

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, June 9, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

At this point, I should like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have with us 110 Grade 9 students of the General Wolfe School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Jack Carroll, Mr. Joe Rafknelson and Miss Hoskin. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

And 44 Grade 11 students of the Garden Valley Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Schroeder. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

And 32 Grade 8 students of the Shuniah Public School of the Lakehead in Ontario. These students are under -- I'm sorry, it's the City of Thunder Bay, Ontario -- these students are under the direction of Mr. McQuarrie, Mr. Houghton, Mrs. Viegandt and Mrs. Eysolfson.

And 65 Grade 8 students of the Beliveau Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Parker and Mr. Oye. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson. On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed -- The Honourable Member for River Heights.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder whether he can inform the House whether he's had an opportunity of examining the Quebec Financial Assistance Program for Fast Growth Industries.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Honourable Minister would undertake to examine it and to report to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave of the House to make a brief announcement. I would like to draw to the House's attention the fact that for the first time in Manitoba a special week has been proclaimed as Royal Canadian Legion Week. Many members of the House have served in the various armed forces and I am sure that the whole Assembly would like to take this opportunity to honour Manitobans who served in the forces and to commend the Royal Canadian Legion for the many activities that it has organized. This is a first for Manitoba and possibly the first time that I am aware of in Canada that such a week has been proclaimed. In this our Centennial Year it is fitting and Manitobans can be proud to recognize the important service of the Royal Canadian Legion in its service to veterans. The work the Legion has done not only benefits its members but many of its projects have been of benefit to the community as a whole. May I also indicate that there are other veterans' organizations such as the Army and Navy and Air Force veterans in Canada, the War Amputations Association, the Imperial Veterans Association, and the International War Vets Alliance, all of which, along with their ladies' auxiliaries, are dedicated to service. For their dedication, may we commend all these veterans' service organizations. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file the Annual Report of the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation, 1968-1969. And also, while I'm on my feet, I would like to answer the question addressed to me by the Honourable Member for Rhineland in respect to the basis of assessment in Northern Manitoba, where no assessments have been in effect previously. I'd like to advise that when an assessment is held in a northern community for the first time, there is a meeting held between officials of the Assessment Branch and the Commissioner of Northern Affairs' people, with the local people in the community concerned, and there is at that time a thorough discussion as to

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) the various principles of assessment that will be utilized in the northern community and questions are answered at these meetings. The basis of assessment is the same type of basis, the same principle is utilized as is done in other communities in Manitoba after the attempt to acquaint the local people in the northern community that are being assessed for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being repetitious, I would like to ask the Honourable the First Minister, Sir, if he is as hopeful today, or less hopeful or more hopeful today than he was yesterday, of Winnipeg's chances for obtaining a Triple A baseball franchise.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Tourism and Recreation does have a statement to make. Whether it is a definitive statement or one that begs another 24 hours, well, I don't know myself but I await with interest the statement from the Honourable Minister.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Dauphin): Well, Mr. Speaker, I might say that this morning from 11:00 o'clock till about 12:30, I spent at a meeting dealing with the question that the Honourable Member from Fort Garry raises, and although I am sure that he realizes the fact that there are many things that have to be looked into and looked after before a definite announcement can be made we are indeed very very hopeful that this will come about. As a matter of fact, I might say here and now that on June 19th I think we'll be able to see our first game of Triple A baseball here in Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for Riel asked me if I would be able to reply to some questions that he had asked on May 28th regarding the construction industry, and I told him yesterday that I had the replies on my desk and that I would supply him with the information today, and I would like to do so now. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that on May 28th the Honourable Member for Riel asked whether or not I could confirm or otherwise that out of 800 steamfitters in the Steamfitters Union in Manitoba that 300 are now unemployed. The answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, was at that particular time, rather than 300, according to information provided to me there were approximately 120 unemployed as of that date. I made another check this morning, Mr. Speaker, and I'm pleased to be able to report to the Assembly that instead of 120 unemployed in the Steamfitters Union, that figure is now down to 20, and it is expected that within a week there will be full employment of plumbers and steamfitters. This information was supplied to me by the Steamfitters and Plumbers Organization.

The second question my honourable friend asked me on May 28th regarding the construction industry: "can he give us any indication of the state of the construction industry for the summer period, particularly in relation to housing starts?" My reply to my honourable friend, and I indicated this yesterday, that comparatively speaking, the starts at this present time this year are down from those of 1969. The comparative figures for '69 were semi-detached, 703; semi-duplexes and duplexes, 63; row houses, 135; apartments, 1,890; or a sum total of 2,791 for the year 1969. Comparative figures for this year: semi-detached, 535; semi-duplexes and duplexes, 90; row houses, 209; apartments, 765; or a sum total of 1,599. And by comparison, Mr. Speaker, may I also indicate the total figure for the month of January to April in 1968 was 1,228, which indicates an increase this year over 1968 but a decrease over 1969.

Then my honourable friend on May 28th asked a supplement question - could the Minister undertake to advise the House on the construction situation, particularly in relation to housing starts and unemployment in the construction industry? I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics does not supply precise information, that is, detailed insofar as various segments in the employment of Manitobans and I just simply can repeat that for the month of April of this year the figure of unemployment for Manitoba was 4.6 percent, the lowest of any jurisdiction in Canada but higher than the year before of the same month, 3.3 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I can't see the Minister of Finance behind the top of his desk, but I would, if I might, like to just enquire of him in view of the discussion that we had yesterday, about whether the Minister - and I must admit to not having had a chance to look at the information that he tabled yesterday - whether in fact the following is a correct statement of what he had in the early part of his statement

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) yesterday. On Page 2642 of Hansard, the Minister said: "However, I must draw your attention to the Manitoba Government's reaction to these proposals, and I'll be distributing some time today a set of summary statements made on behalf of this government on the subject, and I will also table copies of the federal statements for honourable members." I'd like to know, Mr. Speaker, with the misunderstanding we had yesterday, if that's a correct statement, that I was really -- the impression was that I had misunderstood it.

HON SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker the Honourable Leader of the official Opposition will remember that I wanted to respond to what he had said yesterday and he was one of those who suggested that it was not in order to do so and

MR. WEIR: On a point of order, if I may, on this particular point the Minister of Finance did respond in the middle of my remarks, and if he would look on Page 2645 at the point where I made the point that I thought that if there was anything at all that we could have a full statement on it was Manitoba's position, not the Federal position, the Minister of Finance interrupted me and I sat down and gave him the floor, at which time he told me, or left the impression with me that I had misunderstood, so I'm really attempting to correct, against the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, a misunderstanding that apparently developed between the Minister of Finance and I yesterday.

MR. CHERNIACK: I appreciate the fact that the honourable member has given me now an opportunity to say what I wanted to say as indicated on a subsequent page No. 2646, no doubt, because as I recall it I did interrupt him, I tried to deal with it and then, while he spoke further, I looked back at my notes and I found that he was more correct than I was but I wasn't given the opportunity to say so, because I imagine it's shown somewhere that the Honourable Minister didn't feel that I could continue yesterday, so now I have the opportunity I'll be glad to do so.

The expression, which I checked again while he was speaking yesterday, was that I was putting in summaries of Manitoba's position -- is that the correct word? Is it? Summation -- well, I can't find it, but it was summary of our position -- I filed the full text of the written notes that I had at the conference. I did elaborate on them and to that extent what I filed was a summation of our position but not all I said, because I could not record what I said orally in the extension of my notes. As to the Federal Government's papers that I said I was filing, what I meant to say, and the notes I had from which I read were incorrect, was that it was the statement issued through the Federal Government on behalf of the Finance Ministers. The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition was correct yesterday and I'm glad he has now given me an opportunity to point that out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. It was stated over the weekend by the labour leaders of this province that the government was not enforcing the Labour Acts in this province. I wonder if this is true or not.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . a hypothetical question, it does not require an answer from me. I'm sure that my honourable friend and the members of the House would be aware that any violation of any of the labour laws or any other laws of the Province of Manitoba that are drawn to the attention of the administration will be persecuted as far as we are concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Labour a question. I wonder if the Minister of Labour received a hypothetical question from the other side, would he answer it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, this morning's Tribune erroneously reported me as being asleep in the House yesterday while my colleague the Member for Riel was speaking. I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that after a long hard weekend on the farm that I probably was taking a nap while my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was demonstrating how to evade direct answers.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, it was the Member for Riel who was speaking when you were asleep.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of privilege, I'm sure that my honourable

(MR. WATT cont'd.) friend must have been asleep too because he didn't answer directly the questions that were being directed to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister or the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I'm not sure at this moment. It's in connection with the withholding of monies to Churchill Forest Industries. Is the Federal Government withholding monies from that organization or its subsidiaries for the same reason as Manitoba does? Could we have that information?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the last part of the question - for the same reason as what?

MR. FROESE: For the same reason as Manitoba is withholding monies.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that could well be, although there is a difference in the program of the Federal Government ADA grants in the sense that those monies are normally not advanced until near the end of the construction phase, and some of the direct grants, or the outright grants, are made available after the completion of construction, after the plants go operational. However, I suppose that some monies that might have been advanced before the end of construction are being held momentarily while additional bookkeeping and auditing procedures are being carried out, so that there would be some connection.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the First Minister. Is it not a fact that Federal Government money through ADA grants are not advanced at all until the plant is completed and in operation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I made it a point to make some inquiries about that. I'm advised that the legislation governing the actual payout of ADA grants is such that there is some discretion with the department making those grants, but the normal procedure is for the grants to be paid subsequent to construction after the plants go operational, but some could be paid, some percentage could be paid prior to that.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Is the First Minister aware of any monies that have been advanced by the Federal Government to the four firms involved in the Churchill Forest complex?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, no, I'm not aware that any have been advanced to this point in time.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the First Minister a question on the same subject. It is my understanding that the loans being advanced now are capital loans for construction. Has the First Minister any knowledge as to the operational funds of the CFI companies? Are they counting on a loan for operating funds, operating capital, or have they given any assurance that they have any operating capital of their own?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the grants, or rather the loan capital being advanced, we have to be satisfied is being used for construction, for the payment of suppliers, that is, for the payment of contractors doing the actual construction and the suppliers' equipment, and also for the payment of fees of the contractors and the consultants and the like. There is no money being advanced for purposes of operation other than the three categories that I've just mentioned: construction, acquisition of equipment, and payment of fees to contractors and consultants.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In talks with the principals of the CFI firms, has the First Minister received any assurances that these firms have operating funds, and if so, how much?

MR. SCHREYER: Whether they have operating funds, Mr. Speaker? I'm not in a position to give any definite assurance on that point. One assumes that they do, but I don't think I'm prepared to give that kind of assurance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, one further question and if it's an unfair question the First Minister needn't answer, but is it one of the reasons why they formed the four subsidiaries under CFI just in order to extract more money under the ADA grants from the Federal Government? I take it that they would not qualify for as much money otherwise, would they?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that is a question that could better be directed to the federal Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question of the First Minister. I wonder whether he could indicate whether the cut of Churchill Forest Industries, which I believe was the largest timber cut in the province, was in fact financed through the Manitoba Development Fund but was paid for as part of the operation by the company.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Mines and Resources could advise on that. I'm not in a position to answer today. However, I can take the question as notice and give an answer later.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I wonder if he can tell us if the government has under active consideration the issuance of a grant towards obtaining Triple A baseball for Winnipeg and Manitoba?

MR. BURTONIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to give an answer on that question at the moment but when the final report is made I'll be glad to reveal that information.

MR. CLAYDON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could we expect some type of an answer before long? A decision apparently has to be made within the next few days.

MR. BURTONIAK: As soon as all the final arrangements are made, we will have that information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could reply to the statement of the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation, his first initial statement on Triple A, because I think it's allowed under the House rules. I feel that Winnipeg would be considered . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as long as it's understood that it would be by leave, because the Minister of Tourism did not make a statement on motions. He was answering a question that was put by the Member for Fort Garry on Triple A baseball. He was answering a question put by the Member for Fort Garry. By leave, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I think, should proceed.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to proceed by leave, but what I meant, when he first made a statement at the beginning of Orders of the Day. He did make a statement, and I believe somebody posed another question to one of the other ministers and I had no opportunity to reply to him.

I feel that if Winnipeg should be considered and granted Triple A baseball in Winnipeg with big league players and naturally big league coaches and managers, I think it would be a great occasion for the city and I think it would be a most happy occasion to have Triple A baseball established in this city. I think it would be tremendous. This would give Winnipeg and Manitoba the type of publicity that Pan American Games has given it, and in my own opinion I think that the people of Manitoba would be very fortunate because, as has been stated, there would be no capital required to run the clubs, because I understand the Expos have agreed and stated that they would be prepared to underwrite the losses if there were any, and there would be no concern of the local people here to underwrite any losses. So this in itself, I think, is of great significance.

I do realize that some consideration and arrangements for rental would have to be worked out and probably improvement in the facilities, and I hope those arrangements will be worked out and I hope that the government will do everything possible and the City of Winnipeg will do everything possible to try and improve the facilities and try and work out those arrangements, because we must appreciate that the Department of Industry and the Department of Tourism and Recreation do spend a considerable amount of money on publicity and advertising, and in my opinion I don't believe any type of money would give us that type of publicity that the Triple A baseball in the Province of Manitoba in Winnipeg would bring to this province.

I think economic factors would be great as well. I believe this would attract people from many other large centres across the line, people to the games here, which would probably otherwise go somewhere else. As well, the managers, the coaches and the players will be spending their dollars here instead of some other city. At the present time there are 21 Major League cities in the North American continent and some have two teams. There are also 24 Triple A cities which are operating in three leagues, and the Buffalo franchise which would be coming here, I understand is not in a Midwest league which there would have to be some realignment, and I agree with the Minister that there has to be a tremendous amount of rearrangements

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) and realignments made out before the whole thing is finalized, but I could see the best league that the Expos in Winnipeg would operate or the franchise in Winnipeg is in the Midwest league. So, all I want to say is to thank the Minister for showing the interest and I hope he will continue to show that same initiative, and hope that we can have Triple A because I think it would be a great occasion for this province and the city.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder whether he can indicate to the House whether it will be the government's intention to exercise its discretion in connection with the fish-processing plants who have been knocked out as a result of the Fish Marketing Board, and to declare them redundant so that they can receive compensation according to the law that was passed last session?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated to my honourable friend what has occurred in this connection.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Honourable Minister suggesting that there is no intention on the part of the government to declare the fish-processing companies redundant?

MR. GREEN: No present intention, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to try and answer two questions that were directed to me, the first one being from the Honourable Member for Morris regarding mercury contamination of wheat - that was in the Debates and Proceedings on Page 2352 - and what the Department of Health and Social Development was doing with respect to mercury contamination of wheat in view of the alarming report that had appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune. The Department of Health and Social Development is taking no action since wheat falls under federal jurisdiction through the agency of the Wheat Board that has resource to grain research laboratory with contacts with the University of Manitoba. The Department has no reason to suspect that the matter is not being adequately taken care of by the above agencies.

On the second question, Mr. Speaker, regarding the Clean Environment Commission, in the Debates and Proceedings, Page 2379, the question was put by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell and he implied that the Clean Environment Act would not apply to things that moved. He gave as examples, cars, buses, airplanes. To these can be added mobile . . . tractors and similar items. This is not correct. The Act forbids any person to discharge contaminants and wastes. This is comprehensive and includes all the above mentioned items except for the noise that they produce. With respect to the noise, it has only recently become fashionable to refer to the effects of noise as noise pollution, and it does not appear to be covered by the Clean Environment Act. However, consideration could be given to its inclusion at a later date as it has been done in the Alberta legislation. The reason for not including noise in the original legislation would appear to lie in the fact that noise may not have been considered to have an effect on the environment but a direct effect on human beings, and thereby would be covered under general provisions of the Public Health Act.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I was speaking in debate on Bill 83. I did not ask a question of the Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: I took it as a question and I gave you an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wanted to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation. I wonder if he could tell me whether his department is giving consideration to traffic control lights at the intersection of the Perimeter and St. Mary's Road.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Transportation. In view of the weather conditions and in view of the conditions that have evolved on the gravel roads in rural parts of Manitoba, is it possible that he will reconsider the policy that is established now of the grading of these roads?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I believe I've made it clear on several occasions that it's a flexible one. The problem has been that the roads were so bad we couldn't even put a grader on because the graders are very heavy and they'd rut the road probably more than they

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) would do good. However, as soon as the roads dry out the graders are out there and grading them, and that's really been the problem.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned Debate. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed)

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we can now, with the concurrence of honourable members, move to Page 8 and take Bills Nos. 87 and 75.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, Bill No. 87. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, could I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand? (Agreed)

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

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I don't know why the delay for the last fire but it's appreciated anyway.

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this discussion of Bill 75, it would appear to me that, as always, when we're discussing the subject of the Liquor Act that there's a distinct difference of opinion as to liquor consumption. I believe our big problem, Mr. Speaker, is that we cannot legislate people's minds, morals or lives. We can only make the laws to regulate and protect the well-being of our people. No matter what we do in respect to liquor legislation, objection or praise will be the lot of us all, depending on who you're talking to on the particular subject.

The bill, to my mind, is in many respects a housekeeping bill, correcting some of the deficiencies that appear there, and I can support many of the parts of the bill but others I question in my mind. I congratulate the Member for Radisson for his suggestion to ease the burden on hotel keepers. I realize that this is, in country points anyway, it is a burden to maintain the staff and the general operation of a restaurant compatible with the time that is allowed for the beverage room to be open. This, I think, will be appreciated all around in that particular business.

In respect to licences being extended to hospitals or sanatoriums or elderly residences, Mr. Speaker, I question the issuance of such licences to the operators of these institutions. My first reaction is that I'm opposed to it and this is brought about by the people I represent and others that I've discussed the matter with. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there are sufficient outlets without moving into this field of healing and rest. In the matter of the senior citizens' homes, they, Mr. Speaker, have the rights and privileges of the rest of us and I know of no hue and cry for the installation of a bar in our senior citizens' homes. It may be that this is oriented toward the city; I don't know; but that being the case, I would like to hear more about it and I would like to hear the mover of the bill give us an explanation as to why this is contained in the bill.

With regard to advertising, Mr. Speaker, I well remember the debate many years ago in this particular direction, and I also remember the unfair position that the local printing industry was placed in due to not having the privilege of deriving business in this regard. I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that at that time national magazines poured into the province carrying liquor ads. Most of these national magazines were printed in Eastern Canada and elsewhere. The Legion magazine, as a case in point, Mr. Speaker, was composed and edited in Ottawa and printed in Montreal due to the restrictions in the Province of Ontario at that time. Those restrictions, I understand, have been lifted.

Recent years have seen the relaxation, Mr. Speaker, in most provinces in regard to advertising. We, too, a few years ago relaxed this effort, allowing a limited amount of advertising through the several medias. More than 500,000 people in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, living along the American border, including the City of Winnipeg, are exposed to

(MR. BILTON cont'd.) American television, and local organizations here in the City have taken advantage of that outlet and I feel that it's rather ridiculous and unfair, and I agree with the Leader of the Liberal Party that TV advertising presently coming from that source to a degree violates the laws of the Province of Manitoba. But what to do about it? I would remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Board of Broadcast Governors laid down stringent rules insofar as advertising is concerned. Material must be submitted to that body, examined and accepted by them, before the media is allowed to proceed. It should be said, too, that under this heading the advertising that is allowed has to do with Canadian beers and wines, and also it is distinctly laid down that such advertising must be addressed to the brands, and possibly the drinkers in order to change them from one brand to another, and I notice that it insists that such advertising must not be made up nor will it be accepted if it attempts to influence non-drinkers.

I also agree with the Minister of Labour that the final decision in regard to whether or not there shall be any advertising shall be decided in this House. I presently have an open mind on the subject and look forward to opinions that will be expressed both here and in committee on the subject. It's very important and should be well talked over and minds made up one way or the other, and vote accordingly.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that this bill has been brought into the House and it is a free vote, and this is the way it should be. Certain parts of the bill, Mr. Speaker, will bring in problems, there's no question about it. We are expected, as members of this House, Mr. Speaker, to use common sense and certainly voice the opinions of the people we represent. As an ex-police officer, Mr. Speaker, I understand many of the serious problems that will develop in carrying out our liquor laws and all its ramifications. No matter how we try, abuses and intolerance will be the part of some people and will continue to prevail.

I am opposed, Mr. Speaker, to extending public liquor privileges to Thanksgiving Day, or extending the hours into Sunday beyond what they are now. Surely, Mr. Speaker, these days have been set aside with intent. That intent must be respected; even if we have laws, we must have laws to enforce it. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a part of our population that would agree with me in that respect and I would hope that they will make their opinions known. In this way, the opinion of the people that do not partake are having their voice heard, and I believe that their opinions should be respected, and whilst they may not be in the majority, they are an awful big minority.

I have my reservations in extending sales to fairgrounds, to rodeos, flower shows and the like. I know, Mr. Speaker, as well as you do, that liquor finds its way to these places. Relaxing the law will, I suggest, bring untold problems and will be the cause of resentment by a large part of our population.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to support the second reading of this bill and, at the same time, I implore all members to give careful consideration to all the aspects of this bill, keeping in mind that reasonable and fair thinking is more important than further opening up an area which lends itself to abuse and oftentimes degradation of persons, and, Mr. Speaker, what is more important is the cause of anguish in some family life.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I rise too, only to say that in terms of Bill 75 that I think that the arguments for the most part have been made pro and con and that there are some sections that I don't find acceptable to me and I'll be looking for opportunities of amendment at Committee, but I don't propose to oppose the bill at second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to state my position in connection with this bill. I do not intend to support it. I do not like to see the extension of advertising liquor and I think we have plenty of advertising as it is.

Then there is one other matter in this bill I'm just wondering about, in connection with government policy. What will government policy be in connection with the bringing into being of new municipalities where the bill will give the right to the government to license, or have them or deem them to be licensed, for certain matters in connection with the serving of liquor, and is the government going to recognize the status quo there, or what is the position of the government? I think it would be well to know this because naturally this, in my opinion, is one of the principles of the bill, and a new principle

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't intend to oppose this bill going into second reading. I am of the opinion that adults should be entitled to make a choice in the way they want to drink, where they want to drink and what they want to drink, but I am opposed to the section in respect to advertising. I opposed it previously when we had this same particular situation and I have a number of reasons for it, but basically, I believe as long as we have laws for minors that aren't supposed to drink, then we should also curtail the exposure they get to this kind of hidden persuasion, and I do not believe, even though we may have the cry from all sides around us that this is being done in other provinces and below the border, that this is an adequate reason for doing the same thing here. Just because you have pollution all around you is no need to pollute your own area as well. Let me also say that in this regard if we, as a social order, can expend money to educate people in respect to alcohol, then I cannot see where we can, on the other hand, say go ahead, advertise to nullify this effect that you as taxpayers are spending in order to educate people to the problems of alcohol - and the problems of alcohol are many and varied. We know them not only in respect to the person who himself is involved but also to the detriment of many of the people surrounding the alcoholic problem drinker, and for that reason I do not think we should have this advertising extended. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I too have heard all the remarks about the bill and I don't intend to oppose it in second reading. I must say that I have heard very good arguments on both sides and I intend and want to hear the arguments that are coming forth in Law Amendments. I don't know that we do need to have liquor opened up as far as this bill has gone, but certainly I have the same sentiments as the Honourable Member from Kildonan regarding the advertising.

There is something, Mr. Speaker, that isn't in this bill that I am very disappointed about, and that is the clauses in the present Liquor Act referring to the amount of food sold being the same as the amount of liquor, and where this applies to private clubs. There are many private golf courses, curling clubs, oh, Belgium Clubs, German Clubs. All of the clubs that have license to sell liquor, we have this specification in here that you must sell as much food as you do liquor. Every one of these organizations, because they are usually in an area where the people that are members of the club live in the immediate area, have this trouble selling as much food as they do liquor. The clubs that I have had a lot of experience with, have had to go into the banquet business, they have had to rent their premises out all the time to build up their food sales and most times they are selling the food at very low prices, making very little money on it, just so that they can say, they can balance their food sales. You will find clubs putting all kinds of other things into food sales that aren't food sales, and I assure you this is being done only because it is being forced upon them to show this balance.

Mr. Speaker, most of the social clubs when they are in this position, they end up, as I said, in opposition to the restaurant people that are in the banquet business, and at the same time they have to go about and buy coolers, walk-in coolers; they've got to have knives, forks, spoons, tables, etc., far in excess of what is required to operate that club for the membership that they have. And they usually end up with a dining room that is not showing a profit at the end of the year. Mr. Speaker, I think it's time, where private clubs are concerned, that they should have this burden taken off them because most of the members that are members of these clubs are people that live close to their homes and they just don't always have the opportunity to sell as much food without making their private club into a banquet hall.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is the club usually, when you have a membership in a club of this nature at the present time and you have to sell as much food as you do liquor, you are not forced but usually asked by the club before you can take out your membership, to buy so many dollars in food tickets which have to be spent at that club. I don't think people who are members of social and private clubs should be put to this inconvenience and I think the burden should be lifted off them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I'm not opposed to the majority of the proposed amendments to the Liquor Control Act. I feel that there are some that are long overdue and necessary, and I think the Member for Kildonan expressed it quite rightly that, after all, these are amendments dealing with adults who should know how they should conduct

(MR. JENKINS cont'd.) themselves with the course of refreshment.

There is, however, the one section, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that I must speak on and that is the section dealing with advertising, and I am strongly opposed to this. I would like to see not only the advertising that is now in force, I would like to see it cut down, because I feel that liquor advertising, be it regardless of beer or whatever spirits may be advertised, are showing only one aspect and they are just showing - and if I might say, it's beamed and taped in on the same sort of advertisement that Pepsi Cola came out with - this is the "Now" Generation, and I think this is a bad aspect of liquor advertising because this is beamed at our young people, and young people I think should not be subjected to this type of advertising. If the people who want more advertising were prepared to come out on television and in radio and in the news media and show the other aspect of the causes of over-excessive use of alcohol - show the morning after, not show the night before when everybody is happy - then I think I might even consider it, but under the present proposal in this bill that we are going to have an extension of the advertising, I certainly, as a member of this House and as a parent and as one who has formerly served on the Winnipeg School Board - and we've had drug education, alcoholic education - I certainly cannot support this portion of the bill.

The other portions of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I don't find too much objection to. There is one that I'm just a little bit sorry I don't see anything in reference hereto, and that's local option, because I think if we're going to have liquor regulations for Manitoba then they should be standard for all of Manitoba, and unfortunately they are not mentioned in this Act and perhaps the member can explain, the Member for Radisson can explain why they are not here.

There is one section I see here and I just wonder, in consideration of the fact that we reduced the age of voting and the age to hold political office, that the Act here states that no one shall be employed in the sale or to be a waiter unless he's 21 years of age. Perhaps the Member for Radisson can explain why, but I think this is a sort of a discrimination. I mean, if we're going to allow people to be able to vote and to be able to run for political office, certainly they should be able to be employed at that age. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think that coming from the north you should hear what we have to say up there, and I think that most people would compliment government, or the private member on bringing in a bill which would update the thinking in respect to drinking, because it's a new part of the province and certainly a younger group that have new ideas and represent probably the youngest part of the Province of Manitoba in respect to their collective age, so I believe that in standing here and saying that I will be supporting this bill, I would have the confidence of most of the people in the areas that I represent.

In looking over the bill, I think that introducing it into the fairs and different types of public gatherings would be a good thing. We have this type of opportunity in the city but in the rural areas quite often you don't just get around to having the same type of service or advantage that they have in the city, and I would go for this.

As far as young people are concerned, I think probably I could take advantage of the fact that I went to Vancouver a couple of weekends ago and they had just got around to allowing the 19-year-olds to go in and start drinking, and the only real problem they found was not the one of over-indulgence, but it was one of the old customers going in to find their own seat which they had taken for granted was theirs but it was now occupied by a younger group. But the police had no trouble with the young groups taking advantage of drinking, and in fact they said that in many cases they found that in taking it away from drinking illegally and in making it legal, then it allowed them to have a better control over what we call youngsters at 19, I suppose. At 18 I don't think there would be any more problem.

I think that we are making a mistake in not allowing them to work in places and serve liquor at 18, because it is rather ridiculous that one can sit there and drink and yet could not be able to work in the place itself, so I would say that in drawing up this bill somebody has had one foot in yesterday and one foot looking toward tomorrow. I think that I would support a move in which people at the age of 18 would be able to work in and serve liquor, because particularly in restaurants where many of the waitresses are under 21, then they're the ones that cannot serve the liquor and it creates a problem where somebody has two or three young girls working there and perhaps one over 21, and it's very inconvenient to have one person have to serve the liquor around to different tables and also look after their own work. So I

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) really feel that if we're going to lower the age to 18, well then we've got to accept the fact that these people should be able to work in these areas as well.

I think that somebody spoke this afternoon about why should the old folks have it. Probably that is the time in life that you would enjoy it as much as any time, and if this is only opening the . . .

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I did not question the old folks having beverage, and I wouldn't want that impression to be left in anyone's mind by the honourable member that's speaking now.

MR. BEARD: Well, as I had understood it, the Member for Swan River said that actually it was more of an urban -- it must be an urban movement rather than a rural movement. Well, I question that. I think that the change is changing throughout the province, where people when they've come to the retirement age, I doubt whether they're going to indulge as much as those of us who haven't come to the retirement age, and if it's legal and possible to serve it in those areas, I think that it may help the odd person feel more at home, and certainly nobody is going to make a mint of money out of it and it's available for those that want it. Those that don't want it, of course, will not have to worry about it.

Advertising seems to be the road block in this bill and I, like many others, really am not concerned because I'm not in the liquor business nor, for the Minister of Labour's information, have I ever made a profit out of liquor as he seemed to be concerned about when he was making a speech at one time, but I think that advertising is something that will find its own level. I don't make a pitch for it. I don't own a newspaper and I don't own a TV or a radio station. But I can say that in many cases I have found that after 10:00 o'clock at night that the advertising, the beer advertisements themselves are much better entertainment than the 25-year-old movie that it interrupts every half hour or so, so possibly it's more up-to-date with the thinking of people than the supposed entertainment that it is supporting.

I think that they've found a loophole in it. All cable TV advertising apparently can use liquor ads throughout the whole day, and in Thompson where we have two cable stations and one live, well then we're getting double the amount of liquor advertising during the day than we are in the evening, and I don't think it's any worse for it. Certainly the children, some of the kids go around singing the little jingles but you've got to admit that they're pretty good jingles or else they wouldn't be going around singing them, so what's wrong with that? I believe most of us now have taken the attitude that maybe it's better for our children to have some beer or some wine, or whatever it may be, with us when we're having it so that they can become educated. It's the best place; I think it's far better for them to become educated in having a little than having to listen about the wild stories about what happens when you take a drink, etc. Certainly the experience is good for them.

I believe that maybe the brand name advertising was a good thing, and I would wonder if maybe the government couldn't take another look at it and get together with these people that have brand name advertising and say to them, in fact, if you want to advertise go ahead, but spend half of it, half of the money that you allocate, towards an alcoholic program or an AA program or some type of temperance program, so that you're spending half on introducing a brand name to the public and the other half on telling them the problems of over-indulgence, because really, I think that if we got down to the nuts and bolts of it, that over-indulgence, the companies themselves don't really want over-indulgence because they lose a customer. If he becomes an alcoholic and then he becomes indoctrinated into the AA program, then they've lost a potential customer for the rest of his life, so I would say that they too should be very interested in seeing to it that people did not over indulge, although sometimes when we watch what happens in the beer parlor we would say that the owner of the beer parlor himself is not too interested, and I think that is where some regulations should be brought in, in respect to putting the onus on those people that are operating liquor and beer outlets in which they allow customers to over indulge, and they do not accept a responsibility to see to it that the customer leaves before he gets stoned out of his mind. I think that if they would accept that responsibility, I think if the companies themselves that produce liquor and beer would take the responsibility of advertising and educating the public on how to drink, then maybe we would overcome this problem of over-indulgence within the community itself. We always look, of course, to government and say, well, you're making X number of dollars out of the sale of liquor and possibly half of that should be put to an educational program, but it is an expensive one, and I think that

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) if they ever got around to doing this, then of course the taxes would go up on liquor and beer and people would find that they were paying more and more to look after those that couldn't control themselves. So I would say that if the onus was going to be put on anybody it should be put right back on those who are producing the product and ask them to take some stand in respect to educating the public.

Some of the members have spoken on the problem of equal food to liquor, and I believe that this is a problem with many many outlets and I believe that today that our attitudes after 15, or 16 years is it, of the Bracken Report, that we have to take another look at this with a broader mind because I think the public are broader-minded now than even they were 15 years ago, and say that there should be a change in this and that there should be a responsibility to the person that's dispensing beverage to dispense also good food, but leave it at that. Tell them that they're responsible for serving food that is acceptable to their public and leave out the amount and the equation between the amount of food that is sold and the amount of liquor that is consumed. In this way, it would allow I think a more equal opportunity for the person with a smaller outlet to compete with the larger one, because today the larger ones are getting bigger and the smaller ones are waning because of this problem of trying to compete with the large hotels that are serving, not only food, but fine entertainment, etc., and they become locked into this cost-price squeeze.

So I'm all for opening up the Liquor Act again and taking a look at it. I know that in Law Amendments, or wherever it may go, we will find that people will come screaming to us and that's the place that they should come to and listen to their facts, but we've heard them over the past number of years and they haven't changed. They seem reluctant -- many of them seem reluctant to give up the fact that they're not living in the 1900s any more, they're living in the nineteenth century and liquor is here to stay and we've got to learn to live with it, and the easiest way I think we can learn to live with it is by having it and having the opportunity to use it or not use it, and to educate our children ourselves at home. Rather than asking or expecting government or the schools to educate them, I think we can at home by teaching them what is good and what is not good. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You may possibly rule me out of order, Mr. Speaker, on the remarks that I'm going to draw to the attention of the Honourable Member from Radisson . . .

A MEMBER: You've already spoken.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, I can speak again. Second reading?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm informed that the honourable member had spoken on this bill on May 29th. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank all the members -- (Interjection) -- I'll be closing . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, I'd like to say a couple of words.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: When it comes to liquor, Mr. Speaker, I'm a bit of a reactionary like the Member for Swan River. I believe that liquor, although it's a part of a way of life, I think those of us who have paid attention to the results of it realize that there's a lot of bad things about liquor. I don't want to be the one that gets up in the House and talks about Demon Rum and let's have prohibition and all the rest of it, but you know we just have to look at accident statistics, and really to be consistent I have to look at it from a point of view as a Minister. We're spending money preaching on Zero 8 on the breathalyzer; we're spending money on many other programs to keep down the accident rate and to warn the dangers of alcohol, and it would be very difficult for me to get up in the House, Mr. Speaker, and say I'd like to see the hours extended and get more places selling liquor, although I know, no matter what I say and how I vote, it's not going to change anything. The majority of the people obviously want this sort of thing and they'll get it. I'm still entitled to my opinion and I'm going to vote on the basis of what I believe is right.

We have a great deal of statistics in our department that show that 60 percent of the fatalities and accidents on the highways happen and are caused directly as a result of liquor, and possibly another 10 or 15 percent where liquor was a contributing factor, and I don't think that I could sleep at night knowing that this thing is going on and yet I would go into the House and vote for such a thing. So, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell my friend from Radisson that I'm

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) very reluctantly, for those reasons, going to have to vote against his bill, although I'm certain that the bill's going to go through in any event, but nevertheless I'll in this small way register my protest and my views and take this opportunity to say why I'm doing it.

The other part that bothers me even more - the loosening part of liquor laws is bad enough but the other part, the real tragic one, I think, is that we're allowing the younger people to drink. Now I know it's not popular to say, "Don't let the young people do it," because we do it and so therefore it's all right for somebody else.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): It's not in the bill.

MR. BOROWSKI: It's not in the bill? Well, the legal age is going to be lowered to 18, I understand, and if the legal age of consent is going to be 18 that means, I assume that 18-year-olds will be able to drink legally. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I know they drink anyway. People smoke pot. I suppose we should legalize that just because they're doing it. I don't think that this is the way you should pass legislation; just because something is being done by a large number of people that we should legalize it because we can't stop it. There's many things that are going on that we disapprove of and we're not passing laws to change them.

I think with kids drinking, those of us who've suffered through hangovers and parties know that certain things you learn through experience, and kids at 18 or 19, how much experience have they had and how do they know how it's going to affect them? The result is that after a few drinks we're going to find that we're going to have problems we never dreamed of, and today we're living in a mechanized, motorized society. If you had passed this law 20 years ago, the worst that could happen is that you get lost with your team of horses in the bush someplace.

A MEMBER: The horse would lead you home.

MR. BOROWSKI: But today they climb into an over-powered car that can go 120 miles an hour, twice the legal speed limit, and there's where our problems come in. I suppose if we wanted to do teenagers a favour, the best thing we could do is give them a good spanking and send them home.

However, we've made one mistake, I suppose another one is in order, and that was that we allowed 18-year-olds to sit in office, to be judges. Now whether a person could practically become a judge at 18 I'm not sure, because you have to be a lawyer or you have to get educated. The fact of the matter is that at 18 he could be a judge dispensing justice. He knows beans about justice at that age; he's had no experience in that field. We've passed legislation allowing him to hold elected office whether it's mayor or M.L.A. We know that those of us who are in here feel quite inadequate when it comes to certain matters and yet we've allowed 18-year-olds to sit, and I think that's a mistake.

However, this one here I think is a more serious mistake because it's going to be reflected in the tragic toll on the highways; it's going to be reflected in packed hospitals - we have no room in hospitals as it is - and it's going to be reflected in higher insurance rates which we're all going to pay. I guess I sound like an old reactionary today but I'm old-fashioned in some ways.

I'd like to say a few words on advertising. If there's going to be advertising, I think we should take the suggestion of the Member for Churchill; let's show the glamorous side where they're having fun at the beach drinking beer or drinking wine, and then show the other side of, well, hangovers is one thing; show a smashed car in a ditch and a broken body there laying alongside. We have smoking ads now that are showing the results of smoking and I would like to see, I don't know what we can do, how far we can go in this bill, but if we're going to deal with advertising I think we should put something in there that would cut advertising down to a minimum or else do as the member suggested, show both sides.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I felt that I just, as a matter of principle, that I should get up in the House and express my views. I'm going to at this stage vote against the bill. We'll discuss it in Law Amendments. If there's sufficient refinements put into the bill, I may be persuaded to change my mind but as the matter now stands I'm sorry that I'm going to have to take the side of the reactionaries and vote against the bill.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Speaker? I'm wondering from what he said whether he would rather that there was some -- that we have prohibition in regard to the use of alcohol?

MR. BOROWSKI: No, I never said any such thing, Mr. Speaker, but I can tell you one

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) thing. If we had less liquor, I can tell you there'd be a lot less problems in society, on the highways, in beat-up children and deserted wives, divorces, and all the other things that come along with liquor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank all the honourable members - I will be closing debate.

MR. GREEN: Yes, I think members should know that the honourable member is closing debate, in the event that anybody else wishes to speak.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: . . . for their contribution to the debate on Bill 75. At the outset, I wish it to be clearly understood that Bill 75, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, will be a free vote. I believe I mentioned this when I first introduced the bill.

In spite of my introductory comments with regard to the amendments in the bill and stating that this bill will be a free vote, there is still some question as to why it was not introduced by the Attorney-General. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is simply because there is nothing in this bill which may in any way be construed as political or controversial. The amendments proposed, I am sure you will all agree, including the Minister for Highways, are sensible and reasonable adjustments. They are pragmatic adjustments necessitated by the challenge of our changing times. The amendments are proposed to keep the provisions of our Liquor Act compatible to the times in which we live.

Mr. Speaker, during the debate it appeared apparent to me that the majority of the members who participated in the debate are in fact - and somebody mentioned to tell Joe to have only one - who participated in the debate are in fact in favour of the majority of the proposed amendments with a small minority opposed to one particular amendment, and that is the one which proposes to eliminate advertising restrictions which now allow advertising from 10:00 p. m. to 7:00 a. m. only. My view was that the minority seemed to take this opposition.

Mr. Speaker I tend to agree with the honourable members who oppose this amendment. However, if we are to be consistent and really mean what we say, then all forms of pollution of the air waves should be opposed. I don't believe, I don't know of any more nauseating or any more offensive advertising than some of the advertising that is carried on and are permitted on the air waves today. At least the beer ads do entertain. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if we wish to be effective that we should oppose the import of Cable TV. There are now some 24 percent of all the homes in the Metropolitan area who have Cable TV, and I understand that the necessary network of cable lines are 95 percent completed throughout the city and are available to new customers, and that the number of customers is increasing steadily. I would also venture to say that direct TV programming from Pembina is beamed to at least 95 percent of all the homes in the Metro area.

Mr. Speaker, I mention these sources of TV because, as I am positive all honourable members are aware, they carry TV ads on liquor. In the case of Channel 12, the ads on beer and wine are ads which are advertising Canadian products. The Honourable Member the House Leader of the Liberal Party suggested that there should be some type of controls on such advertising. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that controls are possible since many of the products are of the same name and are available on both sides of the border, and I don't think we can legislate on the type of brands that are being advertised over Channel 12. Mr. Speaker, this means that in opposing this proposed amendment, we are in essence supporting United States television. I don't believe that the honourable members would want to be deliberately party to loss of advertising revenue to the U. S. market.

I have a letter here, and I'd like to quote a few excerpts, and this is from a gentleman who was hoping to benefit as a result of the relaxing of the advertising. It's from a musician. "As a full-time musician living in this province, may I say that we are very pleased to see our government take steps to modernize the above legislation in an intelligent and adult manner. Our group has worked long and hard to put together an entertainment show of live music and song in Bavarian Beer Garden style. This group utilizes costumes, special music, songs and yodelling, presenting a professional quality show of good taste and very appealing to the general public. Our entertainment group is called 'The Smaltz and Lena Band'. This style of entertainment is of course conducive to the beer sales field. It is our hope to participate in the many parades, fairs, sports events, conventions, centennial celebrations in the province. Our purpose is simply this, a sincere desire to entertain the general public with music and song in good taste, to augment our income by using this form, and finally the fact, we believe that

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd.) this is family entertainment enjoyed by all ages."

Well, the amendment and the relaxation in the type of advertising would permit this type of entertainment which would be sponsored by some of the breweries, and my understanding is that they're prepared to do it.

The amendment on advertising also proposes to eliminate the undue discrimination now practised, that is the broadcast versus print. Newspapers today are permitted to carry wine and beer advertisements.

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the honourable member would be prepared to table that letter.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Certainly. There is undue discrimination between the broadcast and the newsprint media. The newspapers today are permitted to carry wine and beer advertisements any time, while TV ads are permitted only after 10:00 p. m. This amendment will give equal rights to the broadcasting media.

I would like to ask the honourable members who opposed this amendment, do you honestly believe that beer and wine companies would act so irresponsibly as to advertise their products during children's programs? I cannot believe this, Mr. Speaker. I believe the brewery and wine companies are responsible corporate citizens and would restrict this type of advertising. Besides, the advertising would not in any way, except that they will be Canadianized ads, that is made up by Canadians, be different than that which is permitted today. They would still be subject to the regulations established by the Canadian Radio-Television Commission.

In answer to the Honourable Members for Roblin and Assiniboia, the proposed amendment with respect to specialty restaurants will give the Board and this Liquor Commission more discretion in considering applications for liquor licences for specialty houses. The present section is quite specific. This will give more discretion.

The Honourable Member for Logan mentioned something about local option. The amendments proposed here are not in any way contrary to the amendments or the proposals of the Bracken Commission. They will still be subject to the local option vote. The proposed amendments are in compliance with the principles set up by the Bracken Liquor Enquiry Commission and therefore are not going to be contradicting any of the types of outlets which have been voted for in local options.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that there will be some amendments proposed in Law Amendments. I'll close the debate. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the member permit a question, Mr. Speaker? Do you believe that we should trust Manitoba manufacturers of beer and wine who circumvent Manitoba laws by advertising during the children's hours on U. S. TV?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Well, there's that situation that Canadian television stations can only advertise after 10:00. The American stations I don't think we have any control, even though I'll agree with you; if we're going to do it, then we'll have to prevent many other forms of advertising and I can't see how advertising -- for instance, there's one brand that I can think of, Black Label, is available on both sides of the border and I can't see how you can differentiate between the product being advertised and being said it's an American or it's a Canadian product.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the honourable member answered my question. I asked him: should we trust these people, as he has inferred in his speech?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Well, I honestly think that they would be very responsible corporate citizens and I don't see, if there is any contradiction of the laws of Manitoba, that they wouldn't be prosecuted, and that is something again that can be worked out through regulation and I think the Canadian Radio and Television Commission would be able to establish the controls on this.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member support? Call in the members. On the motion that Bill No. 75 be now read a second time.

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

YEAS: Messrs: Allard, Barrow, Beard, Bilton, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Claydon, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Girard, Gonick, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Jenkins, Johansson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), McBryde, McGill,

(STANDING VOTE cont'd.) McKenzie, Molgat, Patrick, Pawley, Schreyer, Shafransky, Sherman, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Einarson, Ferguson, Froese, Henderson, Jorgenson, McGregor and McKellar.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 37; Nays, 8.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I would like to introduce 60 Grade 5 students whom we have with us from Minnedosa Elementary School. They are under the direction of Mrs. Gomes and Mrs. Oliver. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition. On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, we welcome you here this afternoon.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings. Bill No. 99. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD presented Bill No. 99, The Thompson Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that in introducing the bill I'd like to point out that it has been quite an honour - I won't say it's an achievement, but I don't believe that it would be very often that a member sitting in the House would be able to introduce a bill incorporating his town, his community as a town and also as a city in his lifetime within this Legislature, and I feel that it is with a great deal of pride that this bill came about this year particularly, in the anniversary year of the Province of Manitoba. I would say that I believe that it is indicative of the future of Manitoba, and along with its sister town, the Town of Flin Flon, and certainly the growing town of The Pas, we can see the astronomical growth of Northern Manitoba in respect to the rest of the province, and I think that percentagewise you will find that the North is certainly more than holding up its own.

If this bill passes, Thompson will become a city under the Municipal Act. There will actually be very little change in respect to the administration. It will allow for two more aldermen and everybody agrees that this is very necessary because with six councillors, as it now stands, it is certainly very hard on them because they have to use up a lot of their free time to attend to the business of such a rapidly-growing community. The community itself is I think properly assessed generally at between 22,000 and 25,000 of a population. There seems to be no end to the growth. In fact, I have some amendments which will have to be brought in at second reading, which have already been agreed to between the town, the International Nickel Company and the province, which will add to the town land, and it is one of these unfortunate legal things, I suppose, that has come about, has already been done, but it hasn't been recorded and they have felt that it should be added into this bill.

This is at no additional cost to the community of Thompson but other than allowing expansion area to the community itself, and I commend the bill to you. I trust that members within this House, in recognizing the North, will support the request of the people and the council, and promote the union in Thompson to become, have a Charter rather, for the City of Thompson within this year, and it would be hoped that the ceremonies can be later on in July, if this is at all possible, when the Queen visits the community of Thompson. And I bring the greetings of the mayor and council to you, and their request that you not only pass the bill but that you in turn come up and join with us in our celebration this summer, because actually as we are a community of only 10 or 12 years of age we can't call on the vast numbers that other communities can in asking them to return home, or to the home of their birth, but I am sure, on the other hand, that if everyone that had visited or worked in Thompson for a month or two or whatever it may be, that certainly we would have a community activity which would take in many, many thousands - I suppose a hundred thousand or more - because that is what has passed through the community of Thompson in these last few years.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to belabour the bill at this time but ask that we have the recognition of this Legislature and the people in helping us to get along with developing the northern part of Manitoba. Thanks very much.

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

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I just wish to add a few

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) words. I think this is a real happy day for the City of Thompson, and I wish to go on record in congratulating them that they have now practically -- the step is practically completed. I know, during our discussions on the now famous Bill No. 39, we at times wondered what population a city should have before it could be called a city, and I'm very happy that the committee accepted the lower figure of 10,000 and not 25,000, especially in the so-called rural areas. I believe that if you take towns like Dauphin or perhaps Selkirk and Portage la Prairie and others that are hitting close to the 10,000 - the City of Portage, it is a city already - but anyway, I think it adds some prestige to quite a few of the areas. People around the shopping centre are proud to have that place of theirs where they do their shopping called a city, and I'm happy that the committee went along on this, and knowing some of the council, the City of Thompson now, council - I was glad to hear the Member say that they are going to be adding two members - I am sure that with the kind of industry they have in their city there must be certain peculiar problems that are of great consequence to the progress of the city, and I am sure that this perhaps, with some of the new by-laws coming up, will give the council and the people of Thompson a little more elbow room to operate it perhaps more to their liking. So basically I rise, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the soon City of Thompson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those on the second reading of this bill, the City of Thompson bill, and I think first of all, Mr. Speaker, to express my appreciation, I guess through the Member for Churchill, to the International Nickel Company for the tie clip which I have, which boasts the Province of Manitoba emblem made out of nickel which was mined, milled, smelted and refined at Thompson, Manitoba, and I think that I would like to acknowledge this recognition by the company at this time.

I think that it is interesting, as the Member for Churchill pointed out, that the same member during his time in the House, has been able to go through the process of introducing the bill incorporating a town and to graduate that community to a city. I think that it hasn't happened in the history of Manitoba and I would hope that it might happen to another member some day, but it's not going to happen to very many of them, and in congratulating the Town of Thompson, the soon to be City of Thompson, may I say that it's surprising that it was done in the absence of Bill 17.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker I would like to join in the remarks that have been made relative to Bill 99, The Thompson Charter. I, too, would like to join with the other members in thanking the Honourable Member for Churchill for the distribution of the tie clips of pure Manitoba nickel and I'd also like to take this opportunity to express words of congratulations to residents of the city or soon to be the City of Thompson.

Thompson is one of the most obvious of growth centres in Manitoba. The history of the community goes back only a matter of 14 years, if it is all of 14 - I'm not even sure of that - 13 or 14 years. There is a sense of a newness and bustle and even excitement to life in this new frontier community. There is something about the shopping centre area of the city that reminds one, based on what we read of course, reminds one of the old agorae market place of ancient Athens where it was the whole focal point of community life in the city, and so it seems to be in Thompson. I think that the Member for Churchill has expressed the hope that it will be possible to have the formal presentation of the Charter made at such time when the Royal Family and the Queen are visiting in this city some time around the 11th of July. I sincerely hope it will be possible to so time the event, and look forward - and join with the residents of Thompson - to that important occasion.

So, Mr. Speaker, may I say in conclusion that there is much to feel good about here. There is much to commend the action being taken, and may I say as a rejoinder to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that while Bill 17 wasn't necessary to the formation of this community and no one pretended that Bill 17 was crucial to the formation of every community, nevertheless we feel that Bill 17 will be helpful from time to time with respect to development of certain resources and thereby in the development of certain communities yet to be born. Having said that, I readily admit and agree with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that Bill 17 is not necessary with respect to all future resource developments and all future community developments. I thank you, Sir.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join the others who have complimented the former member for that constituency when it was Churchill, on the adroit manner in which he's introduced the bill and reminded us of something of Thompson's past.

I think it would also be well for present members of the Legislature to perhaps refresh our memories even by reading back to 1956 when, I believe it was in 1956, when former Premier D. L. Campbell introduced the necessary legislation which was the actual beginning of the community of Thompson. I think it was unique at that time that I don't think in the history of all of North America that a mining company had been required by the province or the state in which it was located to give so much of its resources financially before the fact; when I say before the fact I mean before the mining operation. I believe that the agreement required the International Nickel Company to provide a fixed amount to the municipal funding of the town. I believe that the International Nickel Company was required by law to build a planned townsite which met the requirements of the planning branch of the province. I think in every respect it was a unique proposition where a planned townsite came into fruition from the midst of the wilderness and instead of having, and I won't name the communities that we know about in North America, mining communities were known as really in some cases shack towns, there was no planning, it was a helter skelter operation and the operators of the mines were only interested in taking the resource and far down the list were the interests of the citizens of the community. So I think that it would behoove us in the Legislature to tip our hat to the former Premier D. L. Campbell and the members of the Cabinet of that day who did such a good job in seeing that the people who were going to live in the community of Thompson benefitted by their foresight today by the agreement with the company and also by the insistence of the province that a planned community be constructed so that the people would be proud of the town in which they lived.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to congratulate the Thompson people in getting a city charter. I think it's also very fitting that it comes about in this year of celebration 1970 when we have our big celebrations of the province and I certainly want to congratulate the member for Churchill in bringing this forward. As we all know, he's a very worthy member of this House and I think the people of that area can be proud to have him bring this bill forward. I do not want to take away any credit from the present member for Thompson, the Honourable Minister of Transportation.

There are several matters in this bill that rather interest me and I take it once Thompson is a city that they will have their own Land Titles Office. I see that the various parcels that are to constitute the City of Churchill have to back to the Land Titles Office at Neepawa and are registered there as such. Certainly once they become a city I would think that they should have a Land Titles Office of their own.

There are other peculiarities and one is that is in connection with the variation of boundaries. I see that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council will have the power and the right to change the boundaries of the city at some future date. I think this is an exception from normal procedure when bills are brought before this House so that the Legislature acts on these extensions or alterations. One thing I think is very good and that is that all the members of council shall be elected at large. Some might think otherwise, but I personally feel that this is a good thing in that the members then will all agree to a certain directive that may be made by the people. I've seen it happen too often in other organizations that when the representatives are elected by districts or so on that they will not necessarily adhere to the dictates of a convention and of a gathering as a whole and this certainly will mean that when they're elected at large they will see to it that the total population is receiving the best of attention.

There was one further matter and that's the matter of a city manager. I think this is rather a new thing that I see in this bill, and I don't know just what the functions are going to be. Some of the details are listed here; but nevertheless I just wonder whether the functions between a city manager and that of a city council are well defined so that there will not be conflict later on. I certainly would like to see when the bill goes to committee that questions will be answered, because I might have some questions at that time.

Certainly I do also want to thank the honourable member for presenting us with these beautiful tie clips. I think they're very fitting and especially that they are nickel and come from the nickel capital of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- no I didn't. My feelings are hurt, Mr. Speaker, as one of the oldest residents of Thompson that the International Nickel didn't see fit to give this to me to hand it out. It seems like somebody's making political mileage at my expense. Nevertheless, I'd like to thank the Member for Churchill for handing these out and in turn thank the International Nickel for making them up and giving them to him on their behalf.

I seconded the bill, Mr. Speaker, and I was very happy and honoured to do so because, for several reasons: one of them is, without meaning to brag, I'm one of the oldest residents of Thompson, I was there when -- in fact we lived in tents originally, we graduated into bunk houses and eventually into the house which I still live in. I'm proud of Thompson, whether it's a town or a city, I don't think that makes too much difference. I think the important thing is how the people live there. It's a community that has no unemployment and no slum housing and very little welfare, the welfare we do have is largely from outside communities, that people are moved in by the welfare agencies to live in Thompson. It's a unique community; it's one of the fastest growing in Manitoba if not in Canada and it's my hope that it has a future like Sudbury and one day that it may become No. 2, passing Brandon. It's our hope that this will happen in the next five to ten years.

I have one reservation only on this status symbol. All status symbols cost money. I've been in touch with some people in Thompson who have reservations for the same reason, that is cost. We just received a -- we didn't receive the tax notice but we were told informally through the press that our taxes will be going up approximately \$100.00 per home this coming year. The larger homes will probably pay \$150.00 more taxes. They're very concerned about the price of this status symbol; they're concerned that once you get into that class, I suppose it's like living in River Heights, you have to have the other things like a two-car garage and drive a Buick or a Cadillac instead of an Oldsmobile -- I'm sorry, instead of a Volkswagen. They're concerned that becoming a city is going to mean trips out of town for the Mayor and Council, visiting delegations which they'll have to entertain and pay for, and all the other things that come in with the name of a city. So I have that reservation and I was told by the Mayor and Council and by the drafters, the Legal Counsel put it down that there's going to be no cost at all. They may be referring to the present time, maybe for two years, I expect that there will be costs, but we were assured that there will be no cost, not a penny more cost to the town, and on that basis I agreed to second the motion. Previous to that I had stated because of the objection of the Steelworkers Union in Thompson, I had stated that I would not second the bill; I wouldn't oppose it because I felt it was improper for me to oppose the bill being a resident of Thompson. However, after being assured that there would be no cost at all to the taxpayer I agreed to second the bill. I think it's appropriate and a happy unplanned coincidence that during this Centennial Year that we should be given the charter as a city.

The Queen will be presenting the charter to the city, I believe on July 12th and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, and may I take this opportunity to extend an invitation to all of you southerners that have never been in northern Manitoba to take this opportunity to come down and see the charter presented. You will be seeing the Queen here but you'll see the Queen also and visit Thompson and visit the north and see what the town is all about and maybe you'll appreciate what the Member for Churchill and myself are trying to do when we get up here and squawk like hell about the different problems we have and how frustrating it is to get things done; and at the same time you're down there you might try some fishing; we have the best fishing in Manitoba in the Thompson area. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of clarification, might I ask the Minister a question? Did he indicate that he was seconding the bill? -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order then, may I say I was in the House at the time the bill was moved and I was under the impression that the bill was seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Thompson was not in his seat at the time so we used the Member for Ste. Rose for the second reading, but on introducing the bill into the House certainly it was the Minister of Transportation that seconded the first reading of the bill.

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

MR. MCGILL presented Bill No. 102, The Beverage Container Refund Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I introduced this legislation as a measure of support for the rapidly growing number of people in Manitoba who are concerned as I am about the littering of our countryside with discarded containers of one kind or another.

This is a problem, Mr. Speaker, that has not suddenly come upon us but is becoming increasingly obvious and the number of voices raised in objection are becoming more in number and louder, and we're hoping that the proposed legislation will meet with your approval and it will have some effect in reducing the number of discarded containers that we find on our roadsides, on our lawns, in parks, on beaches, golf courses and throughout the whole of Manitoba.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the intent is that a retailer will under this legislation be required to charge a deposit on any type of container containing a carbonated beverage or beer or ale that is taken from the premises and consumed elsewhere. We do not attempt to legislate against any particular kind of container but merely to say that if the container is to be taken away from the premises of the retailer then a deposit should be charged. -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry I didn't hear that.

MR. PAULLEY: What about tomato juice?

MR. MCGILL: We believe that, Mr. Speaker, normally drinks of the kind suggested by the Minister of Labour are normally consumed in residences and we're not attempting in this legislation at this stage at least to legislate for all kinds of containers. There are containers sold at grocery stores and other places that are normally placed in refuse barrels and taken away through the normal processes.

But, Mr. Speaker, the kind of container that is most commonly discarded around the province are those which contain the commonly known soft drinks or that contain beer and are left to be broken or to rust and to generally contribute to the environmental degradation that's taking place through this and other causes in our province. We think, Mr. Speaker, that at this stage in the recognition of the problem that there are now people, many people in Manitoba that are prepared to take and make a little extra effort in order to overcome the problem, and if this legislation is acceptable then it will mean that we will go perhaps to the system that we did use formerly that of taking back the containers to the retailer, receiving our refund and thus having the containers properly processed, either discarded or returned to the manufacturer. The comments at this early stage on this legislation have been almost 100 percent favourable and I'm sure that the industry itself now recognizes that this is a problem which they must face and for which an answer must be found.

Mr. Speaker, many states in the United States have introduced legislation to attempt to control the problem. It's early to say how much success has been achieved. Some of the provinces in Canada now have legislation similar to the bill which is now before you. I would just like to read a brief report in the Christian Science Monitor of recent date on the experience of a Bank in Massachusetts that recognized the problem and offered a penny apiece for empty cans and bottles gathered by youngsters under 18. The response was terrific; some 1,180,000 bottles and cans were turned in within five days. Children were helped to organize by Boy Scouts, Councils, Churches and School groups. The Bank had thought it might have to pay out \$2,500.00. The bill actually came to \$11,800.32. Now this is a way, Mr. Speaker of at least starting on the problem of environmental pollution, that part of it occasioned by the discarding of containers of all types. I commend it to your attention. I hope that you will give it serious thought and that this will be adopted. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. DOERN presented Bill No. 103 an Act to amend the Transcona Charter for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to transfer a small portion of land from the Rural Municipality of Springfield to the City of Transcona. What basically happened was with the construction of the Floodway that a small portion of land was isolated from Springfield and the problems involved with servicing an area crossing over a floodway and so on are rather insurmountable and too expensive, so it was mutually agreed by the two Councils that the territory should be transferred to the City of Transcona where it could be properly serviced, in particular with water and sewer facilities and also police and fire protection.

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . I think, Mr. Speaker, it's as simple as that and I commend the bill to the members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

MR. TOUPIN: Although I'm not going to oppose this Bill, I would like it to be known by the members of this House that I did have delegations regarding this bill and some opposition has been pointed out from my constituency in Springfield.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I just have a question. I believe the Honourable Member for Elmwood said that there had been mutual agreement between the councils. Is this perhaps only the council or the councils?

MR. DOERN: Presumably they represent the people.

MR. BARKMAN: I see.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if you would, we'll go on to the Private Members' resolutions, first in the name of the Honourable -- (Interjection) -- Excuse me a moment will you, Mr. Speaker? -- (Interjection) -- Oh. It was stood Mr. Reeves.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would go to the Resolutions on Page 2.

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions. The proposed resolution of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the resolution is self-explanatory and I will not bore the members by a long speech on the matter, but what in effect I am suggesting for the communities so named and also other communities that have provincial Crown land and provincial buildings is that the province change their present method of paying grants in lieu of taxes to paying 100 percent of the tax assessment on their property. This is something that has been done for quite a few years now by the Federal Government; wherever the Federal Government have buildings they pay the complete taxation in that community. I think some years ago when the tax situation wasn't so desperate - I'm talking now about the real property tax situation - when it wasn't so desperate as it is today, perhaps the communities so affected were not feeling the pinch as much as they feel it today.

In the city of Portage La Prairie, if the government were to pay 100 percent taxes on their property it would mean a lowering of the mill rate by approximately 4 to 4 1/2 mills. It can readily be seen that there's a large amount of government property there, that the grant is, you might almost say is insignificant in the amount of taxes that would have been paid. Now I know that there are those who would say that well these communities are benefitting by provincial jobs. They have civil servants living there and they have the benefit of the industry, if it's a hospital or in the case of Portage, there's a large retardate home, there's a boys' school, there's a Land Titles Office, there are other buildings. I suppose what I'm saying could also be related to Selkirk and Brandon and The Pas, Fort Garry, other communities where a high percentage of the assessment is really provincial buildings. So those who may be inclined to say well perhaps you would like to have those institutions moved away, I don't think that's the answer at all to make a suggestion such as that. No matter where these institutions are they become directly a cost on the municipality by way of snow plowing, policing, street cleaning, lighting, street lighting, that the other citizens who do not work in those institutions and who must pay their full share of taxes, these citizens then must subsidize the provincial government and I think that it's about time that there's a change made in the policy; I think it's about time that the provincial government followed the federal government's lead in this matter and paid their fair share of taxation, real property tax, on all their buildings wherever they are in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable member would permit a question for clarification, and let it not be construed if he answers that it would be closing the debate. Reference is made to Fort Garry, for instance. Have you in mind that the educational institutions at Fort Garry would have to have taxes as a result of that paid to the local municipal council and would this apply to all educational buildings such as schools throughout the province?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well secondary schools or elementary schools are supported by the taxpayers of the local community, but a school such as the Red River College or the University which serves all of the province I would think that they should pay taxes to the community in which they're located.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could also ask a question? To be consistent

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) with the honourable member's proposal, would he consider that religious organizations, churches, should also be taxed in the same way?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I believe that any group whether its a religious group or a scholastic group or a veterans group or whatever, if they have a building and they have property that they should pay their fair share of taxation. I have always maintained that stand. When I was on the Council at Portage, and Portage has a great many churches and has a great many provincial institutions and it has two veterans clubs, but I think that the time is passed when one group of citizens should be called upon to subsidize another group with which they may have nothing in common whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments; not necessarily in support of the motion, but I think there is a principle here that should be discussed and should receive some airing, and that has to do with the government locating their offices in one particular area in rural communities. I find that this is discriminating. I have seen so many of the government offices locate in Morden and that's in the southern general area, when they could be dispersed at other points such as Altona, or Winkler or some of the other communities. We find that they are all congregating in Morden. And we have, I could name any number, for instance the Telephone System, the School Inspectors, the Ag Reps, the Health Unit that was recently opened, the Land Titles Office, the Court House, and then we have federal buildings, the federal experimental farm, the Farm Loan Board, these are all located in the town of Morden. Why cannot some of these be located in other communities so that they need not be all in one area, because this matter of locating offices means that those areas are getting more people into their area and that there is a steady payroll coming into those centres which is not the case for other communities. I feel that this policy certainly should be changed so that other rural communities that have a fair sized town or a fair sized population should also be considered when new offices or departmental offices are being opened throughout the province. I feel that this should definitely be considered and that different policies should be brought into bearing. Then I certainly would have greater feeling to support such a motion. I don't know just what the federal government position is, Are they giving support to -- (Interjection) -- the Federal Government I am informed by the Member for Portage, pay 100 percent taxes. Well if that is the case, certainly these communities are then being envied by other centres in the province.

MR. PAULLEY: On certain buildings do they pay taxes? They don't pay anything for the Penitentiary at Stoney Mountain.

MR. FROESE: I'm informed that this is on real property tax only. I would like to hear from the government ministers on this just what is the situation and why are we following this practice and why is the government bent on this policy of only supporting certain communities in this way. Certainly I think there is room for improvement here and when new programs are being brought in, such as the Vet Services which is one that is being brought in through a new bill, and I am sure there will be others from time to time, that we should consider locating these in the various other centres and not just piling them up in certain communities as has been done in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I would move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I took this adjournment the other day to give the matter further consideration; having done so I believe that the proposed motion and amendment by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce is quite proper because he points out in his amendment that two of the main recommendations of the TED report have in essence been adopted by government. There may be some argument as to the frequency of the meetings of the Standing Committee on Economic Development, but that is apart from the main resolution, because we have established a Standing Committee on Economic Development of this Legislature. If you recall, Mr. Speaker, last year, the composition of this particular committee was one that was changed on a couple of occasions to make it a broader representative committee, but nonetheless the committee was created and there's every indication of course that it would be a continuing committee. As a matter of fact, if memory serves me correctly the rules of the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) House were amended to make provision for a Standing Committee on Economic Development. I believe this to be the case.

Then the second point contained in the amendment by my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce, deals with a high level advisory council on economic development drawn from the private sector. By and large this recommendation of the TED report has been accepted and adopted by the government and that the committee, the Advisory Council on Economic Development is working at the present time.

So that leaves the last two propositions of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, namely the establishment in Ottawa of an office of economic affairs. This has been a matter of scrutiny, not only by the present administration, but is one that was considered by previous administrations as well. I'm sure that my honourable friend, the Member for Ste. Rose will recall that as far as the establishment of offices outside of the Province of Manitoba at one time we had an office in London, England that eventually was closed because it was felt that the work that was going on could be done by other agencies or in co-operation with other agencies. I'm not, by saying this, Mr. Speaker, saying that we're not prepared to look at that part of the resolution of my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose. Indeed it's implied by the amendment of the Minister of Industry and Commerce that the government is prepared to look at items Number 3 and 4.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if it is agreeable to the mover of the main resolution if he would accept - of course this is up to him - accept the premise contained in the amendments proposed by the Minister of Industry and Commerce then the government is prepared to consider items Number 3 and 4 in order to attempt to give effect to the four main recommendations referred to in the main motion by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has indicated the government's desire to have a look at the two clearly outstanding propositions and the First Minister in a speech earlier in the debate indicated that on the other one, which is really the one under contention, that is whether or not we have in fact a high level advisory council on economic development drawn from the private sector. My concern was that it was not drawn from the private sector which is what the TED commission had recommended.

Well, I'm quite prepared to accept the recommendations of the TED Commission are not sacrosanct, they can be changed, but I think I pointed out to the government then that there is a very valid reason for having the economic council drawn from the private sector. I pointed out most clearly that this was not in opposition to the man who is holding the job of Chairman, Mr. Kristjanson, who I regard as a friend, but I thought it put him in an untenable position of having on the one side to be the economic advisor to the Premier of the province and on the other side, being the judge as to how his advice and his work was being followed through.

The First Minister indicated then that he recognized the difficulty and that he was considering making some changes in the structure, and on that basis then, this as far as I'm concerned settles satisfactorily the question there of an independent advisory body. I would hope that the government will act soon on this. I'm not wanting to remove any responsibilities from Mr. Kristjanson, but I think it's important that he have responsibilities that he can in fact fulfil properly, not dual responsibilities which simply will make it impossible to work. So I'm prepared to accept the amendment and intend to support it.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, could we have this matter stand? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the amendment particularly on this resolution, I find it rather amusing that a member of the government should introduce an amendment of this kind to commend the Minister of Agriculture for his initiative and representation to the Government of Canada on behalf of the farmers of the

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.) Province of Manitoba. I think that what is contained in this resolution, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is to be commended by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye in bringing it into this House and I fail to understand the thinking behind the Member, I believe it is, from St. George, who introduced the amendment, why he should be concerned that this resolution couldn't be acted upon.

There are a number of problems over the past year or two that farmers have been very concerned about, and I think rightfully so, and many of the areas of the problems that they are confronted with are as a result of lack of communication or information concerning these varied problems. I'd like to go back just when the Minister became the Minister of Agriculture and I can recall his initiative, and I commend him for it, when he had the idea that insofar as the advance payment to farmers on grain was concerned, the maximum amount that any one farmer could receive was \$6,000. I remember his interest was that it didn't make any difference what size a farm you had; he felt that every farmer should be able to get \$6,000, or a maximum yes, regardless of the size of farm, I believe; whether it be a farmer who had a half section of land or whether it be a farmer who had a section of land. If I understood the Minister correctly I don't think it made any difference. The fact was that he should be able to get an advance of \$6,000.00. He made several trips, I believe, to Ottawa consulting with the Minister of Agriculture at that time and I recall asking the question in the House in the first session or last fall, what progress the Minister had made and I got a reply I think once or twice in the negative and then finally he hoped that he would be able to make an announcement soon, I believe was the last reply he gave me on the last question I asked him. Today I'm still waiting for the answer.

When I look at this resolution and I think of the organizations that are requested to come before an Agricultural Committee I think it has real great significance and importance. The fact that we didn't have an Agricultural Committee last fall, I fail to understand how anyone of his colleagues could suggest that this amendment is in order.

Secondly, that having the committee established - we have gone through this session for about two months and not one bit of action has taken place to date and I would just like to say there are some farm leaders in the Province of Manitoba - I don't think it's out of order for me to mention names such as Mr. Parker and Mr. Runciman who I think have played a very active and an important role in dealing with the many important problems of agriculture in Manitoba. And while I think it may be said, Mr. Speaker, that a number of problems are not provincial jurisdiction, rather they are more of a federal nature, I don't think that this would suggest to anyone that the Minister of Agriculture in the province can take action on bringing these different organizations together around the table and discussing the various problems that we have.

One of these problems that comes to my mind at the present time, Mr. Speaker, is that we've heard a considerable amount of talk about our wheat and the protein content of our wheat and the protein content that it's going to have to have probably in the years to come as to whether we are going to sell it or not. I'm given to understand that tests have been going on for a number of years and I also am given to understand that we are considerably behind United States and Australia in developing this protein content insofar as selling our wheat is concerned. This, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest can pose serious problems for the wheat grower of Manitoba, and I can think of particularly in the area of the Red River Valley where farmers, because of weather and so on, are not always favoured with producing the highest protein content wheat, and as a result of this and because of the lack of information, farmers are not aware of these important problems and as a result they can be caught in the bind. I think that had the Minister taken the bull by the horns, so to speak, called our Agricultural Committee together and asked these organizations to meet with us, because you know, Mr. Speaker, we've had a varied amount of criticism of our Wheat Board and the way it's been operating. I don't know for sure myself as to whether the Wheat Board is altogether to blame for the lack of selling our cereal grains that we produce in Manitoba and I think it would have been well if we had been able to get these people to come with us and discuss these problems.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, just take you back, and I think it's something that has never been said in this House, while it goes back a year and a half, a year ago last January, and I think for the information of those members in this House, I should like to mention it. You recall where the tie-up of ships at the west coast and they indicated that there was a lack of wheat there and as a result ships not being loaded, not getting out of the port to the various countries

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.) that were interested in buying our wheat. And of course I think you are aware of the story that took place thereafter. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that this is information that was knowledgeable in Vancouver for about three weeks while that information never got over the mountains, all the way to Ottawa, and I would just like to say for the information of members in this House, Mr. Speaker, that about three weeks later I contacted my member, Mr. Muir, and asked him what they were doing about this matter in Ottawa. He informed me that the Conservative Party requested through the Agricultural Committee that the officials of the Wheat Board be brought to Ottawa for questioning, merely to discuss the matter and find out what was going on. But I'm not critical of the Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker. I don't want anyone to misunderstand this point. What did concern me, Mr. Speaker, was the lack of action on the part of the Minister who is responsible for operating the Wheat Board, and as a result of this, if you recall, the Minister who was responsible at that time, really didn't take any action for about a month or five weeks and to me I think that that matter was much more serious.

When I mention these points, Mr. Speaker, I think they do have some significance in that here's an occasion where the Minister of Agriculture - and we did play our part, I thought. You can go out into the rural areas of Manitoba and the farm people and even the people who are not engaged in agriculture will tell you so. But I think that here's an area again where the farm organizations could do well because as I understand it - again I mention Mr. Parker and Mr. Runciman because they are, at least Mr. Parker was President and Mr. Runciman is President of two farmer-owned grain handling organizations - they are on the Advisory Board of the Canadian Wheat Board. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I do say they play an important role insofar as solving the problems of the farmer is concerned. I don't think it's a case of trying to find markets for that which we are producing, this has much more importance than some of the things that have been done.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot go along with the amendment that the honourable member presents in this resolution because I do think that the Minister could have taken action and I'm sure that these organizations mentioned in the resolution would have been only too pleased to meet with the agricultural committee of this government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, could we have ayes and nays, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call to the members. We're dealing with the motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye on Page 3 and the amendment thereto of the Honourable Member for St. George.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Malinowski, Paulley, Pawley, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Claydon, Einarson, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Molgat, Sherman, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Ayes, 25; Nays, 19.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment carried. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I didn't vote; I was paired with the Honourable Attorney-General. Had I voted, I would have voted against the sub-amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the motion as amended? The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that 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 Finance in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in rising to comment briefly on the amendment of the Minister of Finance to the resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, I had at that time

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) noted that the amendment as proposed and now before us had the effect of changing the specifics of the original resolution to generalities but that the action part of the resolution remained the same, that is that the whole question of the federal White Paper on taxation be referred to the Standing Committee on Economic Development for immediate study.

Mr. Speaker, since the adjournment of the debate, the specific and detailed position of the Province of Manitoba on the federal White Paper has been presented to Ottawa and has been tabled in the House by the Minister of Finance. The Minister has assured us that in spite of this action having been taken that it is still important and necessary that the discussion go on. It may seem perhaps that it is somewhat redundant that we refer the matter of the position of Manitoba on the White Paper to the Standing Committee on Economic Development at this stage when in fact the position has been outlined. However, I do feel that now that the detailed and specific recommendations of the government have been presented to us and also that specific alternative proposals have been outlined by the Minister, that it does enable the committee, if and when this is referred to the Standing Committee on Economic Development, to discuss these matters in detail and perhaps to take some opposite position on any of the alternative proposals.

I think, Mr. Speaker, without dealing at length at this stage, that I would support the amendment of the Minister and concur that the recommendations as we have now received them, be referred to the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

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

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the motion as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, 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 Rhineland and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne in amendment thereto and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Gladstone. I'm sorry, for Charleswood.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member could we have this matter stand? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour in amendment thereto and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Riel in further amendment thereto.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it might meet your convenience to call it 5:30. I note there's only two minutes to go.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll call it 5:30, and I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock tonight.