

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 29, 1970

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed this afternoon may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have, as my guests, representatives of the Junior High Schools of Manitoba. They are here today to acquaint themselves to some degree with procedure in our House, tour the building and the Art Exhibit, 150 years of art, and attend a reception in Room 254 hosted by my daughter Nadine and assisted by some of the Junior High School sons and daughters of honourable members of this Assembly, namely Miss Arlene Burtniak, Miss Judy Craik, Miss Kathy Sherman, Mr. Kenneth Fox, Mr. Patrick Weir. May I also mention to honourable members that if any should find the opportunity later this afternoon, I am certain that our guests would be most happy to meet them and you are certainly most welcome in Room 254. On behalf of the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, may I once again extend a welcome to you.

We also have 50 Grade 7, 8 and 9 students of the Arden School. These students are under the direction of Mr. McCullough, Mr. Paramor and Miss Eamish. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. On behalf of honourable members of the Legislative Assembly we welcome you here this afternoon.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, when the Minister replied to this Order for Return, I unfortunately was not in the House but I made a point to read carefully what he had to say on that occasion and I notice that he suggests that it would take several people several months to gather the data which I'm requesting. Quite obviously, Mr. Speaker, I would not want to put the government to that kind of an expense. I might add that very shortly after the Order was introduced, I received a letter from the Deputy Minister of the Department and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . our guests that photographs are not allowed in the Chamber. The Honourable Member may proceed . . .

MR. MOLGAT: . . . letter from the Deputy Minister which the Minister had indicated would be forthcoming, indicating that I could see the department and get all the information that I would require; they would co-operate in any way; and furthermore, the Minister indicated that they would make this information available to anyone who wanted it as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will not press for the Order to be presented in this form at this point. I will now go to the department, following upon that letter, and see what information I can get. I have asked the pages, Mr. Speaker, to pass to the members of the House a sheet which shows the reason for my concern. This is directly from the departmental figures and it shows the very drastic decline in the production of this one major category of fish which is the one that is the most important one from a commercial standpoint and the one that brings the largest return to the fishermen.

Now any industry faced with this sort of a record is in sore need of immediate attention. The information I was seeking, it has been indicated to me by others with whom I have consulted outside of government, would be the type of information necessary to accumulate to try and find out what in fact is happening in the fishing industry and this is the reason that the Order was placed in this way.

Now I know we have the Fresh Water Fish Institute out at the university now; I know that within the department there are some studies going on; but I urge the government to get on this question very very quickly because there is a whole resource here which is lost to specifically the people who are involved in it in the first place. -- (Interjection) -- Certainly.

MR. SCHREYER: Because the honourable member is closing the debate, I'd like to ask him a question. I suspect that he knows, has a pretty good idea as to why the production record on these three lakes is the way it is, and would he care to elaborate just a little as to what he thinks is the explanation of this decline in production over the past two decades.

MR. MOLGAT: Well I think there are a combination of factors probably, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know exactly what the answer is. I suspect that a good deal of it is in fact pollution - and I'm not speaking here only in terms of mercury pollution - I think in good part probably the areas where the fish spawned have now been polluted by, in some cases, an excess of

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) drainage, too much soil getting into the gravel beds . . .

MR. SCHREYER: What about rough fish?

MR. MOLGAT: Rough fish. Yes, rough fish are a factor, undoubtedly, speaking for Lake Manitoba which I know the best, being in my constituency from the very outset. I know there that the carp population which was virtually unknown in the early days is now a major factor. There are other problems though, problems of mesh size for example are very important, because if you have a certain size of mesh I know in Lake Manitoba the result is that you do not get the saugers out. You end up by only taking out certain species of fish and you throw your balance completely out. This is why it can only be studied in the light of all the elements that make up the question. But I repeat to the Minister, I will not press for the Order but I would hope that within the department, within all the government services there will be a very serious study of all the factors and that this will be undertaken as an item of priority.

When I first introduced the motion I pointed out that any other industry in Manitoba faced with this sort of a decline, the population would be up in arms. We wouldn't stand for it, whether it be in agriculture or in the needle trades or whatever it is, because you simply cannot have this sort of a resource decline without urgent action. So I withdraw the Order; I urge the government to take this up as an urgent priority.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the honourable member would submit to a question?

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. SPIVAK: Does he believe, in view of the remarks that he's made, that the Standing Committee on Economic Development should be called for review of this matter?

MR. MOLGAT: It is one area where I think the committee could perform a useful function in getting before it the information available from government. I think that this would be a proper question the next time the committee meets to see exactly where we stand, what direction the committee would recommend further study in. I would certainly approve of that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of my honourable friend's remarks was that he is asking for leave to withdraw the Order. This will relieve us from voting it down, which we would not like to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave granted?

MR. GREEN: Leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: This I believe had been moved . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: Yes. Unfortunately my seconder who I had this morning is not here right now, so . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: It's before the House now.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm the one who asked that it be stood over. I have to indicate that I am not in a position to support this motion as it is spelled out; and having done so, the honourable member has a right to speak to it and I will of course speak at greater length in explanation for the position I have to take. But if I do so now, then that will deny the honourable member the right to introduce the motion, so it's up to him to decide whether he wishes to speak in proposing the motion or give me the floor. -- (Interjection) -- Of course.

MR. MCKENZIE: I just basically want the information, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then, Mr. Speaker, I -- when I received the information that the honourable member was filing this Order for Return I personally had no objections in principle but I sent it on to the Superintendent of Insurance to make enquiries as is the practice that I follow of whether or not it's a practical one which we can deal with, indicating that I had no objections, and I have a message now from the Superintendent which I will report to the House and then I'll indicate further discussion I had with him.

I'm informed by the Superintendent that the information requested is not available. During the course of a year he says hundreds, and verbally he said even thousands of complaints and enquiries are made. They involve all classes of insurance but no attempt is made to segregate and list them into various classes as the motion requests. In addition to the telephone calls the Superintendent of Insurance has a file of complaints in writing, but those would only be a small percentage of the total, and he has indicated to me that between 90 and 95 percent of the claims he gets are verbal, not written, and are dealt with in a verbal manner and are not recorded. He indicates that such enquiries or complaints are not required to be

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) filed or tabled under The Insurance Act, and for that reason no record whatsoever is kept. Now if we accepted this Order for Return, then we could not answer at all, I am informed, the number of complaints received because no record is kept; nor could we give them in any categories because no record is kept of categories.

Now, the way this is worded I would have to request support to vote it down because it just cannot be answered. If the honourable member acknowledging the statement which I have received that only five to ten percent are in writing, if he still wants to know the answer to this question in terms of the number of written complaints, then of course I have no objection to giving that, pointing out that in the estimate of the Superintendent of Insurance it is meaningless because it only represents five to ten percent. And then of course I could not accept it into categories because again it's not kept that way. However, with this kind of explanatory note, it may be that a review of the written complaints - I don't know how many there are, I don't know how much work is involved - but a member of the department could go through them and categorize them, unless one complaint falls into more than one category. That's a minor problem. So I would say that I cannot produce the information requested because it's not available. If some member of the - or some friend, let's put it that way, if some friend of the honourable member moving this motion is willing to propose an amendment to this resolution saying the number of written complaints, then I would accept it, indicating again that I understand it would be a rather meaningless exercise but one which would be up to the honourable member to decide whether or not to support it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I think the terminology used by the Honourable Minister is appropriate when he said that this would be a meaningless exercise. I suspect that if we examine the reasons for this request, we can find the basic problem that the opposition continually has under our system of its attempts to try and get meaningful information, to be able to make some evaluation of government decisions. The request here is for information that I think would be of help in the opposition's attempt to assess the government's action with respect to its proposed monopolistic auto insurance plan. The information that's being requested is being requested in a sincere attempt to be able to determine how many complaints, the nature of complaints, specifically concerning automobile insurance and generally with respect to insurance matters so that we have some idea of an appreciation of the manner in which the Superintendent has operated in the past, the manner in which complaints have been handled and some evaluation of the nature of the complaints so that we would be in a position to judge the necessity of a government monopolistic plan.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements of the Honourable Minister of Finance, and I can appreciate what he has said, because I think he's indicated that these complaints come verbally, they come over the telephone, they may not be general rather than specific in nature, that in view of the remarks that he has made, it would be most appropriate to suggest now, as I believe we will suggest when we are in the Public Utilities Committee, that the Superintendent of Insurance be allowed to appear before that committee as a witness, to be able to present to the members of the committee and to the members of this Legislature pertinent information in connection with the operation of his department with particular information in connection with auto insurance companies, his relationships with the companies, his relationship with the complainants of specific instances where they feel that they have not been handled correctly, and generally to be able to get his expert opinion on the variety of matters within his purview so that there can in fact be some evaluation and judgment on this side with respect to the government's proposed bill.

Now from the information that's been presented to this House, from the general statements that have been made and from the comments outside of the House, particularly by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, one can almost believe that the Superintendent of Insurance has been basically ignored by the government in arriving at its political decision in connection with the proposed auto insurance bill, and that's perfectly within the right of the government. They do not have to listen to their civil servants, they do not even have to get information from them, they are the government. However, I think that if we on this side and the people of Manitoba are to properly judge what has taken place with respect to this matter, we are entitled to have before us either the specific information which possibly could be obtained through an Order-in-Council, or through an Order for Return as suggested, or if not the specific information, at least have the opportunity of having the Superintendent of Insurance be present at the Public

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) Utility Committee hearings, have the opportunity of having him present the facts as they are, giving all the members of the committee, and thus the members of the House, the opportunity to make an evaluation and to determine whether the government's proposed decision to proceed in a compulsory monopolistic position is correct.

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order. The honourable member is speaking to a motion requesting information, and he has now indicated that in relation to a particular bill which is still before us and on which the honourable member still has a right to speak, I believe, or other members of his party have, he's asking that a civil servant be available to a committee. Now if he wants to argue, as he does now, that the information requested here be available at the committee in the person or through the person of the Superintendent, that's one thing, but if he's going to start broadening the debate to discuss whether opinions or whether ideas or whether anything else is to be available to a committee, in connection with a bill, by a civil servant, then I think he's going well beyond the resolution before us, which deals with information, and I would suggest that he should be asked to confine his remarks to how to obtain the information which he suggests should be obtained.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my comments to a large extent, were motivated by the references made by the Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . point of order that I made. I don't know if the honourable member is speaking on a point of order or possibly is accepting my comments.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I again, Mr. Speaker, point out that my comments were made as a result of the remarks by the Minister of Finance which suggested that the information was meaningless and that in fact the Order that is being requested would not produce meaningful information. I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we have only certain procedures in this House to be able to determine information for debate; this happens to be one of them; and I'm suggesting as well that in discussing this and recognizing and appreciating what the Honourable Minister has suggested, that it would therefore become apparent that the only way that we could obtain this information is if in fact the Superintendent of Insurance was allowed to come before the committee. We cannot force that to happen. We can only request that and I think it's appropriate to mention at this time because it's obvious that the information is not going to be forthcoming and even if it is presented, the Minister of Finance has indicated that it will not be meaningful for us to in any way examine, so therefore I think it was correct that I make reference as I have - I don't want to repeat myself again; it's not necessary - to the particular Bill that is before us because the information that is requested under this Order, at least part of it is required for the evaluation of the Bill. We have only certain procedures, Mr. Speaker, and if we're not allowed to be able to obtain . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would appreciate if the honourable member if he wishes to continue with his debate on this motion for an Order for Return that he do confine his remarks to the matter of the motion for an Order for Return. I'm sure the honourable member would agree that there are certain limits which must be drawn and it would be irregular and improper to refer to various other effects and side effects of such a motion that may result.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, again, this is a debatable motion. It's not my purpose to in any way disagree with the remarks that you have made, but I must point out again that our purpose is to try and attempt at least to seek information. An Order for Return is one way in which we seek information and it would appear that the information that we want to receive on this side is not going to be able to be obtained, therefore for our purposes, and I think for the purposes of the House, it would be very wise for the government to give very serious consideration to the Superintendent of Insurance appearing before the Public Utilities Committee to be able to be examined on this detail and other matters with respect to auto insurance.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I would like to introduce a guest sitting in my loge to my left, a member of the Legislative Council of Yukon, Mr. Ken McKinnon. On behalf of the Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here this afternoon.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

MR. MOLGAT: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that an Humble Address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of any agreement made between the Manitoba Government and any of its Boards, Commissions, Agencies and Departments and any person, persons and corporations with regard to MacDonald Airport land and/or buildings.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: No problem, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I think the procedure is wrong because I think the mover of the motion has not had an opportunity to speak had he wanted so to do.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to speak at this time.

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

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that an Humble Address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of any correspondence between the Manitoba Government and any of its Boards, Commissions, Agencies and Departments and any person, persons and corporations relative to any agreement concerning the MacDonald Airport land and/or buildings both prior to the agreement being made and since the agreement was made.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, normally I would have placed these two as one address but I felt that there might be some time in preparing the material for the second Address and if there was to be any delay I felt that the agreement at least could be made available instantly because I think it is in the hands of government.

MR. SCHREYER: May I indicate, Mr. Speaker, that again I see no problem in acceding to the request here to the motion, except that I would like to have it clear that the correspondence that is being referred to - I assume that the honourable member is not expecting correspondence that might be of an inter-departmental nature. This is usually understood to be not tableable or subject to being tabled. There is other correspondence of course of a conventional kind that pose no problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for River Heights.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with the concurrence of the Members of the House I would propose that we move to the Bills standing in the names of, or introduced by Private Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed that we proceed with Private Members' Bills? (Agreed)

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. Bill No. 36. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the House Leader. I regret that the matter stood in my name for I think two occasions now. I just happened to be out when they were called.

I rise to compliment the member who is introducing the Bill, Mr. Speaker, and even more to compliment the individuals who are involved in the incorporation. I think their objects and the whole purpose of the installation of this corporation is indeed a good one. I think Manitoba has an enviable record in the field of sports and anything that we can do to further that is to the advantage of our community as a whole.

Here are a group of people who through no possibility of personal gain themselves want to do something to improve the status of sport in the province. Some members have spoken about others who have been involved in sports in Manitoba, in particular about Dr. Frank Kennedy, and I certainly want to join with them in tribute to the work that was done by this very

(MR. MOLGAT con t'd.) fine man. His death was a great loss to sport in Manitoba. Thanks to him at the University of Manitoba some very important changes were made in the whole approach to sports and I'm pleased to see that a group now such as this one is going to be carrying on in this vital field. I hope that as time goes on government will be able to assist them in every way possible to ensure that the objects of the new corporation can in fact not only be met but surpassed as well.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading, Bill No. 87. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX presented Bill No. 87, The Manitoba Dental Services Corporation Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to incorporate a Dental Care Services Corporation. It's very similar, almost exactly the same as legislation which incorporated The Manitoba Medical Service in 1942 and as it was amended from time to time in the Legislature. The affairs of the Corporation would be conducted by a Board of not less than seven nor more than fifteen members of whom two-thirds must be dentists and practising under any scheme or plan that is devised. The purpose of the legislation is to provide a vehicle for provision of prepaid dental care to Manitobans and a method of control over the use or abuse of such a plan either by subscribing members of the public or by dentists practising under the scheme.

The corporation would not be entitled to make any pecuniary gain under such a plan or plans. The corporation would be required, however, whenever requested by the Minister, to furnish to the Minister of Health and Social Services all information concerning the affairs of the corporation as he requires.

Upon dissolution or winding up of the corporation, any surpluses remaining in the hands of the corporation after paying the accounts of dental members would have to be turned over to the University of Manitoba for research in the Faculty of Dentistry.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend this Bill proceed on second reading and it will go before the Private Members' committee where representatives will be available to answer any questions on details.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker. regarding this Dental Services Act it seems that this is a most appropriate Bill. It should help people to be protected against the costs and with perhaps the expression of some concern whether we have an adequate supply of dentists in this province to look after the needs of the people, with some reservations on that score, I would think it would be quite appropriate to send this Bill on to the Committee for discussion there.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Radisson, Bill No. 75. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member could we have this stand?

MR. GREEN: There's no objection on our part. I do believe certain members have been wanting to speak on this motion. Perhaps the honourable member could indicate whether it's agreeable to him that anybody else who wishes to speak can do so.

MR. CRAIK: That's quite agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 75. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I had not decided to speak on this bill until the Attorney-General last evening gave us a eulogy on his philosophy of the liquor laws of the province and how they should be operating and the changes that are contemplated. I associate my feelings with many of the others who have spoken on the bill already, and wonder again why the Attorney-General did not bring this bill before the House. Such wide-changing approaches and opinions to The Liquor Act at this time, I think, are required, but is there some reason

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) why the Attorney-General didn't care to bring it, and I'd like to know, because many of my constituents are wondering, why was it brought in by a backbencher? Simple little bills and simple changes of legislation I agree -- (Interjection) -- I'm not suspicious at all but I certainly would like to know, and I have people that are concerned that a backbencher should be bringing in this type of legislation at this time with such wide-ranging problems.

MR. SCHREYER: Backbenchers shouldn't be ignored.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, I look at other Acts that are coming in here with changes of great magnitude and government should tackle these problems - I have no quarrel with that at all -- (Interjection) -- That's right, a government member but still not a -- (Interjection) -- Yeah. But let's go and say why not take Bill 56 in this way, you know, do it that way; bring it in by a backbencher - or 16, 17 rather. That's the reason I asked the question and no doubt the Honourable Member from Radisson will give me the answer - at least I hope he will. But I am one who opposes a lot of the things that's in this bill. I don't think that Manitoba needs all these changes in the liquor regulations. I'm a sort of a moderate; I . . .

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): What!

MR. McKENZIE: Well, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface can quarrel with that if he wants or he can stand up and debate with me, but like in the sports arenas and things like that, I like to go to a hockey game -- (Interjection) -- Well, can you wait till I finish?

MR. SCHREYER: Would you permit a question?

MR. McKENZIE: Certainly.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member. My question relates to his statement of just a minute ago where he was wondering out loud why it was that this bill was introduced by a private member. That's right, isn't it? The member was wondering about that? So I'd like to ask the honourable member if he can recall, since he's been here since 1966, whether he can recall the incident when a bill was brought in respecting liquor law and it was introduced by a private member on the government side at the time, and it was indicated that it was a private vote. On another occasion, the former Attorney-General, a Minister of the Crown I admit, introduced a bill, however, on liquor law, and announced that while he was introducing it nevertheless it was a free vote. And so, in the light of that, is the honourable member still so curious about this?

MR. McKENZIE: I have no quarrel with what the First Minister has said. In fact, I think a free vote is a very sensible approach to legislation of this kind, and whether the Attorney-General is not in a position to bring it in, that's -- but I'd like to know why, and I think we have a right to ask of the Attorney-General why he didn't care to bring the legislation before us, and if he doesn't want to answer it then there's nothing I can do about it, but as I say, I think I have the right to ask the question in the House and I think I have the right to try and take the answers back to those that I represent. But basically, the point that I was trying to put across is that I think liquor has its place and we are today, in Manitoba we can buy liquor in a sort of a free society, but one of the times that I detest seeing liquor exposed to the public is at a ball game or a hockey game or a football game. I go there as -- well, I go there as an interested spectator and I think that . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: If I want . . . to run in the can and have a drink?

MR. McKENZIE: I go there to see the sports spectacle and I think I've got lots of time to refresh myself before the sports event or I've lots of time to do it afterwards, but I don't think the public deserves that type of exposure from liquor.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh come on.

MR. McKENZIE: We have an image in Manitoba that's one that's highly respectable today with our present liquor laws and most acceptable by -- most people think that Manitoba's liquor laws today are very liberal and acceptable, and now - well, we shove booze down our necks, you know, more and more and more. I do become concerned and I think that there is room for moderation in this field and I agree that this is why I become concerned. When backbenchers bring legislation of this nature into the House then I think we should exercise more concern because when the government is not prepared to bring it in, then I do become rather excited.

I would like to have the Member from Radisson give me a full explanation of subsection (1) of Section 121 -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? Well the principle then would be with regards to the tables and the chairs and all this philosophy. What does that mean to me

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) in having a beer in a restaurant whether the table is round or whether it's square or whether it's got cracks in it or whether there's a table cloth on it, or the type of chairs that's in the room. I would wonder if he would explain that section a little better than I understand it at the present time.

The section on advertising, of course, is one that I can't associate myself with at this time. Possibly the member in his explanation will change my opinion on it, but I don't think that it's realistic at this time for us to take a look at that approach to liquor. The other one, the matter of occasional permits for conventions, fairs and ta da ta da, I think it covers the waterfront. I become very alarmed; in fact I would ask the member: who is going to control all this booze that's going to be around? It's bad enough today to attend a private function, as I have in my constituency attended from time to time, where young people are exposed and there doesn't seem to be the best form of control even under our present legislation, and if we liberalize it more than it is today where -- I wonder, who is going to be responsible or who is going to take charge of it and regulate it and make sure that we're not breaking the laws, and when we do it in public I become most concerned. With those few remarks, I will support the bill in second reading but in the committee I would have maybe some amendments and changes that I would draw to the attention of the Honourable Member for Radisson on this bill.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may the previous speaker allow one more question?

MR. McKENZIE: Fine.

MR. SCHREYER: In the honourable member's mind, what is the major difference between a bill that is introduced by a Cabinet Minister but which is announced as a free vote bill, and a bill that is introduced by a private member and is announced as a free vote bill. Both being free vote bills, what is the difference?

MR. McKENZIE: It's a matter of policy, and I think the liquor laws of the province should be government policy. I mean the government controls, they control the Commission; you know, it's their jurisdiction and they can regulate it and they can impose the regulations, whereas a private member can take a different approach to it altogether. He hasn't got the same responsibility as a Minister of the Crown.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, will the member permit another question? If it's announced in advance that it's a free vote bill, then regardless of whether it's introduced by a member of the Treasury Bench or a private member, how can it be a matter of government policy if it's announced as a free vote bill? Does it not then become rather inconsequential as to whether it's introduced by a minister or a private member if it's a free vote bill?

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, on that point I would say, in my opinion, if a Minister of the front bench, the Treasury Bench, submits a bill even on a free vote, I still think that that's government legislation, whereas if it's coming in by one of the members of the back bench, then it's not the policy of the government and then I become alarmed for that reason, because I think the Ministers of the Treasury Benches, you know, the Liquor Act, they should -- and I could be wrong but that's my own opinion, and I think that on legislation with such wide-ranging powers that are asked for, I would submit that that, in my humble opinion, is one that the Attorney-General should have brought to the House.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand why the last speaker becomes suspicious because a certain person brings in a bill. I think he should be more interested in finding out what the bill is all about. I think that we at times -- a bill such as this one is practically an omnibus bill, and it might be that many members of this House would like to vote on certain sections and not on others, and I think that this is the question, this is the reason why it was decided to have a free vote. And I, as the First Minister, I also recall Mr. Smellie was the Minister of Municipal Affairs who introduced a bill and the first thing he said -- it was a bill on daylight saving time, on uniform time. It was something that the people of Manitoba had asked for quite a while, and Mr. Smellie got up and the first thing he said, "I'm not presenting this bill as a member of the Cabinet, but as the Member from . . ." - I don't remember what constituency he was representing -- "from Birtle-Russell." He said, "I represent, I'm here speaking as the Member for Birtle-Russell." So I don't think that this is important. I think that, I rather suspect, Mr. Chairman, that the member was having a little fun with us when he said this because I don't think that this is the most important thing, and if he wasn't having fun with us then, it was certainly funny to hear him talk about no liquor at a ball game. This is something I like to talk about. Does my honourable friend think that if

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) there's any liquor available you have to get drunk? Is that what he means? Whenever he wants liquor you have to . . . Well what is wrong with enjoying a ball game on a hot summer day with a glass of beer?

MR. PAULLEY: Use Pepsi Cola.

MR. DESJARDINS: Gosh. I can't see any reasoning in that at all. Liquor is for enjoyment. It's for recreation and there's nothing wrong with it; it's the abuse of liquor that's dangerous. And there is nothing wrong in having a bottle of beer where you're watching a hockey game or a baseball game. And I certainly -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and most of the stadiums now and the arenas are serving it in paper cups so you can't even throw the bottle on the ice or on the playing field. Well I suspect that those that are against it might want to bring their own, I don't know. This is the suspicion that I -- I know that I've assisted, I've seen games, the Blue Bombers play, and it wasn't allowed, but the people around me -- I don't know if I was in the wrong section but the people around me, nine out of ten had their own little bottle of booze. So why be a hypocrite about this? Why be a hypocrite? -- (Interjection) -- I was pretending I didn't have any. I was drinking from the other fellow's booze. But I think, let's be reasonable, and there's nothing wrong with liquor, nothing wrong at all; it's the abuse of liquor; and I don't think that we have to start worrying about exposing people to liquor. It's the way you're brought up and if you really want to drink that badly you'll find it, no matter where. And I know that my honourable friend was, and he might still be a great sportsman and he played baseball and we played against each other, he played hockey, and I thought that, well, the training that he had in sports and so on would make him look at things a little differently, and I think he'd be the first one to say, "Let's enjoy it." You don't have to hide for that. It's something, it's recreation; it's a good thing as long as there's no abuse.

Now, if -- this is why I ask, I started by asking this question -- if his feeling is that because there's liquor for sale you should get drunk, it's an invitation to get drunk, definitely I would say a ball game or a sporting event is no place to sell liquor because you automatically have to get drunk, but I would say this of any other place either. So I hope that my friend will reconsider it. I'm sure he was having a little bit of fun. I'm sure that he doesn't really believe that.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. MCKENZIE: Does the honourable member not recognize that there is a problem with the minors in this particular atmosphere?

MR. DESJARDINS: No I don't. There's a problem with minors if you preach against liquor, like there's a problem with everything else. But if they are taught to use this in moderation, I don't think it's a problem at all. I've gone to hundreds of ball games and hockey games where they served liquor, and the kids were eating peanuts or ice cream and they didn't even know; they thought nothing of it, they were too busy watching the game. But if you say you can't have it, well right away there's something wrong, and this is where they're going to hide behind the barn and start drinking, as far as I'm concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a few brief comments. Before that, would the Member from St. Boniface entertain another question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, sure.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'm not sure whether the Member for Roblin is concerned about the selling of beer, that's beer in the Act, by the cup in the stands where under-age people can purchase it, or in a beverage room attached to the stadium such as the Winnipeg Arena. What is the intent of the bill in that regard?

MR. DESJARDINS: I was speaking on what the honourable member said. As far as I'm concerned, I would like, I don't care if there's a tavern in the same building. I don't care if there's somebody that's coming in with paper cups and selling beer in the stands. I think it's perfectly all right, and unless I misunderstood my honourable friend, I think that he didn't like the idea of any liquor being sold on the premises or during a sporting event.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the attitudes of Manitobans have changed considerably since 1956 when a very progressive piece of legislation was brought in based on the Bracken Commission. And I think it's recognized throughout parts of North America, certainly all of Canada, that Manitoba had taken a reasonable approach to the use of alcohol by its people, and I think that that Act has stood the test of time throughout the years and from time to time as our people have sought modifications or modifications have been

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) brought in, and I think by and large they have passed except for some degree.

I find myself in general agreement with pretty well all of Bill 75 except for the one. And this was pointed up the last time there was amendments made to the Liquor Act, when the television and radio industry wanted the free, or no restrictions with respect to carrying advertising on that media. And we heard at that time all the arguments as to why a television station could locate outside the province or outside the country and beam their messages and their advertising into, well in this case into Manitoba, and the local radio stations and the local television stations had to abide by the Manitoba law. Well, I'm one of those who feel that if it isn't right you don't condone it because it's being done somewhere else, and in this case I don't think that it is right that a television set can be turned on in the home and whatever message comes across has to be accepted by the family or by the people in that home unless they want to jump up and down and turn their sets off. I think that the amendment that was proposed by Mr. Campbell, who was in the House then, that the restriction be made that this type of advertising not be allowed before 10:00 o'clock at night was a reasonable one, and because Channel 12 has taken advantage of this somewhat by obtaining advertising contracts with the various breweries, doesn't make it right in my opinion, and I would go further if I were a member of the government and had this responsibility - I would have an informal meeting with the breweries who persist in evading the laws of Manitoba by taking this type of advertising to a station in another country and having it beamed in to our province. I think that is contempt of the law, and while it may be legal, it's still contemptuous of the laws of this province, and I think that the appropriate people in government should talk to these brewers and suggest to them that if they don't follow the law as it applies in Manitoba, then they won't do very much business with the province. In other words, they are taking advantage of a situation and I think that the government has a duty to step in and point out that if they persist in this method of advertising then the province will exert some pressure on them.

So I find, Mr. Speaker, that I can agree with Bill 75 excepting for the one that has to leave the advertising regulations for a matter to be considered by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. And I think it should be in the bill that the hours should be observed, and at the appropriate time in committee I intend to move such an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? Relative to this advertising problem that you referred to, I'm not sure as to just what the situation is, but let us assume that the product that you are referring to is sold in North Dakota, is that not -- that is not a complication as far as you're concerned?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: No. My concern is that the product, the Canadian product that is advertised on the American station for the Canadian market is, in my opinion, contemptuous of the laws of Manitoba wherein they reside and wherein they manufacture and sell their product.

MR. GREEN: Then it is not the case that the product is also sold on the American market?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: No.

MR. GREEN: Thank you.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a word or two about this particular bill, and I want to say quite frankly I'm glad that the bill that we're going to consider has been introduced by a private member, because this relieves me, as a member of the front bench, to have to adhere to a government proposition. My honourable friend the House Leader of the Liberal Party and others have raised the questions as to why the Attorney-General, who is responsible in respect of the Liquor Commission, did not introduce the bill.

The Member for Portage la Prairie a moment or two ago referred to deliberations in this House in the past on the matter of liquor legislation, and I believe he referred precisely to 1956, as the result of the enquiry and investigation by the Bracken Commission into all aspects of liquor in the Province of Manitoba. I happened to be a member of the House at that time and I paid my respects to the work that was done by John Bracken and his commission at that time, and I felt that he, along with the members of his commission, the secretariat, had proposed to the Legislative Assembly a reasonable alternative to the then prevailing liquor laws in Manitoba, and I think we should be appreciative of that.

But I sometimes wonder whether or not by adopting, if we indeed adopt the suggestions of Bill 75, we are going just a little beyond due bounds insofar as liquor and the control of liquor in the Province of Manitoba. I think, Mr. Speaker, what we should first look at is the title of the bill itself under which the liquor laws of Manitoba are administered, and that is The Liquor Control Act of the Province of Manitoba, and it does seem to me more and more as we are proceeding with amendment to the so-called Liquor Control Act of Manitoba that we're going into the liquor uncontrolled act of Manitoba. I suggest to my honourable friend, the proposer of this resolution, that this is a directive to this Assembly for more uncontrolled application of the use of liquor in Manitoba and all aspects concerning the same.

MR. BEARD: Shame.

MR. PAULLEY: And my honourable friend, I believe it was from Churchill, who said "shame" - and I believe it was you, Sir, and I'm not going to refer to his associations in his normal vocation which may have prompted the word "shame" - but I do sometimes think, and I don't need to say to the members of this House that I am one of those who imbibe with liquor, and sometimes, Mr. Speaker, more possibly than I should, but at the same time I realize that there are times that even a person such as myself who may violate the general application of the use of liquor and the intent thereof, as a legislative member or a legislator in this province should take a real close look at the extension of our Liquor Act and our liquor laws in the Province of Manitoba.

While I realize, Mr. Speaker, it is not permissible generally for anybody speaking in debate on second reading to refer to a particular section, may I simply say this, that one of the sections that the bill suggests should be amended is that dealing with the day we normally call Thanksgiving Day. And I say, as an adherent to the general premise of observance of religious observance, that Thanksgiving Day is not just merely a holiday in the Province of Manitoba and elsewhere where we can get out and rake our grass for the last time before the onslaught of winter, that it is a deep day of religious significance to many people, and I am one of those, Mr. Speaker, with all of my deficiencies, who respect the reason for the observance of Thanksgiving Day, not only here in Manitoba but in Canada and across the whole western hemisphere, and I would suggest to the honourable members who may support this bill, that if we want to change the connotation or the concept of the observance of Thanksgiving Day, that rather than do it through the medium of the Liquor Control Act, that they should bring in a measure to abolish in all of our legislation the observance of a day called Thanksgiving Day. This to me would be a more practical and a more realistic approach than the one suggested in Bill 75.

Mr. Speaker, when we were considering the report of the Bracken Commission, we dealt at long length in this House with the question of advertising, and I said at that time that if we are going to make laws respecting advertising that we should have it on a broad spectrum. In other words, that there should be no start of advertising at 10:00 o'clock in the evening on radio and TV, that we should have it, if we are going to have advertising at all, it should apply to all of the media of advertising uniformly. And what do we find in this bill? We find a suggestion here that the control should vest in the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I'm a member of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council but I don't agree, I don't agree that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council should have the right to prescribe when and what type of advertising should be done.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

I'm opposed to this action of the bill and I think that in the context of the Bracken Commission report and previous legislation, that it should be this Assembly in total, the representatives of the people in Manitoba, not those of us who happen to be privileged to be members of the Executive Council, should have the right by a free vote. And I agree with the principle of the free vote insofar as this aspect is concerned. I don't want, as a member of the Executive Council, to have rights that supersede those or override those of the members of this Assembly in the respect of advertising, and I highly recommend to all of the members of the committee that will be considering this bill that we reject completely the concept contained in this bill, that those of us who happen to be of the Executive Council, the right to supersede this Assembly in respect of advertising, and I will be suggesting that that aspect of the bill be thrown out and that the responsibility in this field be vested where it is at the present time, in this Assembly and not outside.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, I object to another suggestion in this bill, and that is the continuation into the Sabbath - and I respect when I say Sabbath I'm talking of the Christian Sabbath rather than that of other affiliations - in respect of the extension into the Sunday lack of observance of what we have historically held dear to us as members of certain religious inclinations.

Then as we take a look at the bill, Mr. Speaker, we come down to other aspects of the bill. A resolution was passed here not so long ago, if I recall correctly, that suggests that the age of majority should be 18, that we should generally accept the principle that a person of 18 is responsible, that he should be allowed to partake freely of liquor. And then what do we find in the bill, in the proposition that we have before us? We find a proposition, Mr. Speaker, that a person in other pieces of legislation becomes responsible at the age of 18, and yet we find in the bill proposed by friend from Radisson that no person under the age of 21 years of age should serve liquor in a licensed premise. Now where is the compatibility? I suggest that there's a lot lacking -- (Interjection) -- and my honourable colleague said they're at work -- (Interjection) -- too hard. So if it's too hard for a person of 18 to dispense liquor, then I say it's doubly hard for a person of 21.

So as we read throughout this bill, Mr. Speaker, I can find many sections any many principles -- (Interjection) -- ah, my friend says just a minute. I'm trying to suggest to my colleagues, and when I say colleagues in this connection I'm talking of my colleagues in the House as a whole because of the fact this is supposedly a free vote, so I'm appealing to my colleagues in this House to make the necessary amendment.

As we read through the bill we find such things as character of beverage rooms; we find licences in theatres, and while I do appreciate, I do appreciate that at the present time the matter of licences in theatres only deals with live performances. Heaven's to Betsy, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you're aware as I am that some of the live performances that we've had in some of our beverage rooms have been the subject of prosecution in many areas, so we're just going to carry this a little further outside of beverage rooms into theatres and the likes of that and we may be in difficulty in those areas as well.

But, Mr. Speaker, there's another principle involved in this. After having agreed to the contention of my honourable friend who proposed this amendment to the control of The Liquor Commission which I said earlier, uncontrolled, where do we go from here? My honourable friend from St. Boniface, my honourable friend from St. Boniface talked about sporting events and this, that and the other, and why shouldn't we just mingle just a little wine with a little lacrosse or a little wine with a little hockey and, oh sure, but I know my honourable friend, I want to tell him that I've been associated with sports possibly longer than he has had the opportunity of gracing this world, and I say too that once we start in an open over-all venture of this nature, it's darn hard to bring about rationalization, and I caution the members of this Assembly, not particularly, Mr. Speaker, as to the contents of this bill, but where we go from here.

When we considered this matter in this House back in 1956, these were the arguments then and I suggest we've gone a long way from the contention of Mr. Bracken and his commission at that time. It is true that at that particular time we had to lift from under the table our cocktail glasses and our wines and our liquors and put them up on top, and I agreed with the stand and it was a good job that that commission did, but I suggest however that in some areas we have to exercise caution, and not only, Mr. Speaker, exercise caution, we have to apply

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.). . . . intelligence to our liquor laws here in the Province of Manitoba and elsewhere as well. I suggest that if the principles contained within this bill were holus bolus accepted, then we may be in for trouble.

Much is made of the free enterprise advertising system under which we are living at the present time. Why should we here in Manitoba be able to listen to or see Channel 12, for instance, from North Dakota advertising Old Crow or something like that, which is incidentally an atrocious concoction - I've tried it, and oh Lord - but anyway -- (Interjection) -- House of Tennessee. I think it is, and I repeat, an atrocious concoction that comes from across there as is most of their bourbon, and I trust and hope that the Member for Souris-Lansdowne is not going to supply this when we go down there on June 5th at the International Peace Garden. But what difference does it make, whether it comes in from North Dakota or whether it's here. I don't think it really makes that difference.

Mr. Speaker, some criticisms have been levied at this side of the House because these matters were not - this bill was not introduced as a government measure. I think I have indicated in these few remarks of mine as to why, and I say this because historically in this because historically in this House matters of this nature have been considered in a free vote. I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to vote for this bill going to second reading, and I trust and hope - and this isn't wrong - I trust and hope that there will be representations when the matter gets into Law Amendments that will substantiate a few of the points at least that I have attempted to draw to the attention of this Assembly.

And in particular again, Mr. Speaker, I want to re-emphasize that I object most strenuously to the section in this bill that gives to the Executive Council, of whom again I want to repeat I happen to be a member, the right of being able to say what the people of Manitoba will be able to read, to listen to, or to see in the three media that are available to us.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Surely.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: First of all, I'm rather glad to see that he agrees with me in part about the advertising regulations that he feels that the Executive Council shouldn't have that awesome responsibility. Would he not agree with me that the same course of action might be followed with respect to the auto insurance regulations?

MR. PAULLEY: I don't see any relationship with automobile insurance and the uncontrolled liquor act, except that under the provisions of the Automobile Insurance Act we're going to have to take a close look of those who imbibe through The Liquor Act while they're driving on the highway.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think you can turn the clock back and I don't think anybody in this Assembly, anybody in this Assembly seriously believes it either. I respect the arguments advanced a moment or so ago by the Minister of Labour, I respect them very much, and I think there is much in what he says. I can't agree entirely with him but I do agree with him with respect to his comments in the area of advertising. I say that I don't believe that we can turn the clock back on this subject because it's a subject that concerns itself with social behaviour, and we've lived in an age of cyclonic change in social behaviour, in habits, manners and morals, an age of changing values and social mores, Sir, and it seems to me to be a futile academic exercise to think in terms of challenging the progressive legislation that was introduced in this province 14 or 15 years ago as a consequence of the work done by the Bracken Commission.

So I begin my examination of the subject from that determination and from a total acceptance of the fact that the changes introduced as a result of the recommendations of the Bracken Commission were progressive and constructive changes, and they have had I think far more benefit for Manitobans than detriment. To be sure, there are always abuses of licence and freedom, but I think the abuse of the use of liquor was far more severe in the days before we had the improved and enlightened legislation now on our statute books in this area than has been the case in the 12, 14, 15 years since. The law is only as good as society's respect for it, and therefore by definition only as good as society's observance of it, and I think in this area, the use of liquor, Sir, we had in this province for many years, in fact many decades, an eloquent example of that.

As of 1956 some very liberal regulations were introduced, and I reiterate my acceptance of their sensibility and their value in terms of the social fabric and the cultural fabric of life in

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.). . . . our province, but I don't believe, Sir, that the sensible limits that we arrived at in this province as a consequence of the work of the Bracken Commission should be forever subjected to erosion. I don't believe that there should be a continual and gradual subversion of the intent of those who participated in formulating the original, enlightened and responsible legislation to which I've referred.

I have no objection to the vast majority of the sections and proposals contained in the bill in front of us, Bill 75. I have no objection to the extension of hours. I think that the extension of hours called for in the Act is compatible and consistent with the changes to which I've referred in our values and in our customs in Manitoba in the last 15 years, but I am reticent when it comes, Sir, to extension of the opportunities for promotion of the use of alcohol, or for any other as far as that goes, for any other element in life that requires a certain degree of responsibility in its handling and in its use.

I think we've seen an interesting and an instructive lesson in this respect in the area of the use of tobacco. For example, when we were all ten, twenty and thirty years younger than we are now, there was unlimited advertising of the use of tobacco permitted in many jurisdictions which now have banned it, at least in part if not in full. The experience of some three or four decades in the use of tobacco demonstrated to a fairly conclusive degree that the harmful effects were much greater than perhaps anyone originally anticipated and much greater than some of the benefits to be obtained from tobacco's use, and therefore in many jurisdictions a limitation on the promotion, the public promotion of the use of tobacco has now come into existence.

I don't suggest that the same thing might happen in the case of alcohol for we certainly have had lengthy experience in the effects of alcohol, in the benefits and the harmful effects of the use of alcohol, and I am not suggesting to the Chamber that some revolutionary new discovery with respect to alcohol's effects on the human system may be imminent. I think we know what alcohol can do and does do, but I cite the example of the changes in the area of advertising for tobacco merely to reinforce my argument that we approach many of these exercises really in a semi-ignorant way, in a hopeful and an experimental way but a way that by virtue of the fact that the human condition and the human mind is not perfect is a semi-ignorant way. We feel our way by trial and error, then if we find that we have erred or gone too far in certain directions it's necessary to make modification. The same kind of need and necessity for modification in the minds of many people where promotion of the use of tobacco is concerned could conceivably, could conceivably come to be the case in the area of the use of alcohol, and I have extreme reservations about extending the licence for promotion of alcohol's use.

I have no objection to the current regulations which permit television advertising, for example, of beer and alcohol after 10:00 o'clock at night. I think that this was part of what I have called sensible and enlightened and responsible legislation which grew out of the work of the Bracken Commission. I do have misgivings when I consider the extension of that freedom and the reduction of the limitations on that exercise. Since I have been a member of this Assembly I must say that there have been many occasions on which I've been impressed by the commonsensical attitude which the House Leader of the Liberal Party has brought to matters before us for consideration and I was impressed today by what he had to say about the section on advertising in Bill 75. Similarly, I feel the same about the remarks of the Minister of Labour on that section.

As I said when I began my remarks, I agree in some significant degree with what the Minister of Labour had to say, I just part company with him in the area of the extension of hours for the sale and use of alcohol. I don't believe that the extensions requested in this bill are unreasonable or incompatible or inconsistent with the way in which Manitobans live and enjoy themselves in the 1970's, but I do agree with him in respect of what he had to say about advertising and I certainly agree with the House Leader of the Liberal Party on that same subject.

Nobody - I shouldn't say nobody, but few people in this Chamber are more sensitive to the difficulties imposed upon local broadcasters, and Manitoba broadcasters in general, by virtue of the proximity to this province of certain American broadcasters and the degree to which certain avenues of revenue are available to those broadcasting outlets located south of the 49th parallel and denied the broadcasting outlets situated in our province. I spent a good many years in the broadcasting industry myself and I have been confronted with this problem day to day, week in and week out for a long time, and I'm the first to admit that this is an anomaly in our system in North America, it's a consequence of geography over which we have no control, and up to this point there has been no legislation possible because there has been

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.). . . . no technical measure possible that would give our broadcasters an even break with the American competition in the contest for this revenue to which I refer.

Of course as you know, Sir, the revenue to which I make reference is specifically that available by brewers and distillers for advertising and promotion of their wares. I don't believe that this government can sit down however with local brewers or distillers operating in this province and threaten them - and this is a point at which my path of thought on this subject diverges from that proposed by the House Leader of the Liberal Party. He didn't use the word "threaten" - and I hope I'm not reading implications or inferences into his remarks - but I inferred from what he said that substantial persuasion or moral suasion should be brought to bear, substantial pressure should be brought to bear if necessary by the province, by the government of the day, on local brewers and distillers located in Manitoba who were using outlets south of the international border to advertise and promote their wares in Manitoba in defiance of the spirit, not the letter but the spirit of the regulations governing advertising of that type in this province.

Now he didn't use the word "threaten" but I am using the word "threaten", because my inference from his remarks was that he thought heavy pressure should be brought to bear to prevent this from happening in the future. I don't believe that the province can sit down and bring that kind of pressure, that kind of possible threat to bear against business, legitimate business operations in the province, but I think that this government could bring legislation forward, could introduce legislation which made it illegal for local brewers and distillers to use the airwaves in Manitoba, not necessarily the airwaves of Manitoba but the airwaves in Manitoba to promote their products before 10:00 p.m. or whatever the accepted hour should be.

I see little difficulty in drafting that kind of legislation. The government may not be willing to do so but it seems to me it would be a far more direct, honest and forthright manner of dealing with the problem rather than attempting to lean on the brewers and the distillers, an exercise which lays itself open to all kinds of abuses. It would seem to me that the forthright thing to do would be to introduce legislation simply saying that brewers and distillers in this province may not use the airwaves in this province, no matter where those airwaves originated, may not use the airwaves in this province to promote their wares and their products before the appointed accepted hour, which in this case is 10:00 p.m. That being the case the -- (Interjection) -- Does the honourable member want to ask a question?

MR. BEARD: I would move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface, that the House adjourn.

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

MR. BOROWSKI: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, before the vote is called, is it proper for a change of Speakers in the middle of a vote or a call for a vote? I recall a similar incident when I was in the Chair as Deputy Speaker and the Chairman was in his office, and at that time the Honourable Minister of Labour made an issue of it and

MR. PAULLEY: No, I never did that, Mr. Speaker, that I recall. I believe that it's quite proper for Mr. Speaker, who is the servant or the presiding officer of the Assembly, to take his Chair any time prior to a vote but not during a vote.

MR. WATT: under similar circumstances when you were on this side of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm the same person on this side of the House as I was then. Mr. Speaker, I want to

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Churchill that the House do now adjourn.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Desjardins, Henderson, Miller, Pawley and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtiak, Cherniack, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Fox, Froese, Girard, Gonick, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Hardy, Jenkins, Johansson, G. Johnston, Jorgenson, McBryde, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Malinowski, Molgat, Moug, Paulley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafrensky, Sherman, Toupin, Turnbull, Uruski, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 7; Nays, 40.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I didn't vote. Had I voted I would have voted in the negative. I was paired with the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying before I was so interestingly interrupted, I think there's a difference between the use of liquor and promotion of the use of liquor, and I have no hesitation in reiterating what I said about the enlightenment of the liquor laws in this province at the present time and my support for the changes in the hours of use, hours of sale advocated in the legislation before us, but when it comes down to promotion of use, although I would not be interested in stifling such an exercise I'm not keen about extending it.

I think that those who produce beer and alcohol and spirits for commercial consumption certainly like any other enterprisers in commerce have a right to promote their wares, but since their wares and products are of the category that require a sense of responsibility in their handling and can have some harmful effects, particularly if abused by young people, I think that reasonable limitations are acceptable in the area of promotion and advertising and I think that the legislation which grew out of the work of the Bracken Commission produced reasonable, responsible limitations on the promotion and advertising of these products. There was no attempt to stifle or muzzle the exercise of promotion or advertising but it was limited and contained in a responsible way which seems to me to have worked successfully and advantageously since it was introduced. The people who suffer are the people, as I've said, who were particularly those engaged in the field of private broadcasting who suffer as a consequence of unfair competition, and I think that if this Assembly can do anything to eliminate the unfairness, to eliminate the hardships to which those local private broadcasters are unfairly exposed, then we should in all conscience try to do so.

But this is where I was suggesting I differ slightly, in degree, from the path proposed by the House Leader of the Liberal Party although we agree in principle and in objective, and I suggest that rather than to try to bring muscle to bear upon local brewers and distillers who circumvent both the letter and the spirit of the law here by advertising in forbidden hours as it were on U.S. outlets, that a simple piece of legislation would eliminate the problem, legislation that simply laid down the rules for brewers and distillers operating in this province with respect to the hours when they might use the airwaves and the airways in this province for the promotion of their wares and their products.

I agree, too, with the comments of the Minister of Labour with respect to the role proposed in Bill 75 for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council where advertising regulations are concerned. The section covering this subject is Section 10 on Page 1 of the bill and it seems to me to contain inherent within it a very dangerous licence for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council of any day, a very dangerous licence for any administration in power in this province in any day, and if it contains within it a dangerous licence for the administration of this province, then by definition, Sir, it certainly contains dangers for the people of this province in a sensitive area such as this where regulations for the promotion of the use of an ingredient such as alcohol, which makes its effects felt socially in a very widespread scale in society, in an area as sensitive as that, ten or twelve or thirteen men should not have the wholesale responsibility for decision-making that that section would confer upon them. So I would like to add my opinion and my support to the remarks of the Minister of Labour where that section is concerned.

But the rest of the bill, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, is acceptable and in tune with the customs that we follow in our society in Manitoba in 1970 and with our present-day values. It seems to me that to limit the hours of closing in establishments serving liquor in the uneven manner in which they are limited at the present time is an inconsistent and an insupportable way to operate. Many enterprisers, many operators responsible for establishments where liquor is sold are placed in an extremely unfair disadvantage and I don't think this government, any less than the one that I hope to belong to some day, is interested in placing different enterprisers and different segments of society at unfair disadvantage with others, so I subscribe to the changes in the bill having to do with the extension of hours.

But I do repeat, Sir, that there is a vast difference in my mind between the use of an item and the promotion of the use of that item, and although I don't want to stifle the manufacturers, the brewers, the distillers, the enterprisers in the exercise of their right to promote their wares to a responsible degree, I don't either want them to have the licence to promote them in an irresponsible way, and I think that the current regulations covering advertising,

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.). . . . particularly on the air where television and radio are concerned, have worked well and if there is any correction to be made in that area it's on the subject of disadvantage for local broadcasters and that disadvantage can be easily remedied by legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the adjournment on this debate stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Swan River? (Agreed)

The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West, Bill No. 62. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I have looked at this bill and we on our side have no difficulty agreeing that it go to committee. I find one thing though that puzzles me. Since the Municipal Act is being changed and this is one of the areas that's incorporated in it, why this should come before us now, although I believe we can discuss this matter when it gets to committee and make a resolution on it there.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I had opened up with my remarks on this resolution on last Private Members' Day and at that time the Honourable Member for Churchill was not present. I hope that he's had an opportunity of reviewing what I said earlier in Hansard because I don't intend to repeat. I did indicate that I understood the type of frustration that would inspire the resolution that he has put, and I also indicated that I didn't believe that the Resolved portion of the resolution represents an intelligent answer to the problem, because if being part of the North West Territories, which is not a geographical movement, could result in some input to the community of Churchill, then there's no conceivable reason why the same input cannot be provided at this moment. And it's for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I'm asking the members of the Assembly and the Member for Churchill to give this government an opportunity of trying to resolve some of the problems that have existed and some of the problems that have been aggravated only a short time ago by the Federal Government announcement with regard to the curtailment of some of its activities in Churchill. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I propose to be amending the resolution but I want to explain what the amendment will be before I put it, because I do not have the opportunity to speak after the amendment is put.

The first paragraph of the resolution reads: "WHEREAS the Government of Canada refuses to acknowledge Churchill in its incentive program for designated areas of Canada," and I think that the terminology there is too final and doesn't leave room for the suggestion that this could be a designated area within the special area program. Furthermore, I don't think that the only basis for appealing to the Federal Government or for the Provincial Government for support, is based on designated areas so I am going to propose that, rather than use the word "refuse", we change the words to "has not acknowledged." This is a nuance perhaps, Mr. Speaker, but it does indicate that we don't take it as a closed book that the government will refuse to acknowledge the community of Churchill as a designated area.

In the second line, the words used are "there has never been any indication of genuine interest by the Government of Manitoba or the people of Manitoba. . . ." I'm not objecting to the honourable member being of that opinion and I'm not going to say whether that opinion is correct or incorrect because it will merely raise the kind of argument back and forth that doesn't really do anything as to whether they did or did not express an indication. I propose to change the words to: "there is required a demonstration" so that it would read: "WHEREAS there is required a demonstration by the Government of Manitoba or the people of Manitoba to provide the funds necessary to further develop the Churchill area."

In the next line, I note that the member uses the words "WHEREAS Churchill suffers through the inability of the Government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba to collectively arrive at a satisfactory program," and again there is a finality to the word that I'm not prepared to accept and I want to change the word from "inability" to the word "failure": "WHEREAS Churchill suffers through the failure of the Government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba to collectively arrive at a satisfactory solution." Now the word "failure" then, Mr. Speaker, would change the nuance again by saying that it's not as if we're completely unable to do this thing but thus far we have not done it, and this doesn't mean that it can't be done in the future.

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)

Then to the Resolved portion of the paragraph, the present Resolved is of course relating to negotiations to have Churchill become a part of the North West Territories and I propose to change the words to read, "that the Government of Manitoba undertake immediate negotiations with the Federal Government as to the respective responsibilities of the Government of Manitoba and of the Government of Canada to satisfy the needs of the Churchill community." So in effect, Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the members of the House and the Member for Churchill to give this government an opportunity of looking at those problems afresh.

Now, that may not appear satisfactory to people who claim to have been frustrated time and time again that the government wishes to have an opportunity of trying again, but be it satisfactory or not, this is what the government would like to do. The government would like to look at this problem again, discuss the situation with the Federal Government, and see whether, through a fresh approach and a new look at the problem, that there is anything that can be done. I do want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we do see problems at this moment but everything that we hear and intuition, that somebody felt it wasn't satisfactory this morning, but nevertheless in addition to all of the intelligence there is an intuition on the part of people of Manitoba, and I believe of Canada, to believe that Churchill will be an important inland port, that it will be important to the economy of Canada, that it will be important to the Province of Manitoba, and not only that it will be but that it is now, and that the problems that are being experienced there are surmountable and that we wish to have an opportunity to attempt to surmount them. So, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Cultural Affairs, that the proposed resolution be amended:

1. By striking out the words "refuses to acknowledge" in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the words "has not acknowledged"; and
2. By striking out the words "there has never been any indication" in the first line of the second paragraph thereof, and substituting therefor the words "there is required a demonstration"; and
3. By striking out the word "inability" in the first line of the third paragraph thereof and substituting therefor the word "failure"; and
4. By striking out all of the words after the word "RESOLVED" in the first line of the last paragraph thereof and substituting therefor the following: "That the Government of Manitoba undertake immediate negotiations with the Federal Government as to the respective responsibilities of the Government of Manitoba and of the Government of Canada to satisfy the needs of the Churchill community."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, since the last time I spoke on this resolution I was cut off by the clock, and I'm glad that the House Leader introduced an amendment so I could finish the remarks that I wanted to make at that time. Since I spoke on this last time, I've received several letters from the people of Churchill, and for the record, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read the contents of the letter which would support what I said at that time. The letter was written on May 7th addressed to myself, and it goes as follows:

"I must write and express my feelings in regards to your article on Page 20 of the May 6th Tribune. You are very right about the members of the Chamber of Commerce. As an example, they formed a committee two years ago here in Churchill and asked Minister Forbes (that's Thelma Forbes who was Minister of Municipal Affairs at that time) to resign her position all because they wanted sewer and water in their stores and hotels. They fought and hollered until they got it and I must say they suckered Premier Ed Schreyer into giving more money near completion of the water line, as you can recall if you dig into it. But there are only about ten homes that benefit from this by obtaining sewer and water. However, the town had to hire a man to look after the pump station and also had to purchase a truck to run around in. Now the taxpayers who did not benefit from this by not being able to obtain sewer and water, certainly cannot be expected to be overwhelmed by the sewer and water installation. What does your Minister of Municipal Affairs say about this?

"I must say that I'm not interested in politics any more for the simple reason that I have never seen anything done in this area by any political party in the sixteen years that I have lived here. As a matter of fact, all I ever see is committees of so many different descriptions come to Churchill that if someone was to have kept count it would prove very embarrassing to the politicians (and I mean that very seriously)."

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.)

Some of the other letters, Mr. Speaker, that I received were in a similar vein, and at that time you will recall that I said it's not the people that are doing the hollering, although they probably have the best argument, the most legitimate reason for complaining and bellyaching, but it seems that those that are oppressed are the last ones to squawk, and a handful of the power structure, the frustrated Liberals and Conservatives who were given the boot politically, are the ones that are really doing the screaming, and I think this letter proves it.

I'm sorry to see that my friend the Member for Churchill, and my constituent, would see fit to bring in such a -- I could say almost treasonous resolution. You know, if any man had brought such a resolution into this House 20 years ago they'd have probably strung him up like Riel, but this is the age of permissiveness and I suppose you could bring in any resolution here and have it discussed. -- (Interjection) -- Well, it's a fact. The Member for Churchill said he would like to go to the people on auto insurance. He thinks this is very important. He says you don't have a mandate; go to the people. But here is a question of permanent separation and what is he saying? He doesn't call for a vote. He says, "Let's have some negotiations." He doesn't want the people of Churchill to say whether they want to separate or not. He's not demanding in this Legislature, as he should be if he's serious about the thing -- he should be demanding for a vote and he's not. And there lies the inconsistency and the hypocrisy of his argument.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be too harsh on him and I don't want to dwell on the subject too much, but in the future, and I understand there is negotiations between the federal authorities and our government, that when inputs are put into Churchill, whether it's under DREE or special area programs, and these discussions are carried on, that we will consider doing something, not for the businessmen downtown but for the people, and this includes water and sewer, this includes recreational facilities, hospitals, schools and roads, what have you. And, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Member for Churchill, if he's serious about trying to help the people of Churchill, that he should propose a resolution or come to the government and ask to be involved in some kind of a committee that goes to Ottawa, and argue for things that are going to help the people, not a group, a handful of frustrated politicians. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would permit a question. I'm just wondering, if I gathered from his remarks when he talked about the frustrated Liberals and Conservatives, I wonder could he tell us are there any frustrated NDP in Churchill?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, there certainly are, but none of them are the businessmen that are doing the squawking.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think it's usual practice to table letters or documents that are quoted from. Would the Honourable Minister

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

. continued on next page

MR. BEARD: . . . on the amendment, Mr. Speaker? The last speaker amazes me in that when he relates back to what I have said he calls it hypocrisy and lack of democracy, and I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the lack of reading, the lack of the ability to read, because I think the Minister of Transportation should go back and read the resolution itself, in which it says that the primary thing is that the people of Churchill should be involved, that they should be involved in the negotiations right from the very start, and if he had listened before he would have heard me say that they had not been. So there's no hypocrisy here. It's out on the table. It's not treason. It's not asking to leave the province, or Canada; it is asking to link the two of them together; and when we are speaking with the amendment I will say to you that yes, I can accept the fact that government would want to take out the word "refuse" and say that they would like to have Churchill acknowledged as a designated area, and I recall that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources did ask the Minister responsible for designated areas a few weeks ago, and he talked about many pockets but he didn't talk about a pocket for the other end of the Bay line, nor did he at that time apparently wish to say where the priority stood. And this is what the people of Churchill are concerned about and this is what the Minister for Transportation doesn't know.

There has been concern for some time and nothing has been done, and I say I wonder, when people say, "Wait, and give them another chance," how long do they expect them to wait? And this, Mr. Speaker, is not just the business people. This is not just the Conservatives or the Liberals because, if this House wants to go back and count the vote they can find some that the NDP had too. And it doesn't necessarily mean that just because you have a business that you have to be a bad man, and I might also state at this time that this was not, has not, nor ever has been a resolution submitted by the Churchill Chamber of Commerce who we continuously hear are the Conservatives and Liberals of Churchill. This resolution was never submitted by the Churchill Chamber of Commerce at a public meeting or any other meeting that I know of. This resolution was brought up at a public meeting called by the local government administrator of the community of Churchill and the radio and TV stations in Churchill when they found out what was happening with the Rocket Research Centre, and I was there, and there were many other resolutions brought out. There were resolutions asking that government help in respect to retaining the research centre in Churchill, and when we went up on our first Task Force that was the purpose of going there. And then, Mr. Speaker, when we went back on our second task force, the people asked us, "Well, you went up especially to ask us what our problems were when the Research Centre was being withdrawn. Now what have you come back to tell us?" And we couldn't tell them anything. It's on the record. It's on the record. All we could tell them was that we had sent submissions out to universities throughout the whole of Canada to see what could be done about retaining the rocket research range in Churchill, because that is certainly an intricate part of the whole complex at Fort Churchill. So when the Minister says that there are a few business people involved, he's wrong. The community hall had over 100 people in. The records show that three people voted against this. Three people.

The resolution does not condemn this government but it condemns the fact, or points out the fact that it's hard enough to deal with one government without having to deal with two governments, Mr. Speaker, and this is the problem that has gone on in Churchill for so many years.

And so then we move on to the third; the "inability" was taken out and we substitute "failure". Well, there was failure, and unless the first Whereas in the resolution changes, then certainly there will be failure and inability in the future, and if the province knows more than I do in respect to the rest of the money that the cabinet minister from Ottawa has indicated there is \$12,000,000 available for designated areas, we are not a designated area at Churchill. If there is more money available, which should be almost half of that if 5.9 is going to The Pas, I wonder what would come about in respect to the development of the Port facilities at Churchill, but certainly \$6,000,000, I can tell you right now, is not going to do the job. The relationship in the community itself - and I've said this over and over again - is far closer to that of the Territorial Government than it is to the very seat of this government, and this is the problem, and while there are many say that poor Manitoba cannot afford to give away an inch of their land or an acre of their land, I say to them, is it better for them to trade a few acres for a new industry? And this is what could come about because there have been changes over the past few years, and those changes have all been against Churchill, and when we talk about new negotiations and time to go about the new negotiations, then actually all we're doing is doing what the original resolution asks, and it asks that the people of Churchill be allowed to sit in with

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) government, the two governments, and negotiate their future, and what is more free and democratic than that?

Never in this resolution has it said that Churchill has to go to the North West Territories, and in my first speech I was very careful to point out the alternatives that were there available, but I did not at the end that the one that seemed to be available for the quickest action was that of one of joining the North West Territories, and of course this cannot come about until governments sit down with the Territorial Government and the people of Churchill and find out what is best for this area; find out what the feeling is, because I don't stand here and present a resolution today, Mr. Speaker, with the thought in mind that I represent a few businessmen in Churchill. I don't think the last election indicated that I only represent a few people in the Town of Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: The resolution wasn't one of your election planks, was it?

MR. BEARD: No. No. This resolution was not one of my election planks, as the Minister of Transportation points out, and the very reason, of course, that this problem had not arisen at that time, that it was in fact the opposite, that the Churchill Rocket Research Range was looking for expansion and had indicated at that time that they would possibly require up to 200 homes and service facilities for that area, and I am sure that there are members in this House that can verify that, but the problem was that the Federal Government did not go down to Washington with the same amount of money that they had the year before, nor the year before that, to negotiate for Canada's top Rocket Research Range. Each year, the last two years, they'd cut their amount and finally Washington said, well, if you're not going to put it up we're not, so that's it.

But this was the problem, and the crux of it came in the fall and the crunch is coming now. There is very, very little left up there, and who are feeling it? The people in business; and who else? The labourer, the people that are working, the technicians, the people who have established homes, bought homes, with the hope that this would carry on for years to come. They are amazed that government would drop such a sophisticated program in such a short period of time. There are those people that had enough hope in this type of program that went ahead and bought homes, and they can't sell them now and they are out of jobs. They were having problems right from when this started, where their severance pay was cut off because they went out and found a job. They wouldn't wait, or couldn't possibly afford to wait until the Federal Government decided when their job would be finished, so they had to go out, and because they are specialized jobs they had to go out and put ads in papers and find jobs, and sometimes it meant that they lost hundreds and sometimes I believe, as I understand, thousands of dollars, because they had to leave before their severances came up.

So there is a problem and that is why Churchill had to turn around and look to some place and some other area in which to expand, and the natural one was the Port, and if this government would undertake to negotiate openly and to include people from Churchill in the negotiations with the Federal Government, which no other government has ever considered, then I am sure that they would be prepared to bend their back toward doing something. But they've got to see something, an assurance of a fund that will be put up, or else why not carry on with the program, even under the amendment as it stands? It still allows to negotiate with the Federal Government, and through the Federal Government with the North West Territorial Government. But let's not do it for them; let's make sure that they are included, so that there won't be hypocrisy; so that the people of Churchill will know what their future is, for a change; so that they won't have to wait for some southern expert on northern affairs to make a decision for them. And if the Minister of Transportation is concerned at all about the problem that came out of the water installations, then he has the Minister next to him who can relate to him the problems that came out of government deciding where water lines should go, the government making the decisions for a whole community and government finding after, that they had decided to change their mind.

MR. BOROWSKI: It was your government who put that in.

MR. BEARD: I don't know who the Minister of Transportation refers to when he says my government. . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Tory.

MR. BEARD: . . . but it just shows that he is again behind. I wish he would get his facts right, Mr. Speaker, because he's wrong. The Municipal Affairs of this government, this premier, did not give a few businessmen in Churchill some money to get water and sewer into

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) their building. That money came out of the Churchill Reserve and it was expected by the people of Churchill that along with monies from the Federal Government that there would be a water and sewer system for the whole of the community, and the message I get from them is that anything that was done in respect to water and sewer was done first-ly because they had to put a new line down to the Harbours Board or this would never have taken place anyway; and secondly, the money was poorly spent; and thirdly, as the Minister of Municipal Affairs knows, that the frustration, the finding that they are not going to put in any more water and sewer now but instead they are going to change their priority to a reservoir, which we are told by laymen - and they live there - that the reservoir could have continued to be repaired as has been done for many years and the water and sewer program could have gone on, so that the people in Churchill could have enjoyed water and sewer, all the people, but you had to start somewhere and the decision by and large -- not by and large, the decision was made by the government, not the people, not the community, and not the advisory council.

MR. BOROWSKI: Which government?

MR. BEARD: You are asking dangerous questions, Mr. Minister. It was the New Democratic Government along with the Federal Government. -- (Interjection) -- When? During the last session.

MR. BOROWSKI: The decision was made in the by-election in February. Keep the records straight.

MR. BEARD: The decision was not made until the members from Municipal Affairs went up and presented it to the people, and we'll both have a chance to finish it off after this amendment is over. I'll go back and check but I am sure, I'm sure that when we find out we'll find that it was announced through this government, through this government. But the fact is that really we are talking about little things instead of big things. The problem was that there was no indication given to the people. As to what was going to happen, they were told. In fact, it comes very close to when I sat on the Northern Task Force in The Pas and the mayor had to admit before us that he signed the contract with his eyes closed because he said they were given a half an hour or an hour to make their decision in The Pas.

MR. BOROWSKI: A nice cosy Conservative deal.

MR. BEARD: In Churchill it wasn't even done that way. Believe it or not, the decision was made and told to the people on TV in a half-hour program, so there are rights and wrongs. The thing is that the advice of the people was not taken into consideration, and again, it was southern experts that were coming to the north to make a decision for the people.

Maybe I shouldn't have risen to speak on the amendment today but I really couldn't let the Minister of Transportation get away with some of the statements that he made, and maybe they are inadvertent statements made but they are not entirely correct. The problem is one of all the people of Churchill, not just the Liberal and Conservative businessmen, not just a few people that are looking after themselves, but the initiation that brought this about was one that was a meeting brought about and called by the people and the advisory council and the administrator and the local news media, so that they could get the whole community involved in the problems where they could anticipate in respect to the withdrawal of the Churchill Rocket Research Range and the problems that they had been struggling with for years. And this isn't the only resolution. There were three others, and unfortunately I haven't got them here; I think I will read them into the record next time so that we can see just how closely allied the thinking was in respect to the whole public meeting at that time and the thinking at the public meeting.

I know that a resolution like this isn't going to get the support of everybody in Churchill. It wasn't intended to. It is only submitted to allow them, or to assure them the right of . . . to be included in their own future because they are the people who have chosen to live there. Now they can move out; they can move out if they wish; but it is a determined type of person that has to stick by it in those kinds of areas and they are a little different, and some of them have won their merits by working real hard and they like it up there, that's why they want to stay. But if you wanted them to move out, they'll move. You could buy a lot of them out very, very cheap right now. You wouldn't have to expropriate at all. But I warn government that if something isn't done next winter they are going to have a disaster on their hands. You've moved into the summer months, but in the winter months - and it's a long winter - that is when the problem is going to come up again and I think that we have to be moving now, not at a later date. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I asked that the Honourable Minister of Transportation table the letter from which he read. The document, the quotation which he has tabled is not complete, and I believe that this procedure was well established in debates in this House, or discussed in this House not more than ten days or two weeks ago, and I believe that this was scissored off on the bottom and is not a complete document. It has no signature on it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend rises on a point of order; the point should have been taken at the time, not now after the completion of the remarks of the Honourable Member for the North.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Honourable Minister of Labour realizes the impossibility of what he has suggested.

MR. PAULLEY: I realize the impossibility of the proposition of my honourable friend from Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this is on the same resolution. The letter was tabled immediately after the Minister spoke and was not received until the Member for Churchill was well into his speech.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, that is correct that I had taken the bottom section off, because part of it was irrelevant, part of it personal. I could supply the name but I don't think the last part of the letter is of any interest to the House.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I don't think that it's within the rules of the House to read a letter that the member isn't prepared to table. Well Mr. Speaker, the honourable member didn't table the letter, he tabled a portion of the letter.

MR. PAULLEY: He quoted from a portion of the letter.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I would submit on the point that that's neither here nor there.

MR. PAULLEY: Of course it is.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I recall to you the discussion that took place in this House approximately two weeks ago. This point was well established, that if a letter was quoted from, it must be tabled with signature.

MR. PAULLEY: It was — (Interjection) — Oh you go back to Ottawa.

MR. CRAIK: I don't have to go to Ottawa.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, and I think that I'll be able to acquit myself there with far more distinction than you did when you were there.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would call on your ruling. I am sure that the letter has to be tabled in its full content.

MR. SPEAKER: I have no recollection of having made a ruling calling for the tabling of extracts of letters. My recollection is that it calls for the tabling of letters. However, in view of the comments raised on the point of order, I will take this matter under advisement and give my ruling on it when this matter next comes up on the Order Paper. Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Riel

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly to this motion, to this resolution. Part of the ground I had the opportunity to cover under the estimates of the Department of the Minister's Salary under the Department of Industry and Commerce, but I would like to add to it very briefly a few comments that are pertinent to this particular resolution.

The amendment to the resolution does not change the resolution significantly; therefore there is no real difficulty in differentiating between the amendment and the main resolution. The items that are listed under the resolution indicate, first of all, the creation of a new Standing Committee on Economic Development in the Manitoba Legislature, this coming from the TED report; secondly, the appointment of a high level Advisory Council on Economic Development drawn from the private sector; thirdly, the establishment in Ottawa of an office of Manitoba Economic Affairs; and fourthly, the development of an applied technical and economic research capability for industry in a new institute.

Mr. Speaker, just briefly may I say that we have preoccupied ourselves in the whole discussion surrounding industry and commerce and business with the question of economic affairs,

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) and this is very important. However, it does have a tendency to predominate the discussion and some factors are very easily overlooked, and I want to suggest to you that the most important factor in this resolution is No. 4, not Nos. 1, 2, and 3. The Number 4, the development of an applied technical and economic research capability for industry in a new institute, is the item which can have the most effective bearing on the growth of existing industry in Manitoba. I say this because I feel that this is the area that requires concentration, support for local industry, which by definition falls primarily into the small industry category which predominates the vast majority of our industries in Manitoba. We as a government are not going to have, through economic policies . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend will permit me to interrupt him for just a moment, because there is an embarrassment which I think should be cleared up now so that there is no misunderstanding about it in the future.

The Speaker has taken under advisement a question regarding a document that the Honourable Minister of Transportation was asked to table. The Minister of Transportation advises me that he does not have the other portion of the document, and I think that the House should know it now so that there would be no question that anything happened to that document between now and the time that the Speaker makes his ruling.

Now it may be that the Speaker will rule that the member was in error in quoting from a document that he could not table, but the honourable member is also in a difficult position, perhaps of his own making and I'm not going to argue that back and forth, but the fact is I don't want it to go beyond this point in time now, that he will not be able to table the document when the Speaker makes his ruling.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think this is for your advisement to be discussed at the appropriate time when you . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on that very point of order then, was the balance of that letter destroyed or is it still available?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, again, the Minister of Transportation indicates that he thinks he could supply the name, that that he could determine, but the part of the document that has been removed is not available to him.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to make one point on it, the technicality. This is a duplication and the duplication has been cut. It's not the original letter.

MR. GREEN: I appreciate everything my honourable friend says. I have no way of explaining the situation except that the Minister of Transportation does not have, and advises me that he does not have the original. If the Speaker rules that the original should have been filed, then he has assured me that he will do everything possible to get the name, and I think that he may even ask the person to try to recap what he wrote, but he doesn't have that piece of the document and I can envisage a difficult situation arising if the Speaker rules that he was supposed to have the document and then he gets up and says that "I don't have it," and it is for that reason that I thought I'd bring it to the attention of the members of the House immediately.

MR. CRAIK: Perhaps Mr. Speaker, we'll have another opportunity to -- if there is any discussion, we can do it at the appropriate time rather than now.

Mr. Speaker, to come back to the point I want to make is that the economic portion, or the impact on the direct economic, apart from the atmosphere or the creation of an atmosphere for the attraction of capital and for the pointing out of opportunity in Manitoba, is about as far as the Department of Industry and Commerce can go. However, they are charged with the responsibility; by virtue of the bodies which they have created in that department, they are charged with the responsibility by suggestion that they should undertake to rectify the gap that exists between the ability that exists in Manitoba and the application of that ability in industry, and this is still a very wide gap. The gap is well pointed out by such bodies as has been mentioned before by the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, by the Economic Council of Canada, and by the other groups who exist within this province.

One of the basic problems that exists in Manitoba, and it's not peculiar to this province but it is characteristic in other provinces as well - not all them but in many of them - is that we have plenty of thinkers around but we don't have too many doers, or doers that at least have the opportunity to apply their knowledge for economic benefit. Now perhaps it's because we do not have as yet the industrial base for this to occur, but the fact that it does not exist cannot be established. We know very well that the loss of people from Manitoba is due to the fact that primarily there is not the opportunity for those highly qualified or trained within this province

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) to actually develop their talent. We have far too many people who are trained in a particular area, who actually have to go into other occupations that may be completely different. The odd one may even, in fact, end up in the political arena. However, the fact of the matter is that they are not getting the opportunity to actually develop those talents sufficiently within the province.

Now, can we point the finger at industry and blame it on them? Can we point the finger at government and blame it on them? And the answer in both cases is "partly". Partly both are at fault, but this does not overrule the fact that between the two of them they can get together and can be a productive force in creating a new technology in Manitoba that is directed toward the needs of the province. It is true that a very large portion of this may be directed toward some of our natural resources, either agricultural or other forms of our renewable and non-renewable natural resources. However, this is the goal which we all have to aim at, at this time, if we are going to get a better distribution of the talents in the province and their application to an economic benefit.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm wondering whether a somewhat greater degree of consideration and courtesy could not be extended to a member participating in a debate? The Honourable Member for Riel may continue.

MR. CRAIK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I realize that this topic is not a topic that has all that much pizzaz or schmaltz and attention-grabbing sort of qualities.

MR. DOERN: That depends on the speaker.

MR. CRAIK: Well perhaps that's true too. It's perhaps unfortunate that the member for Elmwood is not presenting the argument, but I don't think that this argument is one that this point has become one that is going to grab the ear of public attention, because it's . . . say, if we acknowledge the fact that politics is the art of the possible, it's pretty logical that the items that are going to get the most discussion are the items which everybody understands and which can receive action, make decisions, get results overnight, the the topic we are talking about is not one that is going to get results overnight. It's a long term investment, but it is a fantastic gap that exists in the economic picture of Manitoba, the gap between the knowledge to produce and the actual production, and I'm talking about production primarily of goods and services based on new technology and on new science.

So with those few words, Mr. Speaker - I do not intend to go further on this - I say that I certainly hope that the Minister of Industry and Commerce pays more than lip service to this, and I must say that I was not very encouraged by his remarks the other day in the course of the estimates discussion on his salary. I feel that he's making possibly some -- taking some directions with his creation of centres of excellence, but it's too token an input to expect any real result to come out of it. What is needed if we're going to fill this gap is a massive move. The areas are plotted out; we know where the directions have to be taken, but they are not being taken. I certainly hope over the course of the next few months that he will take this into consideration, Recommendation No. 4, as one which is very, very necessary, requires a great deal of insight, and that he puts that insight into it and in fact we can do some longer term development work in the Department of Industry and Commerce. I would suggest, if this does not take place over the next short period of time, that the government ought surely to consider removing this important aspect out of the Department of Industry and Commerce and putting it into some form or as a government agency, and this is one Crown corporation which will get full support from this side of the House, one particular sector. If the action is not taken by the government itself, then it ought to consider whether or not an agency at arm's length would not in fact be able to do the job more effectively by putting it into the no man's land that exists between industry, government and the academic community.

. continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In this particular resolution I am a little regretful that the Minister of Finance is not here.

MR. PAULLEY: We'll tell him what you say, Harry.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you. The whole question of estate tax rebate, the principle involved; has been debated earlier in this House and the views of the Minister of Finance are well-known where he takes exception to estate tax rebate and feels that it's the responsibility of the Federal Government, and his inherent request from the Federal Government that "give us some more money in some other ways." But I think that the subamendment made by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose brings the Province of Manitoba into perspective as a truly western province.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't too long ago that we had a conference in Lethbridge dealing with the one-province theory. I, as an individual, personally don't think that the time is ripe for the one-province concept. However, there are many fields that the three prairie provinces can work in unison on, and if there is not unison then there becomes differences, shifts, which make it more advantageous for one province than another, and the common approach, while it may not appear to one province to be particularly in line with their political philosophy, it might be more advantageous to the province to consider the views of the other two provinces in that particular subject. And I think this is one subject that is essential that we consider seriously.

In Western Canada we have the one advantage, that of estate tax rebate, which in essence is an incentive to encourage development, to encourage people to come to Western Canada, and Alberta and Saskatchewan are enjoying that situation whereas Manitoba is not enjoying that same tax benefit to the people that live there, plan on living there through their retirement, and making this their permanent home. -- (Interjection) -- I am glad that the Minister of Labour is concerned about unemployment. However, I think that it is hardly applicable in this case because we are dealing with people that have retired more than those that are just starting out in a lifelong job. The Minister might very well find himself in that same position very soon.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm retired now.

MR. GRAHAM: But we have to, in Western Canada, approach matters with a common view. This was evident when the former Premier of Manitoba instigated the first regional approach to prairie economic problems and was successful in forming a Prairie Economic Council which dealt with problems that were common to our three prairie provinces. I think last year we saw one particular field where the common approach is essential, when we had a problem with mercury contamination on the Saskatchewan River, and we have to have a feeling of cooperation between the various provincial governments of the western segment of Canada. Initially, I think the one-prairie-province concept of their convention could have been a political move. However, I think that the concept cannot be political in the sense of belonging to one party. I think it is something that economic conditions will probably dictate in the future unless we make more use of other fields which give us the basis of having a unity, whether it be political or economic, that gives us the advantage that is so necessary to develop our Western Canada.

We find in Eastern Canada the question of urbanization, pollution and other matters are causing a great deal of concern. The management of large urban areas is not an easy task and the development of Canada as a true nation requires that development be widespread, not concentrated in one particular area. So that with the use of the estate tax rebate, we do offer an incentive and I think it is something that these people that are reaching a senior level in their life are quite concerned about.

With communication being what it is today, it's a relatively simple matter for people to move. Our modes of communication are changing living habits. It makes it not too difficult for a person to decide relatively simply to change their place of habitat, say, from Toronto to

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.). . . . Vancouver or Winnipeg to Calgary or some other place, and any incentive that we can have that will keep people in Manitoba, I think is something that we have to guard preciously and not slough off for political purposes when it might not in the long term be advantageous to the economy of our province.

The whole question of economics is going to be of increasing concern. There is evidence now that the economy of not only Manitoba, other provinces, the Dominion of Canada, and indeed North America and other countries of western Europe, are having some doubts about a continuing prosperity and there is increasing concern on the part of people that are planning estates when the future of the economic condition of our country is somewhat in doubt. So at this particular time it becomes even more apparent that we should be considering the implementation of an estate tax rebate in Manitoba.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this isn't an appropriate time for the honourable member to interrupt his own remarks until the next Private Member's Day, seeing that it's 5:30.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, before I do, could I ask the Government House Leader the order of business for Monday.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's quite likely that we will be calling the Supply on Monday. I can't be assured of that but it's likely.

MR. PAULLEY: But this is a Private Member's Resolution, in any case, for Tuesday.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.