

Monday, April 11, 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 57 students Grade V and VI standing of the Carpathia School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Pat Shapera and Miss M. Hallama. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

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

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, there's a notice of a Committee Meeting for Thursday April 14th on Public Accounts. The Minister of Finance advises me that his Deputy Minister is out of town for this whole week and will be needed at the meeting, so I would like to cancel that meeting. I'll try to arrange another meeting for Thursday morning.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW, (Minister for Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet) introduced **Bill (No. 56) The Farmlands Protection Act.**

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can confirm to the House that the officials of Polar Gas informed him as of December last, December 1976, that the pipeline would not be going through Manitoba but in effect would be going through northern Ontario?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I follow my honourable friend's question, since it is geographically incorrect in itself.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, again I will pose the question to the First Minister. I wonder if he can confirm and inform the House that the officials of Polar Gas informed him and the Manitoba Government that the pipeline would not be coming through Manitoba, through the Eastern part of Lake Winnipeg, but would in fact touch at Churchill and go through Northern Ontario?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, they indicated some time ago that that was the probability. However, they did not rule out the possibility of doing further analyses. I should add as well just so a sense of proportion is kept in this matter, that even on the basis of their initial inclination, that the distance the pipeline would cross and the terrain would be much the same, both distance and terrain, in Manitoba and northwestern Ontario. **MR. SPIVAK:** I wonder then if the First Minister would answer another question? I wonder if he would indicate then, in effect they suggested that although there may be other alternatives the preferred route chosen by the consortium would not come in the main through Manitoba and that it was based for economic reasons and the length of mileage of the pipeline itself?

MR. SCHREYER: I think I indicated as much last week, Sir, that the initial preferred alternative is the one coming west of Hudson's Bay and across northeastern Manitoba and northwestern Ontario. They, however, did not rule out the possibility of making further analysis.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights final.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can confirm that the Polar Gas has made a request for Manitoba government's participation in the further economic studies' environmental studies, yet to be completed, asking for an investment at this point of \$5 million to be paid back when the Polar Gas is on stream?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been such a request, however, I believe it would be fair to say that there has been no suggestion whatsoever that Manitoba's participation would in and of itself predetermine a route to be followed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Resources, and ask him if the Manitoba Government have made arrangements with the contractors to complete their share of the mitigating works along the Roseau River that are part and

parcel of the agreement to enlarge and widen the channel of the river on the American side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that that matter is still before the International Joint Commission.

MR. JORGENSEN: My understanding is that the Americans do already have the appropriations and they are prepared to proceed with construction this spring. I wonder, in keeping with the agreement, whether the Manitoba Government would be prepared to carry out the works on this side of the province as per the agreement.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the matter is still before the International Joint Commission, and works on our side of the border in accordance with the study board's recommendation should be paid for by the United States authorities since it is their works that are resulting in the need for activities on our side of the border, but I believe that the matter is still before the International Joint Commission.

MR. JORGENSEN: I understand that the works will be paid for by the American authorities but the arrangements for contracting will have to be made by the Manitoba Government, will they not?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the matter is still before the International Joint Commission. There has been no final decision by the International Joint Commission to adopt the report or to proceed or to recommend conformity with the study board's report. The latest there was is a study board report, and our officials are preparing comments on the study board report which has not yet been finalized to my knowledge but I'll certainly check it to make sure that I'm giving my honourable friend the correct information.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Attorney-General, I would like to ask the Attorney-General what activity his department is taking to bring before the Courts of Manitoba a person by the name of Julius Koteles?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that is presently before the Courts, and all that I'm aware of is that the Sheriffs have been instructed to bring him before the Court in order to deal with what could be a matter involving contempt of Court.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question. Has the Attorney-General investigated the activities of the Sheriff's office in that respect?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I see no reason that I should investigate the activities of the Sheriff's office as they are working under the direction of the Courts in this instance.

MR. GRAHAM: Just as a matter of information it may seem strange. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. GRAHAM: I would like to give the Minister some information before I ask him a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. GRAHAM: In view of the fact then that the news media has no trouble contacting Mr. Koteles, can he inform us why his Sheriff's office is having some difficulty?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Continuing Education, can the Minister provide us at this time with an estimate of the number of students from high school, universities, community colleges that will be seeking employment this summer and also provide us with an estimate of how many job opportunities or positions will be available this summer, and if there is expected to be a shortfall between these two estimates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Continuing Education.

HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): The answer to the first question, Mr. Speaker, no; the answer for the second, about 3,500; the answer to the third question, I cannot provide him with that information at this time.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister explain to the House why it is that he cannot provide us with adequate estimates of what the number of students will be and what the estimated shortfall is expected to be so that some planning could be done based upon that kind of examination?

MR. HANUSCHAK: It's a question of simple arithmetic, Mr. Speaker. Not having the data for the honourable member's first question therefore we cannot answer the third. I do not know what demand there will be or how many students will, in fact, be seeking employment come the beginning of May or, to take in the high school students, come the beginning of July.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether the government has assessed the job positions that will be made available by government departments and Crown corporations and can he indicate whether they will be of a similar number as there were last year, a greater number or less of a number than there were last year available for summer students.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member put his first question — the three-part question — at that time I had indicated approximately 3,500 so having given that figure obviously

we know the number of students that we will be able to accommodate in the various departments of government and other agencies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, a final question.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether that number of 3,500 is a number that is comparable to the positions that were available last year, or is it less of a number that was available, or will any addition be made to it?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe it is comparable, plus or minus a couple of hundred.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. It arises out of the extremely dry conditions in the Interlake and the province generally but specifically having to do with his responsibility of Crown land. Is the department providing any assistance in fighting the fires that are currently raging through the Interlake country, the north Interlake country in particular?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Minister in charge of that responsibility is the Minister of Renewable Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources, and hope that he is working together with the Minister of Agriculture. Specifically, can the department assist the people fighting fires with perhaps the use of a plane, the difficulty being that where water used to be, in the sloughs, there simply isn't any, and badly needed forage, both tame and wild on Crown lands, is being burnt up in considerable acreages at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources.

HONOURABLE HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupert'sland): Well, Mr. Speaker, my department is making every effort to try to contain the fires that are burning and in fact extinguish those, as I announced earlier in this House, and further to that we're making every effort to try to limit as much as possible those fires that are being set. We are advising local groups and farmers, landowners, not to burn, in fact not issuing burning permits except in those cases where there is identified need for a particular kind of crop to be burned off so that a new crop can grow. But we are making every effort to watch the situation and keep close watch on the extreme fire danger.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a further question on the same subject to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I have been asked by some municipal people for permission to close off, to restrict travel on certain provincial road allowances. Would the Minister and the department consider making that decision available to the municipalities if they should request it under specific circumstances?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member is really asking for a legal opinion but my recollection of the Municipal Act is that the municipal council is the traffic authority within the municipal district and they would have the authority there in the Municipal Act now, if necessary. But what is happening is that in many areas, indeed in my constituency, in fact a whole farmstead burnt over the week-end as a result of fires being set in marshlands and areas, because of the wind conditions, and the like. I'm not sure whether even the closing of roads will be able to prevent some of the fires that have raged through the area.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary and final question, Mr. Speaker. Closing roads won't prevent the fires but restricted travel sometimes . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question, please.

MR. ENNS: Could the Honourable Minister undertake to confirm whether or not in fact that is within the ambit of the municipalities at the moment, or whether there is required special permission by the provincial authorities?

MR. URUSKI: I will check that but I am reasonably certain that that authority does exist.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Continuing Education and Manpower and follows along the same lines of earlier enquiry with respect to summer employment for students. Can the Minister confirm the accuracy of a statement attributed to the officer in charge of the Canada Manpower office at the University of Manitoba to the effect that, "There are jobs for students who want them."?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I can neither confirm nor deny a statement made by an employee of another level of government.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the Minister as Minister of Manpower received any communication from the Manpower office at the University to the effect that there are jobs for students who want them?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It relates again to Polar Gas. I wonder if he can confirm that a request has been made by Polar Gas for the Province of Manitoba to interject before the National Energy Board Hearing in support of the preferred route through Northern Ontario?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that I should take that question as notice and consult with my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would then take as notice the basis on which Manitoba would arrive at such a decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Tourism. Can the Minister indicate whether the road and extension to the causeway that was constructed to connect major highways to the new tourist recreational facility at Hecla Island was submitted for an environmental review to the Environmental Protection Review Agency?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice and I would also wish to check out which of the two departments had the prime responsibility for the construction of that road, whether it was my department or the Department of Highways.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Minister could also take as notice whether in fact an additional \$100,000 to \$200,000 will be caused as a result of mitigating efforts to repair the damage done to the marshland areas because of that causeway?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that the Saskatchewan government through Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan is about to take over a potash mine just on the Manitoba border, will the Minister use his good offices to ensure that Manitobans employed there will be assured of continuing employment once the government has taken over?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I cannot interfere with the employment of people residing in the Province of Saskatchewan any more than I would expect the Saskatchewan Government to interfere with the employment of people in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Environmental Management. I would ask him whether the province is initiating or intending to initiate any preventative action with respect to the battle against Dutch Elm disease in Winnipeg and Manitoba trees this summer or whether their action is only corrective and remedial after the trees are diseased?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is a program relating to dealing with the Dutch Elm disease problems which is being carried out through the Department of Agriculture. With regard to preventative programs, I believe almost simultaneously with becoming Minister, there were indications that Manitoba was in danger of being affected by Dutch Elm disease. At that time it was also indicated that no effective or demonstrably effective procedures could be taken but that certain steps were available such as the catching of branches floating down the river, etc., that there have been no effective means of preventing Dutch Elm disease in all of those locations where they knew it was coming, but that Manitoba would do those things which were at least suggested. Despite that Manitoba, such as other jurisdictions, has been affected by Dutch Elm disease and the programs that are taken now are both preventative and resultant. Resultant in that they deal with trees that been affected; preventative in that they hopefully prevent them from spreading.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise whether funding is made available to stricken municipalities or whether the assistance and the involvement of the province is limited to counsel and advice?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there has been a program which has involved considerable expenditure on the part of all of the people in the Province of Manitoba through the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on the same topic to the same Minister. Can he indicate whether his department has undertaken to assess or examine the proposed chemical treatments that are being offered by certain firms in the Province of Manitoba, that are advertised as being preventative or which are being suggested, I believe, by the University of Waterloo Agriculture Research Station? Have these been monitored? Can he tell us whether they are in fact effective and is the government going to do anything to provide licensing or standards for these kinds of chemical operations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, the program for dealing with the problems that we

now have is being undertaken through the Minister of Agriculture. I don't know whether his officials are dealing with the questions that you raise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of members opposite, it should be recalled that we did announce some time ago, over a year ago, that there was an Advisory Committee on tree protection that was providing us with all the data, up-to-date data, on protection and in particular with respect to Dutch Elm disease. That Committee is made up of university people Canada ' Forestry and the Province of Manitoba, and the City of Winnipeg. So that we are working in harmony in that sense.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Would he be able to answer the question that I posed to the Minister of Environment? Has there been any testing done of the chemical treatments that are presently being offered and advertised as preventative measures for the Dutch Elm disease and is there any intention to put any standards or licensing arrangements on those operations that offer them? In fact, does the government itself have any plans to itself initiate some of those kinds of chemical treatments in strategic areas where it may be required?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Advisory Committee to date has not recommended any other course of action than what we have been taking for the last year. Now, I can take the question as notice as to whether they are aware of the results of any recent tests that have been undertaken.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then I would ask the Minister if his department or that Advisory Committee would be able to provide fairly immediate information concerning the present treatment programs that are being advertised in the province or in the city, to determine whether in fact the consumer who is involved should be spending the money for that kind of treatment?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think any of the public should take great caution in purchasing any of the product and service that is offered to them from any sector because it could be that they may not be totally aware as to the benefits of such a treatment program, and may not be totally aware that that treatment may have to be repeated on an annual basis. So that, yes, that information should be sought from the Forestry Service and indeed from our department. The public would be well advised to seek out that kind of information before they spend any money.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A further question to the Minister on the same subject. Could the Minister undertake to investigate and report to the House on the effectiveness of a new fungicide called Lignasan BLP which has apparently proven very effective in the United States in preventing the disease, not merely in coping with it after it strikes, but in preventing it, according to reports so far obtainable?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, we have had numerous chemicals that were recommended but found to be extremely expensive and the Advisory Committee has not recommended on wholesale inoculation of trees just because of the expense of doing so. With respect to that particular chemical, I am not at all aware but will take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Finance who we are all pleased to see back in his chair after his absence. My question, Mr. Speaker, relates to the judgement handed down some months ago by the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench, which required the Province of Manitoba to rebate more than \$1 million in sales taxes assessed to over-flying Air Canada aircraft. Can the Minister tell the House whether his department has decided whether or not they are going to appeal that ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen a report on it. There may be one now but I have not yet seen a report or any recommendations from the department.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can tell the House whether there were additional rebates made to other airlines, other than Air Canada, based upon the same ruling.

MR. MILLER: I can't answer that question because I don't have the information. I will take that as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It has to do with the manner and way in which real property taxes are collected from owners of mobile homes who from time to time use a trailer court. Can the Minister indicate to me, is it the policy of the government that the owner or operator of these trailer courts are held responsible for the collection of these taxes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will take the specifics as notice but I believe the levelling of fees are

left open to the municipalities as to what rate they wish to apply on the mobile homes.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, while the Minister is taking that question as notice, for further information would he also indicate to me or to the House, at a later date, whether or not there is a uniformity of a rule applying to all mobile home trailer camp operators in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HONOURABLE PETER BURTONIAK (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to make a very non-political statement at this time. (Agreed)

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, in rising on this occasion I feel like the young chap who said, "I have some bad news for you and I also have some good news for you, and I wonder which you would like to hear first." I am afraid that I would have to say that I have to give the bad news first, although I will not dwell on it because I am sure all the honourable members are aware of what took place about a week or so ago. I am, of course, referring to the Manitoba Junior Hockey League championship series between the Dauphin Kings and the Kildonan North Stars. I feel it was a rather ugly incident that took place at that particular time, particularly due to the fact it happened prior to the beginning of the game. And, of course, I feel that the Commissioner dealt correctly with this matter in awarding the series, which stood two games to one, to the Dauphin Kings. I think that he felt that there was no way that he could see this series continue under those circumstances. So, as the situation now stands, the Dauphin Kings have been awarded the Manitoba Junior Hockey League championship and are now involved in a series with Saskatchewan and I feel that I speak on behalf of all the members here, in wishing the Dauphin Kings every success on the trail to Centennial Cup.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATES - SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like you to proceed with the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Adjourned Debate, Second Reading, Bill No. 5. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned Debate, Bill No. 11. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL (NO. 18 - THE RETAIL BUSINESSES HOLIDAY CLOSING ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned Debate, Bill No. 18. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this bill has been the subject of a considerable amount of debate in the House, and because of the importance of the subject matter I deem it advisable to pay a considerable amount of time in assessing the various points that were debated in the bill.

It seems to me that there has been a considerable misunderstanding of the objectives and also the subject matter contained in the bill. So I intend, Mr. Speaker, to dwell at some considerable lengths of time on the remarks made by honourable members of the House.

When I first introduced the bill, Mr. Speaker, away back on March 17th, I took at that particular time, I thought, pains to indicate to the honourable members of the House that this was a subject matter of a matter of concern that had been on the books for a considerable period of time. And at that particular time when I introduced the bill I suggested that there may be honourable members who would want to suggest certain changes in the bill when it got into committee, and said that while the bill may be imperfect in some respects it is, of course, subject to a review by the committee to which it is referred and may be subject to amendment, and I never ever suggested otherwise.

Further on I said, Mr. Speaker, that I can appreciate and revise it on first glance, for instance, Mr. Speaker, of a choice between Saturday and Sunday for store opening or store closing in certain instances, and that may be subject to misinterpretation. Little did I realize, Mr. Speaker, the validity of that statement that I made on March 17th. That is, that the meaning and the interpretation that I was placing in the bill would be subject of misinterpretation. I quote again from March 17th when I said, "As a matter of fact I heard some comment over the air to the suggestion that because of those alternatives within the bill I was knocking the observance of Sunday all to hell, figuratively speaking."

Then I went on to say in my introduction, "My honourable friend who made that statement has just repeated it, I want to say to him particularly and to all members of the House and the general public and to all members of the community that the intent and objectives certainly is not that, but to recognize and realize, Mr. Speaker, that we don't all observe the same Sabbath. While I appreciate that there are those who feel that maybe we should exclude the Seventh Day Adventists who observe

Saturdays, and that we should serve those who attend the Synagogue on their Sabbath, which is Saturday, that we shouldn't say, in effect, 'We're not really concerned with you. You have to observe the day of rest that we as Christians consider the Sabbath'."

I think it's very important, Mr. Speaker, that honourable members recall the words that I used on the introduction.

I went on to say, Mr. Speaker, "I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues in this House that the least we can do is recognize the fact that there are others who observe a different Sunday or Sabbath than we who follow the Christian religion."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry or any honourable member wishes to introduce motions declaring otherwise or amending the legislation, they have a perfect right so to do, and I would not deny them of that. But when one deals with a matter of principle I suggest that the basic principle of recognition of the fact that we have different days of observing the Sabbath should at least be worthy of consideration on the introduction of this bill in respect to the hours of closing. h

The general intent of this legislation is to require labour or large retail establishments to close on general holidays and on Sunday or another Sabbath day to ensure that workers have at least one day's rest on the weekend to spend with their friends and families.

It is peculiar to me, Mr. Speaker, as I read over the various Hansards that almost without exception those who took part in the debate made no reference at all to the second general principle contained in the bill, namely that dealing with the statutory requirement of the closing of these establishments on statutory holidays and the payment of wages the employee would have earned on that day, which of course, Mr. Speaker, is legislation that this government has introduced for the benefit of the workers of the community and assuring them that they would have pay for statutory holidays.

I indicated some time ago, Mr. Speaker, that I had obtained the voluntary agreement by the larger stores and the Econo-Marts and Kresges and Woolcoes that they would agree to a closedown on statutory holidays and that they would agree to pay their employees. But that voluntary agreement, Mr. Speaker, was being circumvented or not adhered to by a considerable number of stores and that is the reason why in adopting this bill, if it is indeed adopting, we will make the statutory provision to carry through what I was able originally to obtain by voluntary agreement.

As we went on in the debate the Honourable the Member for Fort Garry spoke on March 29th at some length, and what has become so typical of the approach of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, particularly when dealing with the Minister of Labour, he became very very violent and vigorous and levied accusations against me on a personal basis, I am sure, because, Mr. Speaker, as I read over, as I did over the Easter weekend, what my honourable friend had to say — (Interjection) — Yes, it was, but it wasn't in the spirit of Easter that this document refers to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: And on Page 1343 just as an illustration, the Member for Fort Garry had this to say: "And it doesn't seem as we feel as strongly about individual rights of conscience where, for example, labour relations legislation is concerned, where membership in trade unions is concerned, so we find an inconsistency in the Minister's using the religious diversity argument in proposing this legislation to us." And he went on to say and emphasizing on the matter of religious points, he says "I do not think this religious equality argument should have been raised at all."

In other words, what my honourable friend has stated, that he doesn't believe, Mr. Speaker, in equality of rights of religious fraternities. He also goes on to say, — (Interjection) — it isn't? That's what you said. "But the trouble with that argument is that that defeats the whole purpose then of one day of economic rest because if people are choosing at random what that day shall be then every day becomes equalized right across the spectrum." And he goes on to say further, "Still the opportunity is there for experimentation with Sunday. The economic sphere is so diverse and so various that there should be always different enterprises, businesses being tested for the market purpose."

Then again, my friend said, "The main issue for me, Mr. Speaker, is a double issue. One is the question of family life and I think that there are enough stresses and strains assailing family life now without adding a full working Sunday to the list of those pressures. As a Conservative I find no difficulty whatsoever in favouring a partially closed Sunday on those two grounds alone and I emphasize the term "partially closed." No one is asking that we go back to a closed Sunday," he said.

Further on, my honourable friend from Fort Garry said, "The Minister has proposed a decision to the House, Mr. Speaker, which I view as a cop-out. The Minister is trying to be all things to all men here. He says that he is making a decision" — and to quote my honourable friend on Page 1343 he states that "he is ducking a decision." And that is me.

Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend had listened to my words of wisdom he would realize that there was no question that I was trying to cop-out, but to realize and understand that even in the time that he has been in this House we have passed a Human Rights Bill that recognizes that in the matters

of employment there should be no differentiation between religions or age, creeds, or codes. It was on that basis that I presented this legislation for the consideration of this House.

My friend said — Page 1344 — “I think that it is a dis-service to the people of Manitoba. I think the Minister cannot expect to be all things to all men on an issue like this, Mr. Speaker. I think, Sir, the principle providing the wide-open option creates a loophole, as I said before, not today but in earlier comments, that will provide for eventual elimination of that one special day of the week. It will reduce Sunday to the level of every other day.”

The purpose of this legislation is just the contrary, Mr. Speaker. This is a matter that has been considered for a considerable number of years by me personally and by others who have been in this House, that we have viewed, not necessarily on religious grounds, but we have viewed and seen the gradual commercialization of that one day of rest or two days of rest, no matter how you look at it, that has taken place.

Some honourable members in this Assembly have held that this isn't necessary because of the Lord's Day Act. I want to say to them, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that they read this Act, I don't think that they have read the Lord's Day Act, because there is no comparison at all. We have found and I have found in my observing of the gradual erosion of what used to be a one day pause by the extension of commercialization. Under the terms of the Lord's Day Act, Mr. Speaker, there were only provisions for the sale of certain commodities, namely, bread and milk and only provision for a drugstore to dispense prescription goods. Mr. Speaker, that's still in the Lord's Day Act, Federal, today. There were permissive exceptions that this Assembly in its wisdom, under at least two different administrations took benefit of.

The Honourable Member for Crescentwood pointed out one the other day, namely in 1963 the provision for Sunday baseball. If I recall correctly, at that particular time we did make provision for baseball games on Sunday but we prohibited the opening of pool rooms in the self-same legislation on Sunday. I am sure my honourable friend, the Member for Assiniboia, will agree with me that that is what we did. We also, which was permissible after a Supreme Court case dealing with the observance of Sunday under the Lord's Day Act, agreed to the opening of theatres after one o'clock, I believe the hour is, on Sunday, the Sabbath. We also agreed and I believe that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry was in the House, not too long ago, to make provision for horse racing on Sundays. So there were some permissive changes in the Lord's Day Act for the accommodation of certain aspects of family life. But Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware, in respect of commercial sales on the Lord's Day, there hasn't been any change insofar as the Act is concerned, but there has been, Mr. Speaker, a tremendous change in the types of merchandise that are sold in grocery stores over what they were at the time that the Lord's Day Act was enacted. Or what a drugstore can sell today. And I wonder if my honourable friends realize that aspect of the truth of the situation when they say to me as the sponsor of this bill, “Why not adhere to the Lord's Day Act?” believe, Heavens to betsy, Mr. Speaker, that Lord's Day Act, I came into effect at the turn of the century and it hasn't been changed. There is still, I believe, a \$25 fine for a breach of the Act. And now when we see the transition and the type of merchandise being peddled by grocery stores and drug stores, you can go to a drug store today and buy an outboard motor on Sunday which is a true contravention of the Lord's Day Act.

A MEMBER: It's a necessity of life if you're a commercial fisherman.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, of course it's a necessity of life if you're a commercial fisherman but you can buy it on Friday. You don't have to buy it on Sunday. And my honourable friend who just spoke, the Member for Lakeside, can justify anything as a necessity of life. The suit that he is wearing, in his opinion, is a necessity for living but I suggest that that is carrying it a little further. And you're going to have an opportunity, my friend, before today is out to stand up and be counted as to whether or not you are going to be in favour of being a little more realistic about the sale of the necessities of life. — (Interjection)— No, you're not going to charge me up today.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is not going to charge me up, at all, because my approach to this whole subject matter is not a question of being charged up, Mr. Speaker, it's a question of attempting to place on the record something that is long overdue in the protection for those who do want one day rest in seven. And I've never deviated at all from that and that is the principle of this bill, and that is the principle on which I have directed my attention throughout.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned as I went through all of the speeches of honourable members, and I think that in view of the time constraints I will not attempt or endeavour to touch on all of the points that were raised.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many members of this Assembly took the time out to read the bill. And from what I gather from some of the remarks, not very many, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside who says that he wants to charge me up, or whatever the Dickens he said a moment ago indicated to me that because I had said that the Ontario Act, in good Conservative Ontario . . .

A MEMBER: It's a fine province; a fine province.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . but a bum government.

A MEMBER: It's a fine government, fine . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order.

MR. PAULLEY: He chastised me, Mr. Speaker, when I suggested that there was a sort of a compatibility between the Ontario bill and the Manitoba bill. —(Interjection)— Oh, that's what you said, and I have it here. Now the difference is this, Mr. Speaker, and it's a matter that I've been chastised for and criticized particularly by the opposition that I was attempting to impose religious inclinations on the people in the province of Manitoba. But' Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the provisions in the Ontario Act clearly . . . (If you're going to mumble and rumble in your usual way either get up in the back row where you belong on your way out or get out.) —(Interjection)— There are none so deaf as those that won't hear. I would appreciate, Mr. Speaker, if you would ask the honourable member to try and act like an honourable member.

The Ontario Act, Mr. Speaker, does make reference to religion. And what does it say? I'm sure that my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, never read the bill because in the Ontario bill, Mr. Speaker, there is this exemption. Section 2 does not apply in the respect of the carrying out of a retail business in a retail establishment on Sunday, where the retail business establishment was closed to the public for religious — mind you, Mr. Speaker — for religious reasons and no goods or services were sold or offered for sale therein within a period of twenty-four consecutive hours in the period of thirty-two hours immediately preceding Sunday.

So, having accused me — some of his colleagues did — of opting out on the basis of religion when I made mention of the provisions in the Ontario Act, and said that ours was similar, it's similar insofar as there is implied in our Act, but specific in the Ontario Act, provision for the various denominational adherence to their sabbath. And, Mr. Speaker, I would say to my honourable friends, and I accuse them I think properly, of not having read the bill at all because I doubt we would have had such a statement from the Member for Lakeside had he read that while the option is there in our Act, it's not based entirely on the presumption of religion. That's a big difference, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside' missed the point.

The honourable member who just left the Chamber, I believe, the Honourable Member for Roblin

A MEMBER: He's a mighty outstanding fellow, too.

MR. PAULLEY: You betcha. The champion of the Chamber of Commerce. And I read his remarks, Mr. Speaker, and I will not inflict them on the House at this particular time.

There is the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, each of them made reference to the matter of the Lord's Day Act. If they had read the proposals before us, Mr. Speaker' they would find that exceptions are made and exemptions are made for anything that is now law under the Lord's Day Act. But the Lord's Day Act is not being adhered to or abided by by the federal authorities who are charged with the responsibility of policing their own law. But my honourable friend from Birtle-Russell, and others, either don't or cannot comprehend the significance.

My honourable friend, the Member for Rock Lake, raised the question of farm implements and parts under The Farm Machinery Act. This is . . .

A MEMBER: That's not in your bill.

MR. PAULLEY: No, it's not in my bill except my friend that there is a clause in this bill that makes exceptions to this bill of any specific legislation such as The Farm Machinery. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, according to The Farm Machinery legislation, it does not authorize the store to stay open for the sale of complete commodities but for the sale of repair parts that are required in order that the operation of the farming can continue.

Now there is a big difference, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, of going down to a drug store and buying an outboard motor than it is under the agricultural bill for a farmer to go down and buy a sprocket or whatever he requires in order to continue his operation.

My honourable friend —(Interjection)— Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I am not being technical, I ask my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, to read the Act, to read what is contained in this Act. My honourable friend, the Member for Logan, raised a question of the exclusion or apparent exclusion of Remembrance Day. Mr. Speaker, Remembrance Day carries on exactly the same as it has; this Act does not affect it at all because Remembrance Day was established by a special Act of this Assembly away back in the days of the Liberal government. And I want to say, as a member of the Legion, I hope it continues to be observed in that way and not junked in with a bunch of other legislation. It is becoming more and more meaningless, that is the observance of Remembrance Day in many quarters is becoming more meaningless and I trust and hope that we can allow it to remain in the legislation, that it is special legislation for a special reason.

May I just for a second get back to one of the basic principles that I tried to enunciate of the Seventh Day Adventists and their adherence and support of this legislation. This is sent to me by Mr.

Allan Freed, the Pastor of the Henderson Highway Seventh Day Adventist Church. The observation he makes, Mr. Speaker, I think is quite pointed, and he says, "This legislation brings concern to Seventh Day Adventists and other Christians who worship on the seventh day of the week, that such legislation will curtail their religious freedom." He then goes on to point out some quotations of Holy Scripture. He states, "Now we are fully in sympathy with a weekly pause day." —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have a point of order?

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Yes, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: I will allow any question at the conclusion of my remarks and be glad to receive them.

"We are now fully in sympathy with a weekly pause day and we uphold the heads of government that will assure all people of the freedom of such a day." That is the approach that they gave. Some were worrying to me about the inclinations of those outside of Winnipeg. I received a communication from the Downtown Merchants' Association of Brandon and they complimented the government on the introduction of this bill. They stated that in their opinion it didn't go far enough. And I understand that they are associated to a considerable degree with the group that the Member for Roblin champions. And I think it would be of interest to the House to hear what the Brandon Downtown Association had to say regarding the store closing Act now before the Manitoba Legislature.

The Downtown Brandon Association executive were unanimously in favour of controlled store hours; with the odd personal performance excepted, the majority agreed with the nine major points of the Store Closing Act.

So, it is not just the workers and the unions, but here in this bill we have received support from those in the commercial areas such as Brandon Downtown Association as well. And so the story goes, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know, quite honestly and quite fairly, of any piece of legislation that I have had the honour and the pleasure of introducing into this House that has received such widespread acceptance as this particular bill has, not only in urban Manitoba but in rural Manitoba as well. I have had literally, literally hundreds of people write to me, Mr. Speaker, and say "Good luck, we hope that you will be successful in forwarding this bill and having it accepted."

My honourable friend the Member for Rhineland speaking toward the end of the debate on this bill, did raise one or two points insofar as his own constituency is concerned. The Honourable Member for Rhineland mentioned the situation prevailing in his own constituency of Rhineland and I appreciate what he had to say. "Most of the people in the constituency of Rhineland believe that Sunday is the day that stores should be closed. It is a day for church and family and some people in my constituency observe Saturday as the day, and we respect their wishes." Now, that's the attitude of my honourable friend, the Member for Rhineland.

A MEMBER: He's a fine fellow.

MR. PAULLEY: He is a fine fellow. Maybe I wouldn't go so far as to say that he is in fine company but I would, Mr. Speaker, agree that he is a fine fellow and he truly portrays the situation prevailing in the constituency of Rhineland. I want to repeat for my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, "and some people in my constituency observe Saturday as this day and we respect their wishes." That isn't the attitude of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that isn't the attitude that many have expressed, that took part in debates in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I indicate to you that if it is a desire of the membership of this Assembly to amend the Act as being proposed, that is the right of the Committee and a decision of this House. It has ever been thus and I trust that it always will. But some members of this House have felt, or got the idea, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation applies to the whole of the commercial enterprise in the community, including departmental stores and the likes. There is no idea behind that, they are forbidden by The Lord's Day Act and that is where that comes in. But the purpose and the main purpose in this Act is to try and institute in the Province of Manitoba a day of pause in the community, insofar as commercial activities are concerned, to try and remove the requirement that is now in vogue for employees to have to attend the retail outlets that they do at the large commercial stores, grocery stores and the medium grocery stores. Some are protected under the law by their unions, the vast majority however are not. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is the type of legislation where it may be misunderstood and where it may be politically advantageous for some to say that the Minister who introduced it was only doing it in order to make a name for himself or herself — had it been a woman here — that this is absolutely erroneous. It is a matter that has been faced up to in some jurisdictions, Mr. Speaker; it is a matter that is being faced up to in other jurisdictions as well.

You often use that phrase, or people want to use the phrase, "Well I am a practising Christian" and let it go at that, and I abhor anything that might adhere with what they think. This bill is not introduced for that purpose. I do, as the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell says, attend church. I am not motivated in this desire to try and fill the pews of any church, be it the Seventh Day Adventists, the

pews in the synagogue, or even in my own Anglican church. It is motivated and I give it to this House in the true spirit with which it was introduced, to give —(Interjections)— Yes, and I want to tell my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, "I will be glad to light a candle for him and I hope it isn't too long before I have that opportunity."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I didn't say under what circumstances, about the lighting of the candle. You know there are such things as the lighting of a candle to imply the necessity for the creation of wisdom and the light to see. —(Interjection)— I won't make any reference to the heat where my honourable friend will be going.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do commend this bill to the House. I have said that I have received widespread support . . .

A MEMBER: In your caucus here?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood wasn't sure how the Member for Lakeside is going to vote on this because he wasn't able to tell my colleague, the Member for St. Johns, whether the party is going to vote as a matter of politics or how they were going to vote. They are going to have that opportunity in a couple of minutes, to stand up and be counted. And I would wager a guess or a bet, if I was a betting man, that, unless there is a scurrying to get out, that those . . . in view of the knowledge that this is an important matter to the citizens of Manitoba, there won't be very many of them who will have the temerity or the courage to vote against it.

I do say, Mr. Speaker, and I must say this, that I did receive some letters in opposition to the proposal. I did receive from the solicitor of one of the stores that I thought had agreed to the voluntary agreement — namely a store in the Constituency of Charleswood that I had understood to be agreeable to the voluntary agreement, and reneged, in my opinion — from the solicitor for that store, a letter of protest. So I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that all the correspondence I received was not favourable. And in this particular case, and I quote from a letter, the suggestion is — I should perhaps indicate that the submission that we wish to make on behalf of the IGA group, the wholesaler, Codville Distributors Limited, would be to allow the independent family-owned stores of whatever size and wherever situated to remain open on Sunday.

So I have received from each, Mr. Speaker, an indication. However, I do, sincerely and honestly, recommend to all members of this House that after many years of discussion, and there has been many years — I remember a former member from East Kildonan, Jim Mills, attempted to bring in a bill dealing with all aspects of store closing — I do believe that eventually we will have to have some legislation dealing with the actual operation of store hours. Let's try this first, let's see how it works. Mention was made of "leave it to the municipalities." Mr. Speaker, I was the Mayor of a municipality once and we tried, through The Shops Regulations Act, to bring in store closing hour regulation. What we did in Transcona was not acceptable just outside of the boundary and we had nothing but utter confusion. The only way that we can apply legislation of this kind is to make it uniform throughout the whole province, Mr. Speaker, and I have no hesitation in recommending full support for this measure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: I would like to ask the Minister what percentage of the population of Manitoba is made up of religious groups that hold their sabbath day on the Saturday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Really I don't know, Mr. Speaker. The only answer I can give, I presume that the percentage would not be far out of line with the people who break the laws of the country for which we have to pass legislation in order to protect the others. It is for the protection of people that we passed The Human Rights Act. And I recognize, Mr. Speaker —(Interjection)— No, of course I don't know. You know, Mr. Speaker, I admire my honourable friend. He says that if I don't know, "sit down." —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. I am sure, coming from whence it came, I will ignore it completely.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the Minister permit one further question, Mr. Speaker? Would the objectives that the Minister seeks and which many of us and perhaps all of us in this Chamber seek, not be achieved through a straight religious exemption of the type provided in the Ontario legislation, without going to the wide-open option that he has put into his legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: In all respect to the mentality of my honourable friend, I think basically the same exemptions prevail in each of the two measures. One specifically makes reference to religion whereas this bill that I'm proposing only implies the same. If my honourable friend is desirable to have the religious aspect introduced into the bill as I said on the introduction of the bill, the opportunity of amendment is there.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there any further question?

QUESTION put MOTION carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The Motion before the House is adoption of Second Reading of Bill No. 18.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: *Messrs. Adam, Axworthy, Banman, Blake, Bostrom, Boyce, Brown, Burtniak, Cherniack, Derewianchuk, Desjardins, Dillen, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Ferguson, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Hanuschak, Henderson, Jenkins, Johannson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, Lyon, McBryde, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Malinowski, Miller, Minaker, Patrick, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Sherman, Steen, Toupin, Turnbull, Uruski, Uskiw, Walding, Wilson.*

MR. CLERK: Yeas 48, Nays nil.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion, the Ayes have it. I declare the Motion carried.

BILL (NO. 22) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE PERSONAL PROPERTY SECURITY ACT AND CERTAIN OTHER ACTS RELATING TO PERSONAL PROPERTY.

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading Bill No. 22. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill for my colleague, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when the Attorney-General introduced this bill for second reading, he indicated at that time that the amendments here were very technical and not only technical but some of them were very extensive and I have to say that probably that statement was an under-statement.

When we look at this bill and we look at the original Act, and we look at what the government plans to do in this particular field, you have to begin to ask a few questions as to why they want to move in, what appears to be in a hurry, in a field where the Federal Government at the present time seem to be moving at the same time. I would think that it would be probably more prudent for a very close liaison between the Federal and Provincial governments, but the Minister in his statements made no reference to Federal legislation at that time. So I have to conclude from that that there has not been too much dialogue between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government in fields of this nature, which causes some concern, Sir, because it has been stated by the Attorney-General on numerous occasions that in certain fields of legislation there should be a desire to have a uniform type of legislation that exists from one jurisdiction to another and if there is a possibility of an interprovincial jurisdiction and extra judicial rights, they should be facilitated wherever possible.

But here we find that we're going to have a bill which affects several other statutes, some parts of the bill will be coming in by proclamation and some by Royal Assent and if there's going to be difficulty and some hang-ups, and I'm sure there are because it is a fairly significant change that is being proposed, then I would think that it would probably be more prudent for proclamation to apply to all things. So then, when the machinery is in place and everything is ready to move, then and only then, does the Minister act. But by bringing some in by Royal Assent, some portions of the bill in by Royal Assent and some by proclamation, while I admire the implication that it forces, it may force a speed-up in other activities. I don't think that maybe it's in the best interest for that to happen. I would have hoped that the Minister would have had all sections by proclamation. In that way he could ensure that some of the building blocks that he is going to have to use to build up his registry and all the rest of it, will be in place and fully operational before the transfers are made.

Now I would have hoped that when the Minister brought forward the legislation that he would have given us some indication of those segments of society with which he had had considerable correspondence with regard to this type of legislation. He didn't give us any indication of that. I know I have gone to some segments of society to ask their opinions on it. The opinions I got are mixed. There is certainly some concern but I don't believe there has been a great deal of dialogue between the Minister and the various segments of society which will be affected by this, so I can only hope that through the media that there will be good

information brought out so that those that will be affected will have ample opportunity to bring forward their views when this bill goes to committee and I would hope that when the Minister is closing debate, that he gives us some indication of the various segments of the community that he has talked to, with respect to this. And also, I would hope that he likewise urges the community at large to make their contributions when this bill goes to committee.

I have certain reservations about some aspects, but I think that those are far better explained through a series of questions which can only occur when a bill goes to committee. So, at this point in time, Sir, I would suggest that the bill go to committee with very good appeal to the community at

large to get their contributions at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just would like to raise several points at this time and I wonder if the Minister probably in closing could maybe reply to some of them. I understand that this particular bill because of the complexity of the implementation of the bill was passed some four or five years ago and hasn't been proclaimed because there is a substantial amount of computer programming and book work and legal work that has to be set up to get this bill proclaimed. I understand that some of the areas that concern myself, and I think concern the consumers as well as the people of Manitoba, I'm just wondering if this couldn't be sped up a little bit.

I would refer specifically to some problems that have been drawn to my attention. Number one, problems with registering conditional sales agreements as far as they apply to some things that are considered to be real property at this time, and I would refer the Minister specifically to farmers in my area — since I have a lot of dairy farmers and a lot of people involved in feeding cattle and feeding livestock — have brought this to my attention that when a silage company comes in and wishes to sell the farmer a silo, what happens is that the silo becomes part of the real property of that particular farm. Now this causes problems in that a silo can be erected and taken down in a matter of three days and the company is then forced to try to take a second or third mortgage on the property — this means that there is an increased cost to the farmer as far as registering another mortgage — it also means that if it is a third mortgage the company's security might be very limited because as the Minister knows, the first and second mortgages take prior claim to the third mortgage. This also causes higher interest rates to the farmer because of the risk involved by the company to make the sale, so we draw that to the Minister's attention. I wonder if he could tell me if this would be covered under this particular Act or does it require other legislative changes? From the information that I've got, is that once this bill will be implemented' this would be part of the undertaking that the bill will seek to change.

And the other thing is, I would like to ask the minister, how far are we away from setting up a system whereby people who are buying recreation equipment such as boats, campers and that type of thing, or automobiles, consumer type goods, when will the section of the Act be proclaimed which will set up sort of a central registry where people can find out if there are any liens against that particular product that they want to buy? I think this is what we are driving towards right now, so the consumer could phone in and say, for a \$2.50 charge it can be checked out to see if there are any chattels, liens, or conditional sales contracts on that. So I would just draw that to the Minister's attention at this time and I wonder if he could just elaborate on that very briefly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 27. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 33. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 44. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 45. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health that Mr. Speaker now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into 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.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

ESTIMATES - CONSUMER & CORPORATE SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): Resolution 36(b) Other Expenditures—pass; Resolution 36, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$115,000 for Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services—pass. Resolution 37, Queen's Printer (a) Salaries, \$93,000.00. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to find where I had read this somewhere but it seemed to be in one of the auditor's comments or something, pertaining to the overstocking and possible better controls pertaining to this, and I wondered if the Minister could comment, has there

been any change since the former director, I believe retired and we now have a new chap in charge of the Queen's Printer, maybe you could possibly give us his name, and give us a run-down of this particular department. This particular report was talking about better controls because of the increasing costs of stationery, and the Minister has talked about decentralization using a lot of these copying machines. I notice he has got one office located in the Fletcher Building on Portage Avenue, and they talk about the future high cost of materials and what have you will facilitate further decentralization, I wonder if the Minister could give us some indication of what proof he has that there has been a greater saving by this setting up of these satellite offices?

I also wanted to talk about the tendering system. I wonder if the Minister would care to comment about, is this a true tendering system because rumours have it that if a non-union shop tenders on a job that they may not necessarily be given the position. I wonder if the Minister could state the policy of the government — can only union shops bid on Queen's Printer's tenders?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps on the same subject, I can ask a question or a couple of questions of the Minister. Can the Minister indicate to the House what amount of printing do the Queen's Printer do themselves, or the government offices do themselves and what percentage is tendered? Are all jobs tendered or once you get a tender for a certain percentage of work then the work goes automatically to that printer or are most big jobs all tendered? I'd like to know from the Minister so I hope that the Minister would answer that.

The other point — I think it's most appropriate, I know that Mr. Evans is now retired but he's been for many many years a civil servant and I think it's only proper that we should pay our appreciation to him. He was certainly most co-operative with the MLAs, I know anything we wanted in the way of Bills or anything, we were able to receive it. I think he has been a very good civil servant and I think it's only proper that Ray Evans. . . — (Interjection) — I don't know what he was but I know that he was a good civil servant so I think it's only proper to express our appreciation to him.

My question is what percentage the government does of its own printing and once they ask for tenders, are the tenders repeated in most jobs or do they automatically give work to someone that has tendered on a certain particular job and then receives more work without any tenders?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a remark or two in this particular section in regards to tendering, and the Minister might elaborate on it a bit for my edification. I understand in our particular area, namely Brandon, they have what they call a tender-desk where the rural printers can present themselves once a week and look at the jobs and tender on them, and I just wondered if in the Minister's opinion this is working out satisfactorily — is he getting enough bids from the rural printers or have they sort of given up on bidding on government work?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN(Springfield): Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all here there's a slight increase over the previous year, I say a slight because it isn't that substantial — we are talking of an increase of \$7,100 in regards to salaries which is due to annual increment and negotiated general salary increases. . . We are working under an open-ledger account, the total appropriation dealing with salaries is \$654,700.00. I'm sorry, the total appropriation for salaries is \$654,700 — last year it was \$544,800.00. There is an overall salary increase, I was talking about a previous appropriation, there's an overall salary increase here of \$109,900 and that's due like I indicated to annual increments, reclassifications, and negotiated general salary increases. The budget of 1976-1977 did not include reclassification and process for nine positions that were reclassified during the year.

The printer is Mr. Patrick Crosbie who replaced Mr. Ray Evans about a year ago.

There is only one satellite photo-copy plant, that is for the Robert Fletcher Building, and this is merely for government offices there, and for correspondence courses being offered (printing).

Other Expenditures that we are dealing with here equally, there is an increase of \$290,800 based on the following:

1. The expenditure for stock and supplies is directly dependent on the demands of government departments. These expenditures are recoverable in total.

2. The projected increase was arrived at in the following manner: (a) stationery projected an increase of twelve percent over 1976-77. The increase would have been \$164,800.00. (b) reproduction projected an increase of ten percent over 1976-77 estimated sales. The increase would be \$76,000.00. (c) micro-film, we estimated that expenditures would increase by \$50,000 in 1977-78 due to projects being negotiated now. The total increase projected was stationery \$164,800; reproduction \$76,000; micro-film \$50,000 for a total increase of \$290,800.00.

Deficit for Revised Statutes and Consolidation, appropriation V7(c), 1976-77 \$23,500 — 1977-78 \$29,000 for an increase of \$5,500 which is due to an increase in Legislative Amendments to the Revised Statutes. The revenue received for updating and sale of statutes cannot cover the cost of printing and distributing statutes as a substantial amount of printed material becomes obsolete on Legislative Amendments.

The Member for Wolseley asked for details — in case the Member for Minnedosa is wanting to know — details in regards to the two appropriations before us.

In regards to tendering system, anyone can bid on jobs at the Queen's Printer at the bid table not just union shops, to answer the Member for Minnedosa. We do between 15 and 16 percent of the government printing in our own plant — (Interjection)— between 15 and 16 percent of our own government printing, the balance is tendered out.

We closed the Brandon bid-table because of lack of use mainly. However rural points still have a bid on jobs through the Winnipeg bid-table itself but the main reason for the closure of the bid-table in Brandon was for lack of use. This is something that we are revising now because I'm not totally satisfied we have explored all avenues pertaining to having a rural bid-table open and having an option for all rural businesses to be able to put their tenders in. I believe, Mr. Chairman, I have answered all of the questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Well, except that you said that the bidding was open to anyone, and of course we are talking of approximately 85 percent of the work done. It's just that at 2.754 million, that's an awful lot of printing activity for a particular department that has a 10 and 12 percent increase in what was said in the Throne Speech and what was indicated by the First Minister as sort of, I shouldn't use the strong term "do nothing" government but a "status quo" government. So it would seem to me there should have been some reduction rather than a 12 percent increase. I do feel also in some areas that I could cut out some fat, and I refer specifically to a charge I'm going to make now that the ministers are having the privilege of having Christmas Cards and Business Cards printed at government expense. I would think that this is an area in a time of restraint that we should be looking at to have some possible saving, and I wonder if the Minister would care to comment if he shares my view pertaining to the use by the government of Christmas Cards, whereas, Members of the Opposition are denied this privilege. I'm just asking because in my day, at municipal politics, everyone was treated equally even though we were not of the same political stripe. So it seems to me, if you have a policy that is for only certain Members of this Chamber, then it is a wrong policy and I think it is the type of fat we could cut out of the Minister's budget.

I did want to also say, it seemed to me that in the reproduction, if this is called a saving because he talked about a secondary centre is located in the basement of the Manitoba Archives Building together with the Fletcher Building, and it talks about a saving, and I hardly call a reproduction increase of \$76,000 a saving and maybe the Minister could explain why that is taking place.

Last but not least, we are talking about a substantial amount of money, and the Minister on Page 27 talks about addressing and mailing. Is this in addition to the Post Office section that comes under another Minister's portfolio? Does this Queen's Printer, could he explain what he means by addressing and mailing because I understand the cost of the Post Office is under another department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 37(a). The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, again I am informed by my staff here that the Queen's Printer has not accepted and not printed Christmas cards for ministers. It could well be that ministers have ordered Christmas cards or any other cards directly for their own use and I can't indicate, Mr. Chairman, that that was paid by the given departments or paid by the ministers themselves. But I am informed by the ADM responsible for the Queen's Printer that we haven't taken orders by departments or paid for Christmas cards that could have been ordered by respective ministers.

In regard to increase of cost, I was comparing here the honourable members making reference to \$76,400, I believe. I was comparing this with the previous year which was \$70,500 and the increase was not \$76,400 but an increase of \$5,900 and that was due to the annual increment and negotiated general salary increase so the increase was not \$76,400 but \$5,900.00. The Queen's Printer rarely responds to a demand for service in regard to such services as raised by the Honourable Member for Wolseley. The increased cost mainly reflects the demand for service by given departments. It's a service agency and it is not in itself actually creating work for the Queen's Printer but responding to demand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being 4:30, Private Members' Hour, according to Rule 19(2), I am leaving the Chair to return at 8 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 13

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The first item, Private Members' Hour, Monday, is resolution by private members. Resolution 13. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask leave of the House to introduce the resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed.) The Honourable Member for

St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that

WHEREAS improved energy conservation measures are imperative for the economic as well as resource conservation interests of Manitoba; and

WHEREAS governments must provide leadership to encourage individual as well as collective conservation measures; and

WHEREAS this Government of Manitoba is currently providing little more than lip service to energy conservation guidance and persistently carries on negative conservation economic measures;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT consideration be given to the advisability of formulating a policy that would,

1. Prohibit the assessment for property tax purposes of any dwellings or other heated structure from being increased because of energy conservation measures in construction which would exceed the Manitoba Building Code and other normal construction standards.

2. Prohibit the assessment for property tax purposes of any dwelling or other heated structure from being increased because of renewable energy collection devices such as solar collection and wind harnessing devices which may be added to or form an integral part of a structure.

3. Remove the provincial sales tax from all insulating materials and energy conservation products that recognizably improve energy utilization efficiency.

4. Provide incentives for upgrading of existing buildings and other energy consuming modes which can recognizably reduce energy consumption.

5. Provide more adequate financial assistance or incentives for research and development in the field of energy conservation and utilization, etc.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the House for giving me leave to introduce this Resolution as we know the Honourable Member for Riel whose Resolution or the member who introduced this is presently sick in the hospital and it is greatly appreciated by the member as well as the party that we were able to introduce this Resolution at this time.

We all know that the Honourable Member for Riel is very concerned about energy conservation as well as all members of this House. We know it is a major issue at this time because of increased costs of all types of energy utilized in Manitoba and for this reason we feel that it is a very important Resolution that is being put forward this year for debate as a private members' resolution.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time the only concern that it would appear this government has with regard to conservation of energy relates to the transportation field. I suggest that, Mr. Speaker, the fact the government has introduced licensing techniques of increasing the charge for large vehicles in terms of licences to try and encourage the public to ride around and transport in smaller vehicles and also we know that this government has also tried to encourage this — or at least they claim this — through the two cents tax that goes to Autopac every time we purchase gasoline so that the only indication that we have had that this government is concerned with regard to energy conservation seems to be in the transportation field. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the greatest consumer of energy, the single energy consumer that we have in this province is space heating and what has this government provided the public of Manitoba with in terms of initiatives to try and do something about this energy that is consumed daily in our province for space heating?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest nothing. There doesn't seem to be any general concern with regard to this problem that the public of Manitoba as well as the world and Canada are faced with. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether we are aware of it or not but the present rate that we have for demand of energy in Canada today, the present rate we're consuming per person approximately 55 barrels of oil a year, not internally, but using it. And this is the rate that we are now consuming energy at in Canada and in Manitoba and if we keep up the pace that we have had in the past two years, the growth of demand for energy, it will be four times that by the year 2000. Again, I re-emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that where the major portion of this energy is being consumed is in space heating of structures.

We ask ourselves why Canada is one of the leading users of energy. Well, Sir, I suggest that it is primarily because of our climate; we live in extreme conditions at certain times of the year that require the energy to heat and keep us warm. It is also because we have sort of become lackadaisical I guess, with concern of energy in the past because of the cheapness of it. We now are aware that energy is no longer cheap, particularly we know that electricity is going up with leaps and bounds as well as the petroleum products and, Mr. Speaker, these are our major sources of heat for our structures in Manitoba. I suggest, Sir, about 75 percent of the demand for energy to heat our structures comes from these two particular types of energy — petroleum as well as natural gas — with the remaining some 20-25 percent from electricity. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we want the people of Manitoba to look at conserving energy, we have to give them some incentives. Well, Mr.

Speaker, what are incentives to an individual or to a company? We all know what incentives are, it's what will it save me? How much money can we save? How much is it going to cost me to make this saving? And unfortunately, this government has not given this consideration.

I suggest this, Mr. Speaker, because at the present time, the experience that we have heard about or we personally have had when we go out to try and correct inefficiencies in our own homes or in buildings where factories or stores are located, we know that we pay federal sales tax and we pay provincial sales tax on insulation. We also know that if we go out and put triple-glazed windows in to try and stop the heat from going outside through the normally accepted in the past double-glazed windows, again we pay provincial sales tax and federal sales tax. And then, Sir, if we decide that it's wiser to build thicker walls and thicker roofs so that we cut down the heat loss, we again get provincial and federal sales tax for these materials.

But not only that, Mr. Speaker, we now have found out that when somebody goes out and tries to recover energy from the sun in Manitoba, he pays a different type of tax. He pays — (Interjection) — Well, the Honourable Member for Morris says, "A sun tax." I guess you could call it that — a sun tax — because, Mr. Speaker, if anybody is aware of solar heat recovery, I believe the most efficient method of solar heat recovery at the present time is building a structure with a relatively large surface facing the south to try and get as many hours of sunlight as possible and to heat up some materials. In some cases it is air, in some cases it is liquid and then the air is passed over rocks or the liquid is passed over some kind of heat storage facility and then it is used when it is required.

Mr. Speaker, it just so happens that where we live that if we wanted to heat our home 100 percent of the time with solar heat, you would probably have to build a solar collector approximately the square footage of your house. If you've got a 1,000 square foot house, you would have to build a 1,000 square foot collector because roughly a rule-of-thumb is that one square foot of collector really only gives you about one tenth of your heating requirements on a per square foot basis. So when we start to take up space on land, municipal assessors — and I guess provincial assessors "There's another structure or it has added value to the structure," and they accordingly get taxed.

Now we come back to the incentive. To an individual, the first incentive he has to overcome is the fact that it probably would cost him around \$4,000 for a solar collector and then he has to pay interest on that money that he has put into the capital investment for this thing, but not only that he now has to pay municipal taxes. So, Mr. Speaker, if we want to overcome this disadvantage or disincentive that the present person in Manitoba has, this government has to make a decision with regard to assessment of structures that use heat collecting equipment or heat recovery equipment because, Mr. Speaker, the other method that is used to try and conserve energy is what we call heat recovery equipment. This can be heat exchangers where the air that is being discharged from a facility, it absorbs the heat that is being poured out and when the new air is being brought in, it heats it up. There are also heat pumps and heat wheels and so forth, but the whole key to the problem is at the present time the majority of this type of equipment is manufactured in the United States and they, in turn, have it patented — or the demand is not large enough to manufacture them here — and I hope that the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce if he happens to read this speech says, "Ah-ha, we have another industry for Manitoba we can pour money into," because I suggest that they look carefully at this, that this is not necessarily the answer.

What we're saying is, take a look at the provincial tax that you are applying on these products. When this type of equipment is put into a building or a residence it ups the price of the building, and where the value of a building is taken into consideration when you are assessing for taxes, there should be some allowance that if somebody puts in heat recovery equipment or somebody puts in more insulation, that an allowance be deducted from the assessment value to try and encourage people to look after this future generation that is going to be faced with a shortage of energy because they are the people who are going to suffer more so than you or I. We can and there isn't any energy?

Mr. Speaker, this is why there has to be some co-ordination with the municipal or other levels of government to try and create a tax incentive, some type of an incentive to encourage not only the people who live in homes but also commercial and industrial users. And why I raise these other areas where energy is consumed to heat structures, we are looking at health safety standards in this province and we are looking at proper working conditions where people can breathe and work in a healthy environment. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are volumes of heat that is discharged from our factories every day, that if there was that incentive to put in that heat recovery — air-to-air heat exchanges that are available — that they would be put in and this energy would be retained and not consumed. I suggest that this energy that is now wasted, it ends up that the user of the end product pays for it. But not only that, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, I believe the other day said that the new increase of oil prices that will be coming through will cost the Province of Manitoba \$58 million.

Well I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if we can cut down this waste of energy where 75 percent of it is supplied by petroleum and natural gases that we are going to cut down that cash flow that is now

presently going out of our province to places like Alberta and Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, our oil production is down again this year because of this government's philosophy with regard to mineral taxation and royalty taxation on these producers. Again' the production of oil has gone down in Manitoba and thus we have to bring in more energy; more energy from outside, more dollars going out.

So again, it's not just the residential space heating we're talking about but also commercial and industrial, that if these people will put in heat recovery equipment, or heat-conserving equipment, then give them the incentive. Give them the incentive to look at what moneys can be saved, and we're not talking just about

saving money today. Everybody looks at a pay-back. The government looks at a pay-back; the individual looks at a pay-back. How many dollars is it going to cost me to put this item in? How soon will I pay for it? And once it exceeds ten years then people say it's not worth it. They say, "Why should we do it?" And as a result, again that overall total consumption continues to rise because the individual has no incentive, the individual company has no incentive, because the Provincial Government taxes them for the product or the material when he buys it, the Federal Government taxes them, and their municipality is now taxing them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this government stop paying lipservice in this field because it's very serious. The major consumption of energy lies in this field — in space heating — because of the climate conditions that we live in. They're not doing one thing about it, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Minister of Public Works, he plays with his toy solar-heater unit in the roof on the building here and we understand it isn't working at the present time, or maybe it is now. But what kind of encouragement is it for the individual who builds his own solar-heating unit and gets taxed to such a degree that he won't even have a pay-back ever because of his municipal taxes, but also the investment that he may have put in, in terms of capital cost.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter because if we do try to encourage our people to look at different forms energy, try and encourage them to conserve energy, yet on the other hand when they go out and try to do it you gouge them. Then that to me is not an incentive, Mr. Speaker, not one bit at all.

Mr. Speaker, what is the Federal Government of the United States proposing on this situation? Well it so happens, Mr. Speaker, that this weekend, I think it was in the Fargo-Moorhead local paper they had a small article on what the Carter administration was looking at. And it stated that they were looking at tax incentives for people and companies to look at insulating their buildings. They were looking at grants and they were even considering mandatory changes because they realize the importance of this particular situation. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Carter will be selling his peanut shells for insulation, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside suggested, because I don't think they necessarily would be the best type of insulation. I think the indication is that the American cousins are leading the way when in actual fact probably on a per person basis we are consuming more energy for space heating than the average American citizen is. And the part that hurts is that we're exporting all of this outside of the country but the other part that hurts is that we're exporting all of our Manitoba dollars outside of the provincial border that could be saved by using a little common sense, by saying, "So we don't get five percent sales tax on this particular item but in the long run we saved on the outflow of dollars in Manitoba for purchase of non-renewable resources."

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that with regard to electric heat the Hydro has indicated that fifty percent of the demand increase in the past three years was due to electric heat. So even conserving the energy in electrically heated homes will help to control the growth of the Hydro system, which has to mean dollars in terms of capital outlay and in operating costs and interest charges.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the government should look at the incentives to make sure that individuals are encouraged to get into this field of conserving energy, and not pay them lip-service which they have to date. I'm sure that the Province of Manitoba and the future Province of Manitoba will be better for it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that was an interesting statement by the honourable member and I would have to say that in terms of intention I would not fault him for his speech or for the resolution of the Honourable Member for Riel because I know they are both conscious of the value of energy conservation procedures and techniques. I think that is a good thing but at the same time they fail to recognize or give credit to programs that this government has, in fact, implemented, or to some of the leadership that this government has, in fact, undertaken and provided.

I would most disagree with the preamble of Resolution 13 and then I'll try to deal with some of the specific proposals as outlined where the member rather unkindly suggests that the Provincial Government is only providing lipservice to energy conservation guidance. And I would like to outline a number of things . . . —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. DOERN: Well it's like, you know, preaching to the converted. It always sounds good to hear the same old hymns and the same old songs, you know; the same old message, tell it again.

I would like to mention half-a-dozen items that our government is undertaking and most of them are being undertaken by my department so I'm most familiar with them. We have had, over the past couple of years, an energy conservation program which has led to savings of the order of several hundred thousand dollars per year by simply getting a hold of such things as the amount of air exchanges in various buildings. Given this climate that we live in, this rugged sunny but cold climate, we discovered — and this was nothing new to people in the business — that by pumping warm air out of the building and drawing cold air in (30 below Fahrenheit) and then heating it up, and so on, that this causes a great deal of energy to be expended, and that if one can control this air flow then one can save a great deal in terms of the cost of heating. On the other side, however, is if you don't move the air around very much it gets rather stale and gets rather uncomfortable or hot. So we have done things like that.

We have also lowered the thermostats, both during the day and in the evenings, and on weekends. We have, on renovations, put in triple glazing, higher insulation, etc., etc. We have had some contests at Red River Community College to encourage the students to write essays and think of new techniques for conserving energy. Last year we had a sort of a PR or energy conservation consciousness-raising activity, passing out buttons and having posters, and so on, to try what is described by economists as "moral-suasion".

A MEMBER: What about a cookie drive?

MR. DOERN: We leave that to the Girl Guides.

A second thing, of course, that members are aware of is the fact that our car fleet is now moving towards 50 percent in terms of the number of compacts and intermediate cars. This has changed dramatically over the years, so that we're now having a number of vehicles, about half the vehicles, which will consume less gasoline. And then one of our more famous endeavours — our electric vehicles — and I would say that in the scale of things our garage probably knows as much about electric vehicles as anybody in the business. The state of technology concerning electric vehicles is not that far advanced, and we have dealt with some of the best people in the field in the United States and we find that they themselves are really just breaking into the field and that our mechanics from seeing some of these places, from reading the literature, and from working and operating the vehicles probably know just about as much as anybody in that particular regard. We are now, I think, operating these vehicles fairly well and I think the only thing that is hampering us is technology, the break-through on any sort of chargers, or transformers, or batteries, that is what we are running into. It is not any other problem other than the advancement of technology. The Americans are spending money there but they seem to have some reluctance to go any further. The Japanese are doing some development and there, of course, is some development in Europe, but in terms of the state of that technology I would say that our experience is direct and is extremely good.

We have also, of course, poured a fair amount of money . . . This government has poured a fair amount of money into public transportation to encourage people to use a cheaper form of transportation. I think it's more efficient and perhaps it's also money saving when it comes to the construction of bridges and overpasses and new roads, and freeways, etc.

Another area that we're very interested in but we're waiting for our junior partners in the City of Winnipeg and that is the study that is now going forward in terms of the burning of garbage and refuse material for heat. This is an area that the province has been asked to share in, by the City, and we are participating in a study. And if that goes forward it will be a very expensive undertaking. I don't know what the cost of that plant will be but it will start at \$10 million and I suppose it could go to \$30 million or \$40 million. But I think that there is one source, right there, which the first time I heard of that, Mr. Speaker, sounded really pretty far out. The notion that you would take garbage and convert it into heat and power and energy. My first impression of that was that they probably used fuel in order to ignite the material. But it turns out, from seeing some of these plants — I've seen I think three of them in eastern Canada, and one in the United States — they are able to somehow or other ignite this material and then once they keep it going they are able to save all kinds of space, in terms of landfill and other methods of disposing of this. And, at the same time, they are able to sell almost every single thing that comes out of that. They sell some of the material in certain places for road construction. In other cases they sell the power.

The trick of building that type of a facility is to have a company or a corporation that requires large amounts of power close-by, so that you don't have to say . . . What they do basically is convert it to steam and then sell the steam. And that is done successfully in Quebec City. It is also done successfully outside of Boston where there is a plant like this set up by free enterprisers and they sell across the river to I think, a General Electric plant with a work force of — I don't know if it was 7,000 men or 17,000 men. They are able to sell that power. But one of the Canadian cities, Montreal or Toronto, made the fatal mistake of assuming that they could sell the power. And they just generate the steam and blow it into the atmosphere and lose a couple of hundred dollars per hour by not

having an ironclad agreement with a manufacturer or someone who could use it. So we have that opportunity here in Manitoba in the City of Winnipeg and I think that if it is at all feasible, and it can only be feasible providing they are able to sell this power to the buildings in the area, and that would include provincial buildings and I think people in the Richardson complex, etc., who would access this kind of heat. If they have that market then it's an economic undertaking. It also could be operated on the basis of savings in terms of trucking material outside of town, and at some places they allow private companies to dump their refuse there and charge them for it — they don't do it as a service — they charge them because it obviously saves them the cost of transporting it outside the city. So that's something that my honourable friend from St. James may not be aware of, that we are receptive to that. He may recall when he was a Councillor that that was under consideration.

We are also using, Mr. Speaker, in our government buildings electric heat whenever and wherever possible. In some places you just can't access the power lines, but basically all our new buildings are going up with electric heat which is conserving gas and oil. Then our solar energy experiment in this building is basically — first of all it is partly for our benefit to learn about solar technology — but it is also to make people aware of the fact that there is a solar technology which at this point in time will not replace gas and oil and electricity. It is being considered only as a supplementary form of power or heating.

I always remember saying to a friend of mine who is an engineer, I was quite excited about the possibility of a hydrogen car, and he said, well the problem with that is that if you have a hydrogen vehicle you would need a gas bag probably ten storeys high. That's the limitation on hydrogen technology. There are great limits on solar technology as well. But I hope that within a few weeks we will have a formal ceremony to which I will invite all the members of the Legislature. I think there is some sort of plan to provide "sun juice" which is non-alcoholic but nevertheless will stimulate the brain and the stomach.

We also hope that in addition to heating the dome as an experiment, that we will also have a display in the basement of this building to which groups of students and visitors, etc., will be able to come and learn about solar experiment and also the solar experiment in this building. One of the main reasons we argued for this building was to make the legislators aware of solar technology and I think that that part has proved successful and will prove more successful.

I might say that the Member for Riel who sponsored this resolution, we are sponsoring a seminar in a couple of weeks from Public Works on energy conservation and one of the speakers at our seminar is — assuming he is healthy and I hope he is — but if he's healthy at that time he is one of the invited speakers who will participate in that endeavour.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that you can see and you will agree that the preamble to this resolution is really wrong, that the whole concept that the government isn't doing anything or only paying lip service, I think I've provided some refutation of that.

I would like to add that under our Critical Home Repair Program we are in fact doing a fair amount of insulation right now. The people who are qualified for that program can have insulation put into their homes. I am certainly one who is very enthusiastic about encouraging homeowners to insulate their homes and would be prepared along with, I think, other members of the government to entertain a proposition that something should be done in the form of tax incentives or other means to encourage people to further insulate their dwellings. When you couple that with the fact that there is serious unemployment in the country and problems of unemployment in the province, then that might be one area worth exploring.

So dealing specifically with some of these points, I would ask members of the Opposition to clarify one and two for me because I have this problem. When you say that if a person upgrades his property you want to exempt him from further assessment, give him some sort of a special consideration or what is it — tax loophole or shelter perhaps is the correct word, a tax shelter — that is the only point that bothers me. If a person invests several thousand dollars on his home and thereby his market value is several thousand dollars more, shouldn't that be reflected somewhere? I mean that is the normal proposition and that is the problem. The problem is that when you put money into your house, your house is worth more, your assessment is more and your taxes are more. I would like to hear some further clarification. I don't know if we're going to be honoured with a speech from the Member for Sturgeon Creek, but whoever is next in the Official Opposition might clarify how they would make an exception to what is considered to be the normal procedure.

The third point about removing a provincial sales tax, again I have to defer to my colleague, the Minister of Finance. Again, I like the idea yet I am not sure of how to translate it into action but I certainly like the idea of encouraging people to insulate their homes. Now how do you do that? You could do it with moral suasion, you could do it with advertising — (Interjection) — Well, see I am sympathetic to your cry of free enterprise and here again you are putting propositions where you want the government to step in and do certain things and there's sort of a contradiction there.

The fourth point, Mr. Speaker, I think is also very unclear and that is about incentives for

upgrading existing buildings. Well there again you have a man who owns a building, let's say he owns an office building with a couple of hundred thousand square feet. Are we going to move in there and triple-glaze his windows and pour insulation in and do all sorts of things for him and then he gets the enhanced value of his property? I don't especially like that. So I would like some clarification of that.

The fifth point I have sympathy for as well, I guess it boils down to Nos. 3 and 5 about providing financial assistance or incentives for research and development in the field of energy conservation.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion that it is not correct to say that the government hasn't done anything in this field. I think that we would be prepared to give consideration to some of these suggestions but I think other ones would have to be explained and we would have to be persuaded by some powerful logic that we should undertake these measures.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to make a comment or two upon this resolution. I would begin first by agreeing with the Minister of Public Works — which I don't often do — that when he said that the government has done something, I agree with him. They have dabbled, tinkered, diddled, fooled around. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— I think the Minister of Public Works would desperately . . .

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the measures undertaken for conservation have been more for the amusement of the Minister of Public Works than they have been for the introduction of effective measures in the Province of Manitoba. It seems that the passing out of buttons and the holding of cocktail parties and the seminars and all the rest of it, are designed more to give the Minister of Public Works something to do, something to keep his hands busy so he won't sort of be mucking around in other matters of the province. I think it is almost designed . . . Energy conservation has become the tinkertoy operation of the Manitoba Government in order to keep the Minister of Public Works hopefully otherwise engaged so that he won't continually sort of fall over his own feet, which he is prone to do on any other measure of seriousness or of substance that should really be his duties. Because really, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the list of activities that he outlined, when you add up in terms of the general impact in conserving energy in the Province of Manitoba, they add up to one of those numerals or ordinals called zero. The end result of all that sort of playing around that has gone on for the past three years, the little gimmicks on the top of a building and the little kiddycars that the Minister rides around in, and we see it on the CBC news, all really add up in terms of the ability of Manitobans to conserve energy to a big zero.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, this government has avoided making tough decisions that would really have an impact and, in fact, have engaged in a serious case of duplicity, perhaps hypocrisy, in their stand as enunciated by the Minister of Industry and Commerce less than a week ago concerning the question of energy conservation, simply that he was playing to the gallery or to the crowds, engaging in what could only be considered basically fairly dishonest statements about the question of increases on gas and oil. You begin to see what their interest is. Their interest is cosmetic, public relations oriented, not dealing with any degree of insight or courage in the question of how you bring about energy conservation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that in part can be traced back to one of the great policy vacuums in this area, which has been the lack of any energy policy in the Province of Manitoba. For three years straight we introduced resolutions in this House until finally we just got tired of having to deal with the buffooneries that we heard, or inanities coming from the other side, particularly from the Minister of Public Works, about why we didn't need an energy policy. And yet every time you turn around you find that we don't have one. We introduced resolutions asking for an energy council, for a department of energy establishing the various means by which it could happen. And all the time we heard from them, "No, we don't need it because fellows we have an energy policy." And now we hear what the energy policy is, handing out buttons, holding cocktail parties, sort of going in their kiddycars. That's the energy policy —(Interjection)— Well, he just talked about inviting all the members of the House to having a non-alcoholic Gatorade cocktail party at the latest seminar. This Minister has sponsored more seminars where he is usually highlighted as the guest speaker than any other Minister I know. Perhaps the only time he gets an invitation to speak outside this Chamber, is when he holds his own seminar. It seems to me that that doesn't constitute an energy policy. It is spending public money to hold your own seminars so that you could tell people about the next seminar . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . you are going to hold to talk about the things you have already done. So that takes an awful lot of ingenuity, Mr. Speaker, to sort of plan your own forums to talk about things you haven't done. You know, we hold things on biomass and solar energy and when you look at the end result, when you look at the product, it isn't there. And it does go back, Mr. Speaker, to the fundamental vacuum that we don't have an energy policy for the Province of Manitoba.

So we have the —(Interjection)— We don't have one, we are not required to have one in the Opposition. It is the government who is required to have a policy. We are here to suggest and recommend as we have done for the past three years. But by God I am not paid to write policy for you

guys. If you haven't got the brains or ability to do it yourself then don't go around asking other people to do it for you. Given our chance we will have one. And we have told you how to do it but frankly, I am getting tired of having to prop you up all the time and giving you ideas. You have a department of your own, get your own for goodness sake. Isn't it about time, Mr. Speaker, that this government realizes that they are a government, that they are here to decide policy and it is about time they started saying, "Well, what are you going to do?" The fact of the matter is, at least for whatever — (Interjection)— Of course, I will permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Could the honourable member indicate whether the department or the Institute of Urban Studies is now delving into the field of energy conservation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, that is totally irrelevant to the issue. Obviously, if there is going to be a continuation of the vacuum, someone is going to have to do it. Maybe we should do it but with 12,000 civil servants in the Province of Manitoba, I expect that they might be able to compare with a staff of five people working in many other fields as well. — (Interjection)— That's all.

I know that the Minister hurts on things like that but the fact of the matter is it is not the responsibility of members of this House, it is the responsibility of government and they don't have an energy policy of any kind, whether it deals with supply or conservation or pricing, they simply react to events.

Now a classic case in point, Mr. Speaker, was the address given with only that kind of solemnity that the Minister of Industry and Commerce can muster up as he rears himself to pronounce upon public matters, when he indicated that he was going to Ottawa to defend the interests of Manitobans against increased prices of fuel. Mr. Speaker, no one in this House is naive enough to realize that this was not a good ploy, good game to say "Let's keep the cost down." But what he was not saying was the other side of the coin, that one of the reasons why you have a pricing policy is that it is probably the most effective way of bringing about conservation. As harsh as that reality may be, it is a conservation measure which has proven to be about the only form that really works, that all the pleading and persuading and moral suasion that the Minister of Public Works likes to talk about doesn't work when you get down to it.

A classic case in point was when we went through the serious fuel energy crisis in 1973 where everyone . . . all of a sudden the truth was dawning that we were running out of available accessible cheap fuel in North America, that it was going to start costing more. Different kinds of governments had to subsidize in a variety of ways, as did our own, to try and moderate the increase. But the fact of the matter is, as soon as the oil embargo was off, what happened? Consumption was right back up where it was again.

Mr. Speaker, there were certain measures that other provinces have taken to start dealing with conservation. For example, one of the things that several provincial governments have already done is reducing the speed limit. It is estimated that reduces energy consumption of automobiles by 15 or 20 percent. Has this government done it? No. Why? Gutless, that's why. They won't do that kind of thing because they are just afraid of . . . You know, that is going to take some courage to reduce the speed limit. The Province of Ontario next door did it, and their consumption factors have gone down markedly. But this government refuses to do it. Now that is a conservation measure that would really begin to count.

And then we get the Minister of Industry and Commerce saying, "No, no, we are going to go down and fight those prices." The fact of the matter is that the pricing policy that is being established is designed primarily for conservation measures. And when he began making statements which I would really, when we get to his Estimates, challenge him, he starts talking about the \$500 million slush fund being held in Ottawa — there is no such thing and he knows it.

A MEMBER: How do you know?

MR. AXWORTHY: Because I happened to read some of the reports. I know the Minister of Public Works doesn't want to get confused by the facts because in holding one idea, you know, is too much for him to cope with. But the fact of the matter is that the point of that pricing policy was to deal with conservation. And what we required from this provincial government was an honest statement, that if they said that they did not agree with that as a conservation measure, were they then prepared to have the Government of Canada continue subsidizing out of the general treasury, not going into consolidated funds to the tune of five or six hundred million dollars a year, in order to encourage the use of automobiles and all the rest of it which we have come to recognize — (Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Is the honourable member speaking on this resolution or is . . . All he is doing is defending his friends in Ottawa. All I am hearing is a defence of the Federal . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the Honourable Minister is debating the point. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is too bad that the Minister seems to have lost all capacity of reading them, where the first Whereas section says, "WHEREAS improved energy conservation measures are imperative for the economic as well as resource conservation interest of Manitoba;" It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that is fairly clear that we are talking about energy conservation measures. And what the Minister objects to is that I am talking about the lack of such measures in the Province of Manitoba. And it is the lack of those measures and the lack of any direction which I think is really instructive.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, the points made by the Minister and by the government, even reach the stage of being laughable in certain instances because, again, their inability to face up to the tough issues required for energy conservation have been demonstrated in this House time and again.

Not only do they refuse to deal with the question of reducing speed limits, not only have they totally and completely ignored the problem of pricing as a conservation matter and have no application and have the nerve to have Industry and Commerce, in fact, engaging in a dishonest game of politics just simply to avoid that issue only a week ago, but thirdly that they have avoided sort of talking about the other kinds of measures which would also be introduced. If we are really talking about conservation, we should be talking about the whole question of transportation in this province. Minister of Public Works Sure, they're prepared to pay 50 cents on the dollar for any buses we buy. Now that is no different from any other province in Canada. What have they done that's been so remarkable. But what have they also done in terms of dealing with the question of providing the alternative to the automobile in terms of policies in this province in the City of Winnipeg? They have really not offered any kind of initiative or innovation in dealing with the kinds of public transportation. Then he says, which absolutely boggles, he says, "What we really want to do is we want to encourage people to use electricity for heating purposes." Now they talk to any engineer who knows anything about the whole question of energy, and they said the most inefficient use of energy is if you use electric energy for heating purposes. It is without question the most inefficient use of electrical energy. Electrical energy is great for lighting purposes, fine for industrial purposes, but to use it for heating purposes is an absolutely totally inefficient way of doing it and yet he says his policy is to go about promoting it.

Now you know, Mr. Speaker, again, the fact of the matter is if you really trace it, Manitoba Hydro, unbeknownst to the public, is basically backing off doing hook-ups because they know as well that the actual capital cost to start hooking places up for electrical heat is astronomical. And if you begin looking at the records of how many heating hook-ups Hydro is engaging in over the past couple of years, you will realize that they are in themselves a contradiction of what the Minister said. But he doesn't know that, Mr. Speaker. Here is the Minister, you know, sort of doing one thing when another agency of the same government is doing something almost diametrically opposed because they happen to know the facts.

So again we go back to the argument of what kind of energy policy do we have. We're simply talking about the fact that we don't have a policy again and that one arm of government or one agency of the government doesn't know what the other one is doing. And so when we talk about conservation, it in itself is not isolated from other parts of policy. It has got to be related to the questions of supply and demand. It has to be related to the question of how do you develop urban areas for example.

A case in point, you want to start saving energy in this province, then start saving on the sprawl that's presently going on outside the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg. Six hundred acres in the Municipality of St. Andrews have been sub-divided this past year. As much acreage as is going to sub-division developments fully within the perimeter route of Winnipeg and this government, which had the power to stop it, has done absolutely nothing — hasn't taken a step, hasn't made a decision. It's the power of that Cabinet under order-in-council to stop that kind of sprawl, to save on transportation, to save on hook-ups, to save on utility extension and what have they done? Zero.

Well, Mr. Speaker, therefore if in fact, you know, we are being asked to accept the argument that everything is being done that should be done, it really stretches one's belief and credulity in the spoken word.

The fact of the matter is, I think that this resolution that was initiated by the Member for Riel and spoken to by the Member for St. James is a good resolution and we support it without hesitation because it does initiate many of the measures but again only a partial measure, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that taking specific slices of the problem, poking in at particular old soft points is not the way to deal with the overall question of conservation. What we must be doing, Mr. Speaker, is . . . go back. The Minister of Public Works is quite right. We must take a look at the pricing question, because the whole question of pricing has to relate to conservation and the wastefulness.

One of the harsh realities of why this government, why I accuse them of not having courage is that someone is going to have to stand up and tell most people, including almost everyone sitting in this

room that we are extremely wasteful of energy and that we can no longer afford to be as wasteful as we have because it is no longer a cheap and available resource. And that is something that is going to take the sort of leadership which has been lacking so far and therefore it means that if certain consumer groups are going to be particularly severely hit by increased prices then you provide support for them. But the fact of the matter simply to bury your head in the sand and pretend that pricing is not a factor, is simply to ignore one of the basic components of any energy conservation policy.

Similarly, the whole question of the way in which we build our communities, the way we put up our buildings, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of buildings being put up by the Minister himself, the Woodsworth Building itself, is an energy wasteful building in terms of its construction. The glass surfaces that were was itself constructed — if we are to ask the Provincial Government to provide us with the example of what to do, then the Woodsworth Building is one of the worst examples of what to do because it is an energy wasteful building and the heat loss and energy loss in that building, as compared to other modes of construction that are presently available is significant.

So the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, you know, you can touch a range of issues and I believe, if the government when the warning signal was heard in 1973, when we all of a sudden realized that 1973 was the end of history as far as cheap energy for this country is concerned and we had to sort of wipe the slate clean and start all over again, then that was the time for this government along with other governments, Federal and other provincial and municipal, to begin planning a careful, comprehensive, step by step, integrated approach to energy planning and use in this province .

Now, Mr. Speaker, they have not done it and so now we're in the game of having to react to events, undertake *ad hoc* measures, or in the case of the Minister, sort of play with his tinkertoys or go to his cocktail parties or hold a seminar, all of which are really of no use or of any purpose. I much prefer him to spend his time and his energy and the resources available to him and other members of the department, to come to grips with the hard issues of energy rather than simply amusing themselves.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, 5:30? Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm prepared to call it 5:30. The hour being 5:30, I am now leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene at 8 p.m. in Committee of Supply.