that is so." But you know, Mr. Speaker, if a farmer has averaged in 1977 he has to wait for five years before he can get the benefit of that particular aspect of the federal law.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I make these few comments and this to me was something I felt was rather important and I don't know what the Minister could do about it, but I would suggest that he could while he says he hasn't anything in writing with the Federal Government, he has had a sort of a verbal agreement, a verbal understanding, and I am wondering if he can't take this up with the federal Minister of Agriculture to see what can be done even though they don't know for sure, they won't know until what the average price is going to be and they are not able to calculate completely until the end of December 1977.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, this is the first round as far as I am concerned. You are going to hear more from other of my colleagues. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, that the debate be adjourned at this time.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 4, proposed by the Honourable Minister of Public Works. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 5, proposed by the Honourable Minister of Public Works. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 7, proposed by the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I stood this is the name of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Honourable Member for Swan River for standing this bill the other day, Mr. Speaker. At that particular time I was not in the Chamber. I hadn't anticipated the bill coming up at that period of the day. However, I have had the opportunity to read the rather cursory remarks of the Attorney-General when he introduced this bill and I think in the jargon of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, we can probably say that it is a housekeeping bill. The Attorney-General, however, I think would like to see it as a housekeeping bill because, you know, Mr. Speaker, I have thought over the years most people in this province — at least in rural Manitoba where I live — they like to have what they call an annual spring housecleaning and that spring housecleaning is designed to do several things. In that housecleaning they expect to take the dirty marks off the walls, to clean up the accumulation of dust and dirt that has built up in very hard to get at places over a period of time and then, through a very concerted effort, they hope that they are able to remove the dirt and the grime so that they have a sparkling new image which appears after their efforts. And I think that this is what the Attorney-General was trying to do when he introduced this bill, the amendments to the Provincial Judges Act.

The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is I believe that last year when there was occasion for some concern on the part of the Attorney-General on some activities of members of the Provincial Judges Court that the activity that was taken by the Attorney-General at that time probably left some smudges and smears on the image of the Attorney-General, so he feels that if he can change the Provincial Judges Act maybe that housecleaning will remove the tarnish and the little bit of smudges

that appear on his image because of the actions taken at that time.

I don't think the Attorney-General is offended by that type of rather general remark. However, I don't think that these changes that he is proposing will really remove that because I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the chain of events that occurred last year in what is commonly referred to as the Pilutik Affair leave much to be desired. It has indeed, Mr. Speaker, left quite a bit to be desired on the part of the public of Manitoba.

When we establish a court and we make appointments of learned people in society and we put stipulations on the qualifications — I notice he's going to try and change that although it's insignificant — where they must be a member of the Law Society before they are eligible, and they "have" to be a barrister and solicitor now I believe instead of "or," we expect from those people a conduct that is above and beyond what we would expect from an average person in the community. Their conduct, I believe, has to be exemplary.

At that particular time what brought this all about was the Attorney-General announced quite abruptly that there was a member of the Provincial Judges Court who would not be allowed to practice. And he was being prevented from practicing pending an investigation or something to that effect. He was removed from the bench, prohibited from holding sittings. In that manner the member of the Bench was more or less held in abeyance. He wasn't able to act as a Judge. He wasn't condemned. He was just hanging in the air more or less while the Attorney-General decided what he was going to do with him. Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that hanging judges are famous throughout history. I would suggest that if the Minister of Health were a practicing member of the Bar, I don't think it would be inconceivable that at some time in the future that label could be properly attributed to him.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General then referred the matter to a judicial council which was established when the Provincial Judges Court was set up. In the meantime I believe he caused investigations to take place or perhaps, I don't know, maybe he will tell us some day, maybe it was the judicial council that caused the investigation to take place. The result of that has never been made known to the public yet and this is over a year ago.

We also know that the Attorney-General is a member of the Law Society of Manitoba and I don't know — he hasn't offered the information — I don't know whether he prevailed upon the Law Society of Manitoba or not to have them conduct an investigation. However, the Law Society did announce that they were going to conduct an investigation and that was over a year ago. I haven't heard any profound statements coming from the Law Society as to whether they have completed their investigation or what they intend to do with it either.

But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, a man who held a position, one that society expected to be exemplary in his conduct, is no longer a member of the Bench. I don't know whether he has ever applied to the Law Society for an active right to practice, but to my knowledge I have never seen anything public. There has been no pronouncement from the Attorney-General. There has been nothing from the judicial council. There has been nothing from the Law Society that says that man has done anything wrong. He has been probably a victim of circumstance.

If the Attorney-General says he has something against him and he has reason to bring charges then, fine, that's okay. But, to this day that gentleman, to my knowledge, has had no charges pursued against him and has been removed from the Bench by the actions of the Attorney-General. I imagine removed without pay. I don't imagine he is drawing any pay today. If the man has done no wrong should he . . . But the whole thing, Mr. Speaker, is that here by actions that were arbitrarily taken without proof of wrongdoing, a man has been removed from the Bench, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that those are the black marks that the Attorney-General is now trying to whitewash off his record by bringing forward changes in the Provincial Judges Act. I don't think it's going to wash, Mr. Speaker, I don't think for a minute that that record will ever be removed from the Attorney-General's image.

A MEMBER: I don't feel guilty at all.

MR. GRAHAM: The Attorney-General says he doesn't feel guilty — maybe the Judge says he doesn't feel guilty. I don't know. However, Mr. Speaker, we do know that under pressure the Judge involved did resign. I would say that likewise if considerable pressure was placed on the Attorney-General without making any criminal charges against him but just constant pressure of supposedly wrongdoing would the Attorney-General resign? Would he? Well, I may have news for the Attorney-General, that he may resign with the consent of the majority of his electorate.

Mr. Speaker, let's sit down and take a look at what the Attorney-General is attempting to do with the amendments that he is proposing to the Provincial Judges Act. He is saying that he wants to amend a section of the Act which deals with the qualifications for a person to be a Judge and he's saying that a person now has to be a barrister and a solicitor instead of a barrister or a solicitor. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that that is a significant point at all. I would say that 99.9 percent of the solicitors in Manitoba are also barristers and vice versa so it has no significant changing other than the attempt to whitewash, or the housekeeping that is going on.

There is another section where the Attorney-General is attempting to change or is adding a

section which deals with an acting chairman of the Judicial Council. — (Interjection) — That's a real tricky one, Mr. Speaker, is right. In 1972 the Provincial Judges Act was passed, which established a Judicial Council. I would like the Attorney-General to tell me how many times that Judicial Council has met since that time and how many actions they have taken and how many decisions they have made. Well, he has indicated that in 5 years they have met once and they have taken one action. And he is very concerned about who will be an Acting Chairman on this Council. Well, I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister should be more concerned about who will be members of the Judicial Council rather than who is going to be the Acting Chairman. Who are going to be the members of this Judicial Council? Because the law that we passed in 1972 said that one shall be a Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, two will be members in good standing of the Law Society of Manitoba and two will be two other persons. Well, if my information is correct, I think that it is correct because it has come from the Attorney-General's office, I understand that one member of that Judicial Council resigned last July and that vacancy has never been filled.

A MEMBER: Never been filled?

MR. GRAHAM: That person resigned to become the Executive Assistant to the Attorney-General.

A MEMBER: There's an election coming they'll fill it now, Harry. There's an election coming, they'll fill it now.

MR. GRAHAM: We're concerned the legislation we're dealing with is going to be really involved in who should be an Acting Chairman. Well, I would suggest that perhaps we should write into legislation that the person who shall be Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman should be the person who will be appointed to fill the vacancy. That has already been offered to me by the Attorney-General incidentally.

Now, Mr. Speaker. . .

A MEMBER: Now you're starting to get somewhere.

MR. GRAHAM: We're now coming to some of the real meat of the amendment — (Interjection) — Oh yes, there's real stuff in this Bill. "The Judicial Council may determine its own procedures and conduct inquiries as it deems appropriate." That's very broad and very all-encompassing, Mr. Speaker. They can pretty well do what they want. The Minister says he's not going to ride herd on them. There's no shot-gun here. He's not going to be involved at all in what the Judicial Council can do and what it cannot do. In fact, Mr. Speaker, throughout this whole Bill in the amendments, I find a rather strange thing occurring and it's contrary to so many things that do occur. And I am sure, if I compared it to his seat mate who is not present the Minister of Mines for instance, I don't think he would be bringing forward legislation somewhat like the legislation composed by the Attorney-General where he is absolving himself more or less from ministerial decision making. That's what he's doing.

A MEMBER: Shirking his responsibilities. . .

MR. GRAHAM: The Minister, and if you look at the Bill you can find out now what the Minister can do with the Bill. Number 1, the first power the Minister has, if you go through it in a logical order, his first responsibility is he can determine the number of copies of the Oaths of Office that shall be distributed. That's a big power for the Minister. . . Number two, he can accept the resignation of a judge. But having accepted it, what is he going to do? He cannot reappoint one, because that isn't his power. He doesn't want that authority. That power, he says, is, quite properly, the power of the whole Cabinet. He is not going to take that responsibility himself.

And then, he had another one. He had the power to decide whether the Judicial Council can hold their hearings in public or in private. But then he finds out and he says, "My God, I made a mistake." He says, "I didn't intend to keep that power. I don't want to make that decision." So when he brought in the bill, he tells us and I quote from Hansard on Page 820, he says, "unfortunately it slipped through the drafting." He intended to take that power away from himself. He says, "I don't want to make that decision." And he says that he is going to bring an amendment in himself. He will bring in that amendment to strip himself of those powers. However, he does have, he does have the power to set the remuneration and the out-of-pocket expenses of the Judicial Council and I don't begrudge him that power at all, Mr. Speaker, because after all in five years they have only met once. So, that part doesn't worry us too much.

On top of that, the Minister has retained for himself one very important power and I think it is the one thing in this whole bill where he has kept a lot of authority. He says he can prescribe who will be the Chief Judge in each jurisdiction. And I don't think he really thought about it or else he would have taken that out of the Act, too. But he still retains the right to designate who will be, pardon me, not the Chief Judge, the senior judge of each court. He has that power. And he also, although he waits for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to appoint the Chief Judge, he says that, "once they appoint him, I will spell out his duties." So that's another thing he kept.

All in all, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — I could go on. The Minister can establish the court areas and the place of sittings and he can change the boundaries of the court areas. Basically, Mr.

Speaker, we find that the Minister has, in essence, tried to remove himself from responsibility' and place that power with the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Under the Act, this is what the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can do. They can appoint the judges, set their salaries, the fees, etc. They can extend the time of retirement of a judge. They can appoint the members to the Judicial Council. They can remove a judge from office. They appoint the Chief Judge, they appoint magistrates and justices of the peace. They set the fees for the magistrates and J.P.'s. But where we all end up is that the Attorney-General is trying to absolve himself and remove his own authority from the Provincial Judges Act. He says, "I am not going to be responsible. I made a mistake once and I don't want to make it again." That is the essence of the changes that occurred in this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the words of the Minister of Health who says, "Be specific, come on, be specific." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not the intention, that is not the intention of any speeches on second reading where we are not supposed to make reference to specific sections in the bill. We're supposed to deal with the principles and here we are dealing with a principal who says that he doesn't want to be a principal. He doesn't want to assume the responsibilities of a Minister. He wants that responsibility shifted to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those types of actions are either attempts at trying to whitewash the grimy marks that have been placed on his image by his handling of Pilutik affair, or else it's a sign of a Minister who is quietly phasing himself out of public office' and getting ready to go back to private practice where he doesn't have to face the problems and the trials of the political realm.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are some of the comments that I want to make at this time with respect to this bill and I look forward to hearing the comments of others and the Attorney-General when he decides to close debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for St. Johns wish to go on the motion at the present time?

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Honourable Member for Assiniboia was proposing to adjourn debate.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed a few minutes ago, the Leader of the Opposition left the Chamber. I don't believe that he left in disgust. I don't believe that he left with chagrin and with real concern about the manner in which the man whom he has appointed as his shadow Attorney-General behaved today, I think he just left because he has other business to do and I would like the Member for Birtle-Russell to feel confident that he is secure in that job.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we heard a very shabby performance today. A man spoke today on this bill who has been attempting to smudge, besmirch, put stains on the Attorney-General for at least a year—two? I don't know how long he has been the spokesman for the Conservative Party on the Attorney-General's department—but he has tried his best by insinuation, by roundabout remarks, nothing direct, but always insinuation, to besmudge the Attorney-General and, Mr. Speaker, he has failed miserably. I hope that the media paid particular attention to the speech of the Honourable, the Member for Birtle-Russell, because the truth is, he said nothing. And the way he said it, Mr. Speaker, should be reported to the public. The attitude he took and the efforts he made to attempt in his superior manner to teach the Attorney-General how to operate, is to me, something that the electorate ought to know, especially those who are likely to have the opportunity to vote for or against him.

Mr. Speaker, he talked about the efforts of the Attorney-General to remove the stains which the poor Member for Birtle-Russell has been unable to maintain on the Attorney-General and then he proceeded to give a number of conclusions based entirely on his own imagination. He talked about Mr. Pilutik who has suffered more in the public eye through the utterances of the Member for Birtle-Russell than of any other utterances I have read. I knew Mr. Pilutik, I was therefore interested in reading whatever I can see the newspapers about the account. And what did I read' as compared to what the Member for Birtle-Russell read? I read that there were certain allegations made about the way Mr. Pilutik had conducted himself in relation to his job on the Bench. I read that the Attorney-General referred whatever the allegations were to the Judicial Council for consideration. I heard that the Judicial Council, I think it was headed by Mr. Justice Nitikman, announced that it would hold hearings and I heard that Mr. Pilutik resigned. And I heard that in the interval between the time the Judicial Council was seized with the problem and the time Mr. Pilutik resigned, that he voluntarily took leave of absence. And I assume that he did it out of a good sense of propriety which I would credit him with and possibly in order to devote the time he felt necessary to review the allegation, consult his lawyer because I also read that he employed a lawyer to consider it. That's what I read. And I read that after he resigned, Mr. Justice Nitikman said, "I am considering whether or not to proceed, in any event, with the hearing under the judicial council inquiry. And I read—I am just saying what I read, maybe I don't read the same newspapers and frankly, when I read our local newspapers I am not too much inclined to accept what they say as gospel but compared with the

Member for Birtle-Russell I have no hesitation in knowing whom to select to believe. I read that Mr. Justice Nitikman said that he believed that he could not go on because there is no longer an issue before him. The issue being whether or not Mr. Pilutik should continue to sit on the Bench and the issue having disappeared when Mr. Pilutik resigned from the Bench. That's the way I read it.

But the Member for Birtle-Russell, not today only, but especially today, by insinuation has tried, well, he has said, that Mr. Pilutik was removed by the Attorney-General. If he doesn't think he said it, I would like him to challenge me right now because I can't prove it until the record appears, but I'd like to know whether he knows that he said that the Attorney-General removed Mr. Pilutik, because I heard him say that. And since he is listening to what I am saying, he has the opportunity, right now, of saying that he did not say it or he did not mean to say it. —(Interjection)— The Member for Pembina says that the Member for Birtle-Russell doesn't want to interrupt me, I don't know why the Member for Pembina has to rise to the defense of the Member for Birtle-Russell. But I tell him that he is one of the friends of the Member for Birtle-Russell who indeed is prepared to rise to his defense because I think the Member for Birtle-Russell isn't prepared to do so for himself and he needs friends. He needs friends, Mr. Speaker and I do know that the Member for Pembina, whom I believe is a sincere and honest person would want to offer a hand of friendship to his colleague regardless of whether it is deserving.

Mr. Speaker, since there is no denial that the Member for Birtle-Russell said wrongly that the Attorney-General prohibited or removed Mr. Pilutik, let me also tell him that the Member for Birtle-Russell wanted to leave the impression that the Attorney-General prohibited Mr. Pilutik from sitting on the Bench. That's not true. But that is the impression that the Member for Birtle-Russell tried to leave. The Member for Birtle-Russell then went on in his very learned learned — he certainly researched this bill, Mr. Speaker, because you could tell that he not only 3 read the bill, he read the law. So he researched it. And what conclusion did he come to? Why that the Attorney-General is trying to slough off responsibility. Where it states here that the Chief Judge may suspend the judge who is the subject of inquiry, the Member for Birtle-Russell seems to want to say that the Attorney-General should retain the right to suspend or not to suspend. Oh, but no. Why the Attorney-General wants a judge to have that power, not he should have that power and the Member for Birtle-Russell appears critical of that. He would like, would he, that this matter remain in the political arena so the Attorney-General can make that kind of decision. And therefore, does that mean he is not prepared to let the courts, a court, a judge who may not have been politically independent in his lifetime, I mean in his pre-judge, in the life of the outer world, but has now retired into the cloisters of judicial objectivity, to make that decision? No. It's just that he is looking for something in which to drive a little bit of a knife into the back of anybody to whom he is speaking. That seems to be the need that he has. And when we find here a proposed amendment giving the Cabinet Executive Council certain powers which under the former bill, under the present law, are given to the Minister, the Member for Birtle-Russell is critical of it. Do you think he really has the delusion that there will be an election, that the Conservative Party will form a government, and that he will be the Attorney-General? Is that what he has in his mind? And is that why he wants to retain that the Minister shall have certain powers so he can have the power?

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to assure him. Firstly, I can assure him there will be an election. Secondly, I cannot assure him that the Conservatives will form the government. But Mr. Speaker, I can guarantee that the Leader of the Opposition today or the leader of the government tomorrow would never make the Member for Birtle-Russell the Attorney-General. And I really believe that to be so. And I think the Attorney-General ought really to look at the law from the standpoint of what is the best way to operate.

Mr. Speaker, there are many powers that are given to Cabinet that is the Executive Council of government but there are certain lesser administrative matters which are turned over to ministerial responsibility. The more there are, the less one can be assured that there will be a general over-all consideration or review. The main reason that a Minister is given certain powers as compared to that of the Cabinet is that you don't want to load the Cabinet with too many decision-making matters so that they will be sitting day and night dealing with matters which could be dealt with otherwise and secondly, because they are purely of administrative nature which the Minister should be able to do. But the Member for Birtle-Russell seems to think that when it is thought that something is of such an importance that it should be dealt with by Council, which incidentally then becomes a matter of public record as being filed as an Order-in-Council, why he seems to decry it. Why the Attorney-General is avoiding his obligations! Mr. Speaker, the comments he made in this regard are arrant nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to what he was saying because I began to realize that he was continuing his efforts to smear and besmirch the Attorney-General, which I suppose is fair game in his way of infighting, and then he proceeded to revive the Pilutik affair, who resigned remember, and Mr. Pilutik resigned for some reason and maybe it was because he didn't want that his name should be constantly raised on a political platform and put in the mouths of people such as the Member for

Birtle-russell. But he resigned. Therefore there was no proceeding against him. Therefore there was no hearing. This was his choice. He had every right to defend himself. He had every right not to resign. He had every right to appear at a hearing. He had every right to ask for that hearing to be public. He chose not to do any of these things for a good reason, I am sure. I think one of the reasons may have been that he wanted to let this matter disappear from public attention but the Member for Birtle-Russell in his great ambition and his great desire to constantly attack the Attorney-General, because he can't attack him on any other way or in any other way, is constantly referring to matters of this type; again raising Mr. Pilutik's name; again throwing shadows on Mr. Pilutik who he says is innocent and yet he is the one who is constantly damning him by raising the question, by hammering it home, and by throwing insinuations.

Mr. Speaker, I said that his contribution was nonsense, arrant nonsense, I really believe it is. I do think I am going to go back and reread what he said today just to confirm my impression that I am right. I did urge that the media report what he said, and how he said it, because I do think that too few times do our electorate know the calibre of the people that represent us, and their manner and their style.

The Member for Charleswood, I believe . . . —(Interjection)— Some member opposite . . . Sorry. Some member opposite agreed with my statement. —(Interjection)— I'm sorry, I'm sorry, the Member for Charleswood. I am wrong. I really thought that he is the one who said here, here. But regardless of that somebody agreed with me that this is desirable. I think we would all agree that it is desirable that the electorate know the calibre and the style of the members they elect. And I would feel rather badly if . . . I would even like to see his speech reported verbatim in his own local newspaper because, Mr. Speaker, I still say he made no contribution except to his own self-pride in the way he could attempt in his own mind to think that he accomplished something great on the political platform. And in doing so that he attempted further in his efforts to besmirch the name of the Attorney-General and I assure him again, he can't do it. I don't believe he can do it in this House. I don't believe that members of his own party have the kind of low opinion that he would like to suggest they ought to have of the Attorney-General. I believe the Attorney-General is respected on all sides of the House. I happen to think that he is one of those Ministers who is least likely to deserve the kind of insinuations that are made by the Member for Birtle-Russell.

Mr. Speaker, I assure you I would not have spoken today had there not been an intention to adjourn debate, because the Attorney-General doesn't need to be defended by anyone, he can do it for himself. Had he had the opportunity to speak today I'm satisfied he would have answered the Member for Birtle-Russell and didn't need any help from anybody else. But I just felt that if the Member for Birtle-Russell is prepared to talk the way he did it should not be allowed to just lie there today. And that's why I appreciate the Member for Assiniboia deferring his proposed motion to permit me to speak. At least for my satisfaction, and my conscience, I am able to say I tried in some way to put the Member for Birtle-Russell in the place which I think he ought to be, which is probably out of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie wish to speak, as well?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: No. I wish to adjourn the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I already have a suggested motion from the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. But I'll take it from the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. It doesn't matter.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Then I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill (No. 15) proposed by the Honourable Minister of Co-Operatives. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill (No. 18) proposed by the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill (No. 23) proposed by the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL (NO. 20) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE SOCIAL ALLOWANCES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS presented Bill (No. 20), An Act to Amend The Social Allowances Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it should take too long to explain the content of this bill. There are various amendments in addition to a section, Section 22, that will facilitate the

judge's decision in the ultimate implementation of Orders for Payment. There is also housekeeping. The Director of Social Services will now be known as the Executive Director of Social Services. Apparently that has to happen because of another Act that was passed.

The other points that I would like to try to explain here, that before anyone is eligible to receive social allowances he will have to make himself available to any other income that might come his way, for instance, Old Age Security, Canadian Pension Plan, Unemployment Insurance. All these methods will have to be exhausted before he could collect social allowances. There is another one, that this will permit the recoveries of money owing to a recipient by a third party, even when this recipient fails or refuses to pursue the third party. The Director of Social Security will have the right, in other words, to go after a third party that might owe the prospective recipient any money. It might be that somebody was injured in an accident and for some reason or other he doesn't want to pursue, well then the Director will have the right to do so if this is not done within, I think it's three months or so.

Then the municipalities now are in the practice of registering liens on all welfare payments. Well they will have to limit these to cases where payments include moneys incurring to the recipients that will increase their equity in the property. For instance, the province will now have liens only in areas on payments that might increase the equity of a person. That is that his property would be worth more than that is all. But most of the municipalities place a lien on everything and this is not cost-shared by Ottawa, by the Federal Government, and we don't intend to cost-share with the municipalities anymore. We don't particularly like the idea of placing liens on everything. So this will stop that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: I'd like to move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL (NO. 25) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE BUILDINGS AND MOBILE HOMES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY presented Bill No. 25, An Act to amend The Buildings and Mobile Homes Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes' Mr. Speaker, as members are aware we introduced a bill establishing The Buildings and Mobile Homes Act which, generally speaking, provided for the adoption of a building code and also certain rules and regulations pertaining to the construction of buildings and also for the requirements under The Mobile Homes of a permit for sale.

The main purposes, Mr. Speaker, of the amendments that I am suggesting at this time is to ensure that all buildings are built in accordance with certain specified construction safety standards and to ensure that all mobile home travel trailers, and similar units, sold or leased in the province meet specified standards of safety. Now that was applicable in the general terms of the legislation which is now in effect. And members will have possibly noted that as of the 1st of April, this year, the standard building code for Manitoba becomes effective.

There is now some question, however, as to the practicability of applying the requirements of the Act and the regulations to buildings or homes built at a site other than the site at which the home is to be located. I'll give you, for instance, the fact that many homes are prefabricated or built here in the southern part of the province and are moved to remote areas in northern Manitoba, just as an illustration of what I am getting at. It now appears to be quite common for buildings or parts of them to be built at locations which resemble factories and are then relocated to a more permanent location. These amendments, which I am proposing with minor changes to the regulations, will require any person who sells or leases such a factory-built home or building to obtain a permit for that purpose. A permit will of course be not issued unless the home is built in accordance with specified construction safety standards.

The objective of our original legislation, as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, was to ensure a protection for the ultimate consumer in construction on site. I've had numerous representations made to me that the Act was deficient to the degree that there was no inspections actually made insofar as construction of homes were concerned on off-site locations. I have indeed on one or two occasions, Mr. Speaker, had it drawn to my attention that, for instance, the wiring may have been deficient and unsafe. So the purpose of this is to make sure that the houses that are built off-site are under the same general rules of those that are built on-site for the purpose of safety.

Now I can appreciate the fact that some might consider that this is another methodology that the government is using that is the issuance of permits to obtain more revenue for the treasury. May I suggest that such is not the case. The permits will be of a nominal nature and I'm sure will not fully cover the actual cost of the inspections.

I trust and hope that the members of the Assembly will accept as a principle of this bill and the intent for which I introduce it for the consideration, as a whole, of the bill for the protection of those

areas that are outside of the general inspection areas at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL (NO. 26) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE APPRENTICESHIP AND TRADESMEN'S QUALIFICATIONS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY presented Bill An Act to amend The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualifications Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to sort of aid in plugging-up an area that has been of some concern for some time under The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualifications Act whereby generally speaking a person who is going to be an apprentice and is endangered his indenture to a single firm and normally having a ratio of an apprenticeship one apprentice to a certain number of mechanics. The basic principle behind this bill is to make it possible for a pooling of smaller contractors to be able to have an apprentice and sort of for the purpose of learning the trade so that the apprentice can move from one small contractor say, or even a small printer to another in order to become qualified as a craftsman.

I would like to introduce this bill to amend The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen's Qualification Act. These amendments are essentially technical and represent no change at all in the principle of the prime Act. The purpose of these proposed amendments is to expand the definition of the term "agreement", so that an apprenticeship agreement can include what is referred to as "pool agreements".

Under the terms of such an agreement an apprentice could, with the approval of the director of apprenticeship and tradesmen's qualifications, become indentured to an organization, association or committee. At the present time an apprentice must be indentured to an employer. This does not, however, take into account situations particularly in the construction industry where apprentices move from one job to another and from one employer to the other. Under such circumstances it is very difficult for an apprentice to become indentured to an employer, as such is the requirement at the present time.

With the amendments it will be possible to register such an apprentice with an employer or an employee organization, or with a trades advisory committee. In this way the organization or committee, rather than any single employer, will be responsible for overseeing the training of the apprentice and the mobility of apprentices among different employers will be improved, increasing their potential for continuous employment and their exposure to various aspects of the trade. In other words, if this is accepted and approved an apprentice will be able in the terms of an agreement with various employers or union or the Trades Advisory Board move from one area to the other and the specific parts of the training which could conceivably or would conceivably lead to a fully qualified mechanic. With one employer who provides all of those different services, it can be then achieved by virtue of the changes within the industry but under supervision and control so that the apprentice just does not learn piecemeal or at least with one employer all the time and to move from one to the other in order to improve his expertise in the particular trade.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: I would like to ask a question before the . . . is adjourned. Can the Minister indicate to the House and make it clear, will it apply to the government employees as well? You know, there may be in some place where an employee could be working for the public works and leaving to go to a private or from a private sector and still be able to have the privileges of the apprentice trade?

MR. PAULLEY: I believe eventually it could conceivably be, although I must say that at the present time if the honourable member is talking of government being what we call the core Civil Service there isn't what I would say — and maybe regretfully I say this — a real apprentice application at the present time, so I guess my answer would have to be, Mr. Speaker, that it's conceivable that there would be if we had a proper apprenticeship training and the member, Mr. Speaker, raises a very interesting question which leads to the type of application that is envisioned if these amendments are passed instead of a fellow just coming around here changing hinges if he goes, say into some other section in the Civil Service, say in the carpentry trade and does another type of work, he eventually might be able to receive fully qualified tradesmen certificates.

MR. PATRICK: Just one more question, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for his answer. Would the Minister really give serious consideration while the bill is in second reading to those employees that would give them an opportunity in the public Civil Service?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my answer to my honourable friend is: As an ex-apprentice in a trade

that point has been under consideration and as a legislation, most of this legislation can be applicable, maybe it is, I'm not sure, I'd have to look at the major Act that it is applicable to the Crown. I'm sure that it would be applicable to the Crown insofar as external agencies like Hydro and Telephones — they have apprentices. He's right, although it may not be related precisely to the bill, I think my honourable friend's questions are in the form of a general criticism because we haven't got an apprenticeship scheme at the present time — (Interjection) — Who, me? Oh, we get along very well. I think mainly the questions are one of apprentices . . . and I accept the criticism.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL (NO. 29) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE SNOWMOBILE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK presented Bill (No. 29) An Act to Amend the Snowmobile Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief on this particular bill. There are two or three pertinent amendments in this bill. Some of the other amendments are of the housekeeping nature but I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the Snowmobile Act of Manitoba is to be judged by the results obtained, it must be deemed to be one of the best Acts of its kind in Canada. Our fatality rate involving the use of snowmobiles generally and snowmobile accidents occurring on highways is the lowest of any province in Canada on a *per capita* basis. This result was achieved at least in part by the rather severe restrictions imposed by the Act on the use of snowmobiles on our highways. Unlike some provinces who allow snowmobiles to be operated upon the roadway of certain highways, snowmobiles in Manitoba cannot be operated on a roadway except for the purpose of crossing it. However, this restriction has led to certain problems in some communities, particularly the remote communities where during the winter months the snowmobile is the principal mode of transportation. This problem was further compounded in those communities owing to the fact that many of the persons who operate snowmobiles do not have a driver's license as they do not own a motor vehicle.

Similar problems have arisen in other communities in the province where snowmobiling is a very popular form of local recreation. In smaller communities especially, the person wishing to operate a snowmobile and strictly comply with the provisions of the Act, has to trailer his snowmobile outside the limits of the town in which he resides before he can legally operate it either in a ditch or other places where snowmobiles can be operated. In many instances, the distances involved are relatively short and as a consequence made many snowmobile operators use a variety of back lanes and lightly travelled streets as access roads to and from these communities. Currently the powers granted to the local council does not include the right to designate in a by-law certain streets and lanes as access routes to and from the particular community.

The bill before the members of the House contains a number of provisions designed to provide some relief from the present restrictions contained in the Act. One such provision will allow persons resident of remote communities to operate snowmobiles upon or across a roadway without being required to hold a driver's license or to be 16 years of age. However, before that right can be exercised, each community would have to enact a by-law designating the roadways upon which snowmobiles may be driven. Also the bill contains a definition of a remote community for the purpose of identifying those communities to which this provision would apply.

The bill also contains a provision which extends the powers of local council to enact by-laws permitting the operation of snowmobiles upon designated roadways or portions thereof, both in remote and other communities. In many communities there are streets which are seldom used by vehicular traffic and these can be designated by the local council as snowmobile access routes.

As a precaution and to ensure that motorists using such roadways upon which snowmobiles are permitted to be operated, a provision is being proposed which would require the local traffic authority to erect appropriate signs indicating to other traffic that snowmobiles are allowed to travel upon that particular roadway.

For safety reasons it is not desirable to permit the operation of snowmobiles in the left lane or other lanes of a multi-lane roadway or two abreast at the same time. Therefore, in order to prohibit such practise, a measure is proposed in the bill which will require snowmobiles to operate as close to the right-hand edge or curb of a roadway as practical and prohibits the operation of two snowmobiles abreast.

A provision is proposed in the bill which will provide discretion to judges when dealing with an offence under this particular act and where the evidence indicates that the offence was committed under extenuating circumstances or where the fault could not be wholly attributed to the

accused, a judge could either acquit the accused or convict and impose a reprimand. The provision is similar to that contained in the Highway Traffic Act to deal with technical breaches of the Act or where the offence occurred under very unusual circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, just to mention again there are a number of other minor details just really housekeeping changes.

QUESTION put.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Riel, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

ESTIMATES — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN: I refer honourable members to Page 32 of their Estimates Book. The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if I could beg leave of the Committee to make an announcement that is related to the Department but not under the item that we're discussing at this time.

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

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, a few months ago there was an announcement saying that in 1978 the Manitoba Winter Games would be held and we asked the different municipalities that were interested to put in their bids. We received four bids and these submissions were reviewed and the proposed facilities and plan examined by a committee of the Manitoba Games Council which serves as an advisory committee to the Minister to run the Games.

The four were Swan River, Dauphin, Morden and Portage la Prairie. There was a delay — we originally intended to make the announcement some time in the latter part of February. There was a delay because of what was happening in other areas. We were looking at the possibility of decentralizing the Games. Because of the delay and other reasons — there are other reasons involved also — one of the towns withdrew its bid. That was Swan River. As they were very seriously being considered, I was in touch with them and asked if they would reconsider because the announcement would be made soon but after meeting they felt that there were other reasons also and they shouldn't go ahead, so there is no point in delaying this any longer.

Today I would like to make the announcement that the 1978 — sometime in March, I guess — the Winter Games will be held in Dauphin. Now, I will have an official release going out to the media but I thought that I should inform the members of this House at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 62(c)(1) Income Security Programs, Social Allowances — \$51,926,200 — pass? Resolution 62(c)(2). The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be able to comment at this time concerning an issue I raised with him . . . provide him with the correspondence related to the regulations section 4(1)(j)(2) of the regulations concerning the application of the Social Assistance Act to those who have property and if he could comment on the particular case.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Well, of course, there was a decision of the Board that we respect — and we're still respecting it as for this case — but this brought a new policy from the department and maybe I should announce it at this time.

Under the new policy, we compute income as follows: 90 percent of gross income from roomers and 70 percent of gross income from boarders — like that is board and room — and this applies to each roomer or boarder including the first roomer or boarder.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The question I would ask then is that under this new formula, would it be . . . 9 applied to the person in question, a Mrs. Simcoe whose case we were discussing, who I gather is presently faced with the problems, and I am not sure, I haven't had time to figure out, if a new formula is more favourable or less favourable to those circumstances. I am wondering if the Minister might be able to comment on that at all?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, under the case of Mrs. Simcoe, we are going along with the decision of the

appeal board and we haven't changed that. They are still under the old formula as ruled by the appeal board.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, in one sense I was hoping the Minister might provide a little bit further explanation because the oddity that I found in this particular circumstance was that when the regulations came in, it ended up from what I could figure out in this particular case, the person involved being reduced down to an income far below that than what they would normally be receiving under social assistance. And I can't quite figure out why the law works in a way that where someone is attempting to provide partial income for themselves through the provision of a roomer boarding in their place, then the way that the social income regulations now appear to work is that a person gets penalized for attempting to provide for some partial income to support themselves. The way the formula, as I read this case, worked out was that if you went on social assistance, you get the full thing. If the woman wanted to stay in her home with a boarder to help pay the cost, then her actual cash will be substantially reduced. It seems to me that is kind of self-defeating, forcing someone out of their house because of a boarder, requiring the payment of a lot more money, where in fact if they had been allowed to stay in their house and keep the boarder, it would cost social assistance less money. But the way it is now, it kind of works in a Catch-22 kind of an arrangement.

MR. DESJARDINS: A person could stay in their house. The social welfare will pay the heat, the tax, everything, and then 90 percent of what this person collects will be considered income. It is income; there is no expense to it under the new thing, and 70 percent if it is board and room but we are paying all the bills. So I think that it is only fair. If we don't do that, what is the difference between somebody working part-time and earning money somewhere else? This is all we are saying and I don't want to go into details because I don't want to generalize in this, but many cases, some of these people are living common law and that is a way to beat the system also. —(Interjection)— Oh, I am not talking about any of this. That is why I said I don't to generalize on that but there are quite a few of the people that are doing that. So it is a legit revenue, we are paying the bills and so on and they can keep ten percent of the cost if it is only a roomer and if it is board and room 70 percent.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I will have to take a look at the formula but it does raise within this administration of social assistance a somewhat broader issue, and that is the degree to which the regulations and the formula for assistance are designed so as to provide a degree of incentive for individuals on social assistance to acquire part-time income to be able then not to have to make full draw upon social assistance payments. And again it comes to my attention, talking to a number of people, that the way it tends to work now is that there isn't that much incentive given and it is almost that you are so heavily penalized by working part-time or by acquiring income through other means that it is almost better not to do it and that therefore the attempt to work out a system which I gather was one of the objectives of the income security project was to work on a graduated scale so that as the number of dollars earned increased, that there would be increasing proportion that would be able to be maintained for personal income and that the social assistance payments would not be cut off automatically as it went up.

I really think, Mr. Chairman, that that is an area within the Social Welfare Act, Social Assistance Act which needs to be looked at because it really does provide, from my assessment of it, very limited incentive for those who work or find ways of making at least part of their own income through private means. I think that that is always a problem in any social welfare act, that it either pays all or nothing, and I don't think the incentive program here is as attractive as it might be if in fact part of the purpose of it is to bring people or give people an opportunity to get some gainful employment on their own account. I can think of two or three cases — actually more than that — that have come to my attention where there tends to be a heavier penalty for someone who wants to go out and work part-time than for someone who stays on full assistance.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, we are even now going further than what the Federal Government was ready to approve on this and they made an exception for our province because of this. Now I might say there has been this Mincome experience that looks at the question of guaranteed income with the negative tax. This is something that we certainly are interested in and I am told that the Federal Government is showing interest. The Minister at one time was very interested but because of the discussion that went on and I think that some of the members of his Cabinet felt that this would be too costly at this time but now they are showing renewed interest. I think this guaranteed income, that pilot project or that study, should be finished in about a year or so and I know that other provinces are interested in it also but I could tell my honourable friend that Manitoba is very interested in that. And if we could give more incentive, we would be all for it. We are going the limit that we are allowed now under the federal regulations.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, it then raises another question that maybe that we are somewhat jumping categories. But it was my understanding that in effect the income security project was really coming to an end, was being closed down, and that the Minister now seems to be indicating that there may be renewed interest in it of some kind, or perhaps he could explain a little bit further whether in fact the results coming out of that experiment are going to be applied in some way or whether it is

simply going to be cut off and will be lost to us, or whether there will be some report prepared as to what it does indicate in relation to that experiment which was a very expensive experiment but one I think that was probably worth doing at the time. But it seems now that it is coming to an end and I gather now that, I am not sure if he simply said that we are interested in it, or whether in fact we are going to do something about it to try to implement part of that idea of an incentive program for employment as part of the social assistance program.

MR. DESJARDINS: There is an item of Mincome, there is an item on the same page anyway, on the same sheet, and the experience is coming to an end, but as scheduled. And the statement I made is that I hope that it will not be all wasted. I am sure that some of this data, some of this information, they have never had before. I said that the Federal Government is eagerly awaiting the results and other provinces too and I wouldn't be a bit surprised if there is talk of reintroducing the subject and maybe that this might be implemented at a later date but of course I can't guarantee that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30, 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. D4

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 10

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Hour. The first item is Resolutions. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the indulgence of the House to make a 3 correction in the wording of the last paragraph of Resolution No. 10 and if the House agrees, I would like the correction by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member by leave proceed and insert the corrections and then we will ask whether he has consent or not?

MR. BLAKE: Resolution No. 10, Mr. Speaker, should be corrected by adding after the phrase "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED" in the first line of the last paragraph, by adding the words "that the government of Manitoba consider the advisability of requesting" and it goes on

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable? (Agreed) Carry on.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In introducing this resolution at this time . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member make the motion first.

MR. BLAKE: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, that a resolution be adopted by the House:

WHEREAS approximately 160 recreational facilities, community arenas, etc. across Manitoba have been seriously affected economically by the recent introduction of demand metering policies of Manitoba Hydro, and

WHEREAS the demand metering policies of Manitoba Hydro are causing economic and social hardships as public recreational facilities attempt to meet the enormous increased costs of heat, light, and water bill, and

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 increased hydro rates, and

WHEREAS many recreational facilities may be forced to restrict operations or in some cases close their doors due to the demand metering policies of Manitoba Hydro,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of requesting Manitoba Hydro to adjust its rate charges so that all recreational facilities in Manitoba be charged a flat rate or a more feasible and sensible rate based on the amount of hydro-electric energy actually consumed in the premises.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that we have got that on the floor we are off and running. In introducing this bill, Mr. Speaker, I do so with the conviction that there is a serious problem area in the costs that will be faced by the local arenas and I do this with a considerable amount of experience in travelling throughout the rural areas of Manitoba and I have had many individuals and many many groups that are concerned with the operation of these arenas express these concerns to me. And we are all well aware that in many many cases these arenas wouldn't have been built or improved or upgraded in many of the rural areas without considerable infusion of government funds by way of recreation grants or forgivable loans. The municipal loan fund has been very active and the municipalities and the recreation people have been very quick to take advantage of forgivable loans under the Winter Works Programs and without this type of assistance I am sure that many of the recreational facilities in some of the smaller communities probably wouldn't have been built or upgraded to the extent that they are today.

They have done this of course with an eye to operating costs that they felt that they could manage. They have budgeted and checked out the costs of operating in some of the larger areas the artificial ice-making machinery that is necessary to provide them with additional months of recreation activity. And when you apply a rate such as is being proposed, that most of them are going on now on a demand-billing basis, it is going to make the cost of operating those units virtually prohibitive.

Now there are many of these programs as I mentioned that wouldn't have started without some type of government assistance or forgivable loans or grants and we see, I think, all too often in today's society where many programs get the initial start with a government grant or a supposed hand-out of some description and only to find that later on that support is withdrawn and the communities are faced with extremely heavy and unbearable costs in many cases to maintain the facilities because there are only a limited number of people who are active and able to carry the load in many many instances.

Mr. Speaker, I have received, as I said earlier, many representations from many people and from many groups in connection with costs. There have been many articles in the news media on it and the one just recently where the president of Manitoba Parks and Recreation Association has indicated, almost to a word' what we are requesting in this particular resolution, that in many many cases the actual energy used has been doubled or tripled with the application of demand billing.

The offer of grants on hydro-electric energy consumed I don't think is a solution. I would not like to see grants or subsidies applied. I would like to see a realistic rate and that is a rate for the actual energy consumed applied to these particular recreation facilities.

The application of demand billing as we heard in the Public Utilities Committee last week is not new but it has never been applied to the recreation facilities in the rural areas or, I suppose, in the city areas before. We find, Mr. Speaker, when you check with some of the recreation people some of them have been put on demand billing now and some of them are not on demand billing yet. But the Glenboro arena, for example, in January would pay a bill of \$722; in May and June they would pay around \$50.00 Under demand billing that bill for May or June will be about 570-and-some dollars and that is throughout the year. The Wawanesa arena, for example, Mr. Speaker, their hydro bill in 1975 was \$9,529.00. They are estimating \$16,000 this year for hydro. The demand billing, their meter has been set at 312 which gives them an average monthly bill of \$740.88 throughout the summer months when there is no activity whatsoever in the arena unless it be a special occasion during fair day or something of that nature, a large public meeting where there are no other halls in town to provide a facility that large. Erickson arena in 1975 paid \$2,263 hydro. In 1976 they paid \$3,690 and this year they will probably pay in excess of something like \$7,000.00

A MEMBER: Wow!

MR. BLAKE: The Local Government District of Gillam in 1975 had a hydro bill of \$34,720; in 1976 it was \$51,487, an increase of 48.29 percent. Now the arena breakdown in 1974 was \$4,300 for the curling club, the arena was \$5,600; 1975 was \$6,984 and 1976 for the arena was \$12,121.00. Now these rates, Mr. Speaker, illustrate The Pas arena in 1975, \$14,000 for a hydro bill and they're on demand billing. These rates, Mr. Speaker, there is any amount of information available. Hamiota, for example, in my particular area, their hydro bill for their arena complex in '75 was \$3,048, in '76 it was \$3,784 which was an increase of 24.14 percent which is the increase in the hydro rates. The projected rate for 1977 is about \$7,000.00. What I'm illustrating, Mr. Speaker, in demand billing the rates for that particular arena at Hamiota for May, June, July, August and September was \$27.80, \$24.76, \$24.76, \$25.29, \$24.67, that was last year. Under demand billing this year that \$24.00 bill will now become for those five months \$572.24. Now it's something excess of \$3,000 that that community will be faced with, Mr. Speaker.

Another small arena in the smaller community of Foxwarren, the area of the Member for Birtle-Russell, in \$4,900.00 '75 the hydro bill was \$7,100 in 1976. For 1977 it is projected it will be in the neighbourhood of \$9,000 to \$10,000.00 And they do operate for one of the summer months, they run

a hockey school there.

But these rates, Mr. Speaker, provide ample evidence that the increase to the demand billing method of charging for the energy in the arenas is presenting a terrible problem to these recreation committees that are in charge of these rinks. They are all volunteer people and our purpose in bringing the resolution forward is to urge the government to consider the advisability of having Manitoba Hydro adopt a realistic approach to recreation facilities such as this and put them on an energy-consumed basis. We don't feel that they should ask for a grant or a subsidy because once you provide grants to facilities of this nature the grants will be used for some other purpose, probably other than what they were intended for. So, therefore, we are suggesting that the meter be applied to actually reflect the energy actually used and in some areas we know that the Manitoba Hydro has a program of customer education or whatever might be the term to be applied. There is no question about it that many many of these facilities can save energy in many instances. We know there are occasions when artificial ice plants in curling rinks are working and there's a heater on in the building to provide an easier climate for them to perform in, to take the chill off the air and this is not good energy conservation. I think Manitoba Hydro is to be commended in the steps that they are taking to educate some of the people operating arenas on energy conservation, little tricks of the trade so to speak on when to turn their artificial ice plants on and when to turn them off, when to make the best use of the energy they are being charged for. There are many many more instances. The instances in one of the letters to the editor used Starbuck, McAuley, Pine River and a hundred others.

Now I have many other statistics that haven't been completely compiled or forwarded to me yet, Mr. Speaker. There will be additional ones coming in from day to day as the people in these communities provide them. But we have received enough of them to get a real good picture that the demand billing method of charging for hydro in the rural areas and in the recreation facilities of city areas as well, is presenting a hardship on the people using the facilities and the people occupying, and particularly the rural areas which is my main concern because there are a small number of people. The same people are working running the rinks and 90 percent of the time it's on a voluntary basis and for them to have to go out now and raise another two, to three, to four thousand dollars it is extremely difficult. They have to put on another two or three fowl suppers, another two or three bingos, which I don't think they should be asked to do when, if they paid for the actual energy consumed in operating their facility, it wouldn't require this extra two or three thousand dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what other statistics or figures that I might be able to add to encourage members opposite and my colleagues on this side of the House to support the resolution because we all know that the curling rink or the skating rink in many of our rural areas is the hub of activity in the town during the winter months. It's just buzzing with action at all times and to place an extra burden such as is being placed on them now, it is just going to be very very difficult for many of them to keep operating and have the doors remain open. I think in some instances facilities have been built in some of the rural areas that they're probably looking at now and wishing they had not upgraded them or had not built the new facility and allowed for some transportation costs maybe to get the children to a larger centre where they could enjoy the artificial ice because with these rates there is just no possible way that many of the arenas are going to put in artificial ice. There are a number around Manitoba that are geared for it and I'm sure that when faced with an additional burden such as this they are not going to be proceeding with artificial ice. I can name two instances where that is the case, Mr. Speaker.

So with that I would urge members opposite and the members on this side of the House to support the motion and urging the government to consider the advisability of requesting Hydro to apply a metered rate to the recreation facilities to charge them for the energy actually used. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. URUSKI: A question, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member gave numerous figures of total bills. Has he got the figures at his hand to relate to the actual consumption of those various months of those various activities as he related the bills from one year to the other? Does he have the consumption of those bills that he gave?

MR. BLAKE: No, Mr. Speaker. I don't have the actual bills. I have the actual bills that were sent to me from Russell but the other one just listed the actual bills. I suppose they took the figures from their books. For example I mentioned the rink at Hamiota where they actually paid last May \$27.80. In June they paid \$24.76. Under demand billing that will jump to \$570 some —(Interjection)— Well, their consumption would be \$27.80 worth. I can't see them consuming any more than that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Minnedosa for affording me the opportunity to discuss some of the matters raised in his resolution dealing with the problems created, that he states have been created by establishing demand billing.

First, I would like to indicate to him some of the statistics that are applicable today on demand billing. Of some total number of curling and skating clubs today, some 671, there is a total number on

demand billing of only 73. Of these 73 it has not been possible, at least Manitoba Hydro has not been looking at the facts as to whether they are privately operated or public recreational centres but there are some figures giving some comparisons on demand billing and general service rates. Bills over 20 percent higher on demand billing, number of customers 15; bills 10 to 20 percent higher on demand billing, 6; bills 0 to 10 percent higher on demand billing, 12; bills 0 to 10 percent lower on demand billings' 12; bills 10 to 20 percent lower on demand billing, 10; bills over 20 percent lower on demand billing, 10; for a total of 65. So you find in that figure about 50 percent on demand billing have gone up and 50 percent on demand billing, the total costs have gone down. —(Interjection)— I've just indicated that, Sir, these are on curling rinks, some 65 curling rinks, there is a total of —(Interjection)— These are artificial ice, that is when they put them on demand billing. And I'd like to explain what demand billing is about. But, before I do that I'd like to indicate that since 1972 or thereabouts, the province through various grants has expended some \$50 million in various forms through municipal loans, through the lotteries revenue and through the PEP programs in aiding communities to improve their recreational facilities. So it is agreed, Mr. Speaker, that the expectations of the communities have increased but so has . . . when you improve the facilities you increase the period of time when the facilities are going to be used, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— I will answer questions at the end.

The Member for Minnedosa indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the usage of these facilities was greatly increased so it stands to reason, even if it was just strictly without putting in artificial ice, that the rates would have been lower, but when you put in artificial ice you have much longer usage. Just in the fact that there is longer usage the costs of operating these facilities would have gone up. It's straight common sense. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have some suggestions how this matter can be dealt with. We do not treat this matter very lightly and we are certainly concerned but I would like to explain some facts what demand billing is about.

Demand billing, well the opposition had opportunity to ask questions last Tuesday — not last Tuesday, pardon me, a week ago Tuesday, when Manitoba Hydro was appearing before the Public Utilities Committee and they will have an opportunity to pursue the questions regarding demand billing. But I would like to explain some of the matters dealing with demand billing. Demand billing or demand metering as it is also called is a widely used method for charging the cost of electric service to a customer in direct proportion to the greatest electrical load he places on the electric system. Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to provide the type of energy that is required when you put in all of the infrastructure such as heaters and also artificial ice plants, all of these things, there is no way of measuring when that is going to come onstream, so you have to build a lot of expensive equipment so that at any time the community requires it then it is going to be available. With demand billing the customer's bill contains two parts, a charge for the amount of electrical energy consumed, measured in kilowatt hours — this is what the ordinary domestic meter measures and that's the kind that all of us have in our homes; two, a charge for the maximum demand or electrical load placed on the utility during a billing period. This is known as the demand component and is measured in kilowatts. In other words a demand meter shows the maximum rate at which electricity is used and an energy meter measures only the amount of energy used. Given an example of what a demand meter looks like at the last hearing of the Public Utilities Committee, it indicated the maximum usage and where the meter would stop that was used in any particular period of time. And then you have the ordinary meter which measures the amount of kilowatt hours that you used in any particular period. Demand or rate of consumption is extremely important to the electric utility because electricity for all practical purposes cannot be stored as you all know. A utility when it connects a customer must be prepared to supply the maximum amount of electricity the customer can use at any hour of the day or night and that is one of the things the costs involve, that they have to be prepared and therefore always that energy must be available. —(Interjection)— If you become patient, Dave, we'll get to that point. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.

It therefore must install sufficient generating transmission distribution and transformer capacity to meet the maximum conceivable demand the customer can impose on the system at any given time. This requires a heavy fixed cost investment for each customer that may have little relationship to the amount of energy actually used by the customer.

On the Manitoba Hydro System since April 1st, 1976 all general service, that is commercial customers who have an indicated demand of 55,000 kilowatts or more, are subject to demand billing, that's 55 Kva. This assured the utility that the larger commercial operations are paying their share of the cost they are imposing on the utility. Demand metering does not necessarily result in higher electricity bills as I've indicated by the comparison on the curling clubs which are on demand billing today. The customer who makes an effort to manage or limit his demand is rewarded by a lower demand charge.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those members of the Public Utilities Committee who were present last week would have been able to learn something from the explanations given by staff of Manitoba Hydro.

The customer who makes more effective year-round use of his electrical equipment is rewarded by lower energy costs. The demand billing system provides an inducement for the customer to make his electricity consumption which in turn will have the effect of reducing the utility's cost.

Demand billing, Mr. Speaker, has been in use for many years' and most industrial customers. . .

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

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I just wonder if the member might table the document that he's quoting from for us, so as we would have it for our information.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Minnedosa will be able to look at Hansard. These are my notes that I have been able to gather together, and they are compiled from a series if you wanted to work on it, you could have done it on your own, if you took the time.

Mr. Speaker, demand billing has been in use for many years and most industrial customers take effective steps to manage their electrical load. This can be done manually with proper planning. It can also be done by installation of a peak load alarm or it can be done automatically. Now, Mr. Speaker, again the staff of Manitoba Hydro is well qualified to give any customer the necessary advice as to the type of equipment that can be best used for their particular recreational facility which they find possibly with some practical information and advice that they can readily improve the cost involved to that recreational facility.

The end result is that selected electrical equipment is not used during peak usage periods. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know I have a skating rink in my area, and I know that it has an automatic electric freezing component and also at the same time there is a heater. So when there is a lot of people and you still find the heater on, certainly it seems to me that it would be logical to have those heaters turned off when there is an awful lot of people, because people do tend to generate a lot of heat — as the Honourable Member for Minnedosa generated a lot of heat but very little information as to how this solution can be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: It is not necessary nor desirable that all this equipment be used simultaneously. I know, Mr. Speaker' in many areas with the grants that the communities receive through the various programs that the province initiated, they have improved their facilities and it naturally would have added to the total overall cost.

However, proper planning in almost any operation can result in substantial reduction in electrical demand without serious inconvenience. Any reduction in electrical demand will reduce the demand component of the customer's bill.

In 1968, Mr. Speaker, following the announcement of the first general rate increase in Manitoba's history the Public Utilities Board was asked to review Manitoba Hydro's rate policies. Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside will remember those years. They engaged the services of Abasco Services, a leading utility consulting service from New York which is considered the world experts in the field of hydro rate establishment.

The Board in its report recommended greater use of demand billing. In 1974 when the electric rates were again raised the same firm was retained to advise Manitoba Hydro.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Their report again recommended increased use of demand billing and Manitoba Hydro has been moving in this direction since then.

Three points should be made clear, Mr. Speaker:

1. Demand billing is a fair and widely accepted technique for assessing electric costs in relation to the demands each customer places on the utility.

2. Demand billing does not necessarily mean that the electric costs will go up with the same consumption. In many cases the cost of electricity may actually go down, and I have already indicated that of the 65 customers, some 50 percent who are on demand billing, their costs have gone down. —(Interjection)— Yes, I can give you those figures.

3. Although the cost of electricity has been rising, consumption by individual customers continues to increase. This then is the result of more use of existing electrical equipment along with greater use of new types of appliances, which in some cases use much more electricity than the appliances they replaced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know any member in the House here knows when you buy a coloured television that goes instantly on, that power is on all the time, therefore electric bill is going to be much higher. There are many other such very convenient appliances on the market today. Frost-free refrigerators, self-cleaning electric ranges and instant-on television sets are examples of those devices in which your total electric costs are increased because of conveniences that the customer wants, and he's willing to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that Manitoba Hydro has already indicated in various brochures and press releases to the people who have complained about increased costs' that they are prepared to send competent people to examine any customer's electrical equipment and advise on steps that may be taken to manage or control their electrical demand in order to reduce costs.

The Chairman of Manitoba Hydro last week reiterated that statement and it is open for the Member for Minnedosa to contact those people that he has referred to, that they can invite, and competent staff will go out to assist in proper management of the electrical usage.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the members opposite are waiting with great anticipation as to what I'm going to do with this resolution and I am not going to leave them in suspense. I have some suggestions which I am sure that they will be very happy with, because one of the things I found, and the Honourable Member for Minnedosa was talking about — he said that there should be adjustments made, but he didn't indicate who should be responsible for the adjustments and who should pay — should we adjust the particular costs of the various recreational facilities whether they be private — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, you see the one thing is the installation costs which have to be somehow rated. But I have a suggestion for the honourable member and I know that it is going to meet with his approval, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: After. Mr. Speaker, I understand but my time was limited. You indicated some time ago I only had . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has thirty seconds.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson that Resolution No. 10 be amended by deleting every word after the word "Whereas" and by inserting the following:

WHEREAS the New Democratic Government of Manitoba is to be congratulated for its programs to build, renovate, and add to recreation facilities in Manitoba, particularly in rural and northern areas which have traditionally been lacking in such facilities; and

WHEREAS Manitoba Hydro is to be congratulated in maintaining energy rates among the lowest in Canada according to Statistics Canada comparisons; — and the honourable members in the Public Utilities Committee had an opportunity to see those changes; that is not part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker — and

WHEREAS the policy of demand metering although justifiable as a conservation ethic may cause some problem of adjustment to new methods of managing energy load;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of providing an open annual subsidy for maintenance of public recreation facilities which are community owned and operated.

MOTION on the amendment presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside on the amendment.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request a copy of that significant document read into the record by the Member for Radisson.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and speak to the amended resolution and to the resolution and to the whole question of demand metering. Mr. Speaker, I must disappoint my honourable friend, the Member from Minnedosa by stating initially that I believe that the form of demand metering adopted by Manitoba Hydro is a very fair one and having said that, the Member from St. Johns cautions his less experienced colleagues not to be in too great of a hurry with any sense of euphoria on that side by having made that statement and he is correct.

I also want to indicate to the House and I think perhaps it is a worthwhile exercise to at least explain to the members of the House, at least the best way that I can, and I would stand corrected, whether or not my concept of demand metering is indeed correct. You see, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, what Manitoba Hydro is saying is that if customers demand the right to service at a particular level, namely at high levels at any time, then it is not unfair for them to ask them to be part and on going, to carry the cost of providing the facilities. If, as a result of peak demands from time to time, Manitoba Hydro, a capital intensive industry, has to build massive multi-million dollar projects on the Nelson, the switchers, the lines and everything else, just so that I have the right as a customer to know that whenever I want to plug in my car or I want to plug in my toaster, and I want to turn on the lights in the arena and all that, that we accept the rights to energy as a right just about, and if we accept that as a basic premise, then, it's not unfair to ask the consumers to, on a formula that Hydro officials have worked out, to carry the total cost, fairly spread over the potential users of hydro energy. That, Mr. Speaker, in brief form is the concept behind demand billing.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat troubled, however, why other utilities and energy suppliers wouldn't also use the same form of billing. For instance we had the Manitoba Telephone before us just recently. Manitoba Telephone, it too has tremendous capital costs. I believe an investment of about \$65 million by now. I will be asking Manitoba Telephone when the occasion rises and we have fixed installation rates but about demand metering. In other words would the Telephone System or in fact, would this government be prepared to state the demand months of telephone use, say from just prior to the Christmas season when we are phoning our aunts and uncles around the country, or when we are phoning to the Eaton's mail order houses, or when the business communities are engaged in

extra business activities for the Christmas rush, and greater utilization of the telephone system generally is being made? Why not apply the same principle of demand billing for the telephone utility? And of course, the Minister suggests that that may not be a bad idea in terms of additional revenue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course one would have to take that one step further and particularly, coming back to the field of energy energy, how about considering the case of Esso, Imperial Oil, that lovely international conglomerate that I know my friends opposite are fond of. They have massive exploration costs' massive development costs. They pump millions of dollars into developing oil fields search so that the potential customer can, if he puts an oil furnace into his basement, he knows that he can pick up the phone or he can dial up his thermostat, he can have his energy on demand, on demand. Mr. Speaker, would this government be prepared to suggest to Esso that Esso be prepared to bill the customers regardless of product used, regardless of energy used through the months of July, August, September when no furnaces are running in this country, in this province, to pay for the developmental costs, the demand load that is placed on the Esso system? I hardly think they would. I hardly would. Well, the Honourable Minister says, "and of course, they do." And of course they do. They are properly and correctly reflected in the rates charged for their product' as should every kilowatt of electricity properly reflect the cost of the production for that kilowatt of electricity. Now, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, my honourable friends are exhibiting — well, I shouldn't say unfortunately, I should say fortunately — a lemming-like desire to destroy themselves politically on this issue. I am not so sure that they have really examined what they are doing. And I'll quote one particular passage from the amendment that the Honourable Member for Radisson has placed before us. He says, "there will be some problems associated with this." Well let me list these problems.

In an election year, you are going to tell the housewives to forget about defrosting fridges. You are going to tell the people of this province to switch from coloured television to black television. You are going to tell the people in this province to get up at six o'clock in the morning and plug in their cars rather than plug them at night. Mr. Speaker, all of these things most worthwhile energy conservation projects, I just want to make sure that honourable members opposite know what they are doing. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in fact, I have a really deep-down feeling that as they begin to move a little closer to that time and actually talk seriously about election, they will be getting sufficient messages like the Member for Minnedosa got. And we will see a change in this policy, particularly in the area that the Member for Minnedosa brought up. —(Interjection)— Certainly I'll permit a question.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I should thank the honourable member for permitting a question. I would like to know what attitude he would adopt on this question in an election year or in a year other than election year on the very points he is making?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am confident what with the wanton wastefulness of our hydro situation in Manitoba that, number one, the very necessary costs, the very necessary increases in the order of 20 and 23 percent annually that we have already had and are going to have, in themselves are creating a powerful incentive to do some of the things that I think, from a conservation point of view have to be done and eventually have to be accepted by our community. The Honourable Member for St. Johns asked me what I will do, I will do absolutely nothing. I am only, in fact, being somewhat helpful to my members opposite in asking them to realize what they are doing to themselves, when they can actually mesmerize themselves into believing that a skating rink that faced a hydro bill of \$3,000 last year and is facing one of \$8,000 this year, that that is no increase. Mr. Speaker, they actually believe it. This is the trap, I suppose, that experts fall into. It is an unbelievable performance, just unbelievable performance that we're witnessing. I must tell you that we enjoy it on this side. We enjoy it. You just keep telling the people of Manitoba, you keep telling the local committees, the managers of our skating rinks and of their curling rinks that you pay \$500 or \$800 for hydro when it's 100 degrees at high noon in August, in my little curling community of Marquette, you tell him that he is being treated fairly and equitably. I could wish for nothing better.

A MEMBER: They're going to give him a subsidy.

MR. ENNS: And you tell him that that \$500 billing is not any increase over the \$24.00 a month that he paid last year for minimal lighting for perhaps safety purposes, then you try to explain that kind of NDP arithmetic. You try to explain that kind of NDP arithmetic. You know, we have the good fortune of having been guided by some school boy arithmetic under Mr. D.L. Campbell but that schoolboy, arithmetic, I suggest Mr. Speaker, is going to have no difficulty in finding acceptance right across this province and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, it's unbelievable that when hydro issue already is there for different reasons and I think, Mr. Speaker, in some unguarded moment, some honourable gentleman opposite was reported in the media that the Conservative Party had lucked into this situation at this particular time; that the timing just was there where at the same time that energy rates were

increasing all over and because we had been making hydro an issue for many years that it was now just a matter of luck that the two happened to coincide appropriately for us at election time. Well, Mr. Speaker, that may well be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: . . . that may well be, that may well be, but beyond that what is happening is deliberate stupidity, politically speaking on the part of the government. It is just unbelievable to think that while the hydro rates have gone up to a point where they have become a major concern, while hydro rates are a subject of discussion everywhere, you are, in addition, going to tackle the housewives of this province and tell them that having self-defrosting fridges is unpatriotic and we have to change that. You're going to tell everybody this morning that it's really better, you ought to get used to taking cold water baths. You should be taking cold water baths in the morning rather than hot water baths, or if you want to take a hot water bath, then get up at 4 o'clock in the morning and put the thermostat on your hot water tank so that you don't bugger up your demand-loading because between running out to the car on a cold winter morning at 5 o'clock to plug it in for the two hours, running back in the house at 6 o'clock to plug in the hot water tank . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: . . . and then telling your wife that you can't really have the bacon and eggs at 7 as you used to have because too many other people in the block are having it at the same time, besides Junior is starting to use the electric razor upstairs, so we transfer that down to 7:30. And this is what this government is going to take on in election time. And they're doing it with a straight face, Mr. Speaker. They believe it. But when in my wildest dreams, in my wildest speeches, I've suggested that this government has a empathy for controlling the lives of people in this province, I would not have believed that this was possible. I would not have believed that this would have come under such a mundane heading as the demand billing. Well, it's demanding something, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I just refer to, in closing, the one sentence that I wanted to remind the Honourable Member for Radisson, whereas the policy — this is the one line — whereas the policy of demand metering although justifiable as a conservation ethic, may cause some problems of adjustment, to new methods of managing energy load . . . and he carries on.

Mr. Speaker, I do not make this comment in the manner in which I am making it to/ make light of the seriousness of energy conservation. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we have presented resolutions on this side of the House and we will present them again, where some meaningful action can be taken by this government with respect to energy conservation and the Member for Riel will be presenting another one very shortly and then let's see whether there is any serious intention on the part of this government to concern itself with energy conservation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not make light of the fact that there has to be a change and there has to be some new technology built into our system that will limit to some extent the peak loading or we'll make more judicious use of our energy as distinct from how we use it with understandable, you know, generosity, because we had it in abundance, we had it in abundance but, Sir, of course, that was a legacy that a Conservative administration left the people of Manitoba. It took only eight years, it took only eight years for this government to fritter away that abundance, only proving that age-old saying "Give the socialists a free hand in the Sahara Desert for any period of time and the Sahara will run out of sand." We have come to the point of rationing some of our energy requirements and some re-adjustment in the uses will have to take place.

But, Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to point out to the honourable members opposite and to express some gratitude to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Highways and others, also many whom we won't be seeing again and for whom I will feel a genuine loss of friendship and comradeship. The abuse that the Honourable Member for Minnedosa's resolution received at the hands of your government, at the hands of a Hydro director. Mr. Speaker, I just want the members who are thinking to know how wilfully they have contributed to the decline and fall of the New Democratic Party in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: If the House wishes it, we'll call it 5:30. The hour of 5:30 having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.