

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 p.m., Monday, March 29, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 24 students of Grade 9 standing of the Dauphin Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Madolny. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Highways.

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

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; The Honourable Minister of Health.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface) introduced Bill 42, An Act to Amend The Social Allowance Act and to give Manitoba Regulation 260/75 retroactive effect. (Bill 42 recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona) introduced Bill 44, An Act to Amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act; and Bill 46, An Act to Amend the Pensions Benefits Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge) introduced Bill 41, The Manitoba Freedom of Information Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. LES OSLAND (Churchill) introduced Bill 45, an Act to Amend An Act to incorporate The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Attorney-General and I would like to ask the Attorney-General if he endorses the proposals of the Government of Canada to broaden the use of wire tapping to include all indictable offences?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I've indicated concern insofar as the extending of the power of wire tapping to include all indictable offences. The offences now that are listed as those for which wire tapping can be obtained are the very serious ones for which I think there is more than ample justification for the obtaining of wire tap evidence. Insofar as all indictable offences are concerned I think that does carry it a little too far.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question then. Has the Minister made those representations and those reservations of the Province of Manitoba, has he made those known to the Solicitor-General of Canada?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there have been different conferences I've mentioned of Attorneys-General where there have been discussions in connection with all phases of the peace and good order legislation. Whether or not there was specific reference to that particular aspect of the legislation by my part I'm not sure; there has been no written submission.

MR. GRAHAM: A further supplementary then. Will the Attorney-General having now expressed the views of the people of Manitoba, will he now make those representations

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) known to the Federal Government by letter in the very near future seeing as how the legislation is presently before the House of Commons?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to review the many meetings that we've had with the Federal Solicitor-General and the Minister of Justice. Certainly they have given us a great deal of opportunity to fully discuss this legislation and I do know in dealing with the legislation that many aspects of it were concurred in by the provinces and others - expressions of disagreement were made. I would have to review to ascertain whether or not we have indicated concerns in that regard prior to further writing to the Solicitor-General.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a further question for the Attorney-General. In a report that was published in the Manitoba Gazette of Saturday last, indicating 18 wiretaps were used in the past year, can the Attorney-General indicate whether all of those wiretaps were carried out by either the RCMP or the Winnipeg Police Forces?

MR. PAWLEY: All the 18 referred to were conducted by either the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or the Winnipeg Police Department.

MR. GRAHAM: Then a supplementary question. Then the Attorney-General can assure the House that there were no wiretaps carried out by other than the police forces, and in fact there were no private investigators that were carrying out wiretaps in . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is very precise methods by which application must be made from police officers to the Department of the Attorney-General to a judge in the Court of Queen's Bench insofar as the providing of authorizations for wiretap. The only individuals who can apply to the Department of the Attorney-General for an application to the courts for wiretap are senior people in the Winnipeg Police Departments, the senior personnel and the RCMP and the senior personnel in the City of Brandon Police Department, so that it's restricted to those areas. I will assure myself to insure that my answer is totally accurate that the only applications were RCMP and Winnipeg Police Department applications.

MR. GRAHAM: While the Attorney-General is assuring himself, could he also assure the House then that if those applications were made by those police forces that they themselves did carry out the wiretap and it was not farmed out.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister responsible for MDC. The question is could the Minister advise the House if the new company that's been set up by MDC, I believe it's the AVTEC at Gimli, if that is a solely Crown owned corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): I believe so, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the corporation has been set up as a vehicle to deal with some of the obligations that Saunders Aircraft has. It's not intended as a new operation.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister could advise the number of employees that would be employed by the new company.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, again that should not complicate the fact that it is the same number that Saunders has to employ in order to deal with its obligations under the Product Support Program, plus anything else that they might find to be viable in which they could finance. It is not a new vehicle, it is the same vehicle. As to the exact number the honourable member will be able to get that when Mr. Parsons appears before Committee.

MR. MINAKER: A supplementary question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that this company, Avtech (Canada) will be handling Viscount parts as well as the Saunders Aircraft, and if any feasibility study had been done with regard to the handling of the Viscount parts.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it would only be done in the same connection in which Saunders was handling the Viscount parts. Saunders was doing that for, I believe, over a year now, so they would just carry on that function. With regard to the consideration which the Saunders Board had when they decided that, that is something which was

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) within the discretion of that company.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Because some municipalities have not received authority to remove grain from expected flood stricken areas, can the Minister tell this House when EMO will contact the Canadian Wheat Board for railroad cars so that this grain can be removed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Well, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that EMO has been in touch with the Department of Agriculture to make these arrangements. I can check to see where they're at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister indicate whether his department is currently in negotiation with federal officials to applying cost-sharing to supply child care services to Indian Reserves in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. IAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Well, Mr. Speaker, the question of who has the responsibility of the Indians, especially those on the Reserves, and so on, is ongoing discussion between the Federal and the Provincial Government, not only in that area, but there are many other areas.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of a statement made by a consultant to the Department of Health and Social Development that present services are only of a life and death sort and are not adequate, does the Provincial Government have any plans to initiate action on its own to upgrade these services and provide more than the bare minimum?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a federal responsibility. We're certainly ready to co-operate and deliver this service if the Federal Government will accept its responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): . . . the Minister in charge of Autopac. Regarding auto-body shops, what are the interim hourly rates as they presently are, and what are the proposed rates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister in charge of the Insurance Corporation.

HON. BILLIE URUSKI (Minister for Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation) (St. George): Mr. Speaker, the present hourly rates in the City of Winnipeg, I believe, are in the neighbourhood of \$12.86, and the proposed rates will be announced when the negotiations have been completed.

MR. WILSON: A supplementary. Are these increases going to be within the anti-inflation guidelines?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the association itself has been in consultation with the Anti-Inflation Board with respect to what increases they may be subject to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable the First Minister. I wonder if the Honourable First Minister could advise the House if the proposed 50 cent parking meter rates in the city will come under the anti-inflation guidelines.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure but I would suspect that parking meter rates are regarded as a fiscal measure of the City of Winnipeg and as such would not be under the guidelines. I am quite sure of it, although not 100 percent so.

MR. MCKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the First Minister then proposes to advise the municipalities and the city that the government would intend to take these huge increases to the Anti-Inflation Board for review.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the City of Winnipeg or any municipal council is democratically elected and they are the ones to make that kind of decision, not bureaucrats in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: To the Minister of Public Works. Does the Minister have any comments regarding his alleged intimidation threats of 50-odd owners as . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Question is out of order. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health and Social Development, and it concerns the appointment of Mr. Fletcher as Director of Fitness and Amateur Sport. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House whether or not this particular position is a Civil Service position.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes it is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JORGENSON: I wonder if the Minister could advise the House whether or not a competition was held for that position, and what was the number of that competition.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'll have to check this, Mr. Speaker. If I'm right he was appointed by an Order-in-Council. He had been acting for a full year, and he was appointed as Director of Fitness and Amateur Sports. But I'll double check.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of the Official Opposition) (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister; it's in regard to the Anti-Inflation Board ruling on Manitoba Hydro rates. Can he indicate, in view of the fact that the rates are apparently effective April 1, whether there has been any review made and any decision made back to Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check with the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro. He may have received some communication from the board; I have not. It's now some few weeks since the material was forwarded.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. I wonder if he could advise whether or not meter readings that are averaged over a period of three months, may in fact when the catch-up is done towards the end of the season - are these going to be subject to the increased rates, assuming that these rates are going to apply.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I will on balance take that as notice. I could advise my honourable friend that the rate adjustment applies, as I understand it, to meter readings after the first of April, which means in effect the consumption after the 12th of March.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on this same topic. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate, in the cases where price rises are put through by municipal authorities and urban authorities for such things as water rates, city hydro, parking meter rates, and so on, why these cannot be subjected in the same manner as the Manitoba Hydro rates are presumably subjected to review by the Anti-Inflation Board. And I refer in particular to his memorandum and press release to the municipalities in January of this year, advising them that they would be under the restraint program that was being imposed by the Provincial Government.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, one of the differences of course is that the Anti-Inflation Board would be loath; in fact I do not believe it has even the terms of reference to deal with such matters as might validly be deemed to be fiscal measures undertaken by local government. And I must add that if that is their interpretation, I concur with it entirely. If the City of Winnipeg is required to resort to other forms of raising of revenue because the Anti-Inflation Board has curtailed them with respect to certain user charges, then the Anti-Inflation Board might as well make taxation decisions for local government, which is certainly not the intent.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I might direct a final question to the First Minister on this. If these bodies, and I include the Provincial Government in the question too, do not exercise visible restraint to people, is it not making it very nearly impossible to take the Anti-Inflation Board measure seriously?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The question is hypothetical, hypothetical answer. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well I realize it's hypothetical, Sir, it's just that I find it difficult to resist answering.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): I direct a question to the First Minister along similar lines. At the recommendation of the Chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board, Mr. Pepin, the federal authorities are taking steps at the moment to include some 310, which is virtually all the casualty and property insurance companies, to bring them under the guidelines of the Anti-Inflation Board. With that in mind, is the First Minister now prepared to reconsider the position that he has taken with respect to the one public insurance corporation we have in Manitoba, namely Autopac?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is hinting or suggesting that there is some analogy with respect to a corporation, be it Hydro or be it MPIC, in which there is no diversion of revenues to the Crown's general purse, we have no difficulty in that being perused by and analyzed by the Anti-Inflation Board, in fact, we welcome it. And so with respect to the generality of insurance companies in Canada, if the Anti-Inflation Board is going to look at the premium price dynamics of insurance companies we wouldn't expect Autopac to be left out; in fact, we would be inconsolable if it were. But then in doing that, Sir, we would expect that the Anti-Inflation Board would look askance at those adjustments in premiums as have taken place, in fact I have before me here indication that premiums in Ontario for automobile insurance are going up 25 to 50 percent. We would like that to be juxtaposed to our 15 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: My question is to the Minister of Public Works. How many of the 50-odd families does the Minister anticipate having to expropriate, and is the lawyer in this case getting paid by Legal Aid?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, out of an original, some 50 owners in the Logan Avenue area, we are in the process of expropriating five or six. I believe one has settled and one more may settle, of an original six. And then we're still negotiating with another group and we expect more settlements. So in the last analysis I can't be sure, but it may be four or five and it might be six or eight out of 50.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have another question for the Attorney-General. I would like to ask the Attorney-General, of the seven applications that were made for wiretapping involving members of the judiciary, members of Parliament, or members of the Legislature, how many involve members of Parliament and how many involve members of the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the honourable member that there is certainly no legal obligation for me to provide that type of information to the House. In fact, it might be even improper if in fact investigations were still under way. But so that we not have any false speculation I would assure Members of the House that no one has been investigated by way of a wiretap, no members of Parliament have been investigated by way of a wiretap within that report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister on the same subject. Can the Minister indicate, what is the basis for his remarks that were reported in one of today's newspapers that he expects an increase in the number of wiretaps in the area? Can he indicate on what grounds he makes that judgment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that should be very obvious to the Member of Fort Rouge because it's the government that he supports federally in Ottawa that's

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) extending the grounds for wiretaps all across Canada at this very time.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. I'd like to know where the Attorney-General receives his forecasting ability seeing as such legislation is not yet law to my understanding.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it's very very simple that if you extend the grounds, which is the proposal by majority now in Ottawa, to include all indictable offences rather than a narrow range of offences, then naturally there's going to be a substantial increase in the number of wiretaps used.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources or the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if either the Ministers could indicate if farmers will be reimbursed for very heavy losses of hay as a result of the starving deer population, particularly in the southwest and south central part of the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there are various types of compensation programs which the Provincial Government has been involved in. I can't recall specifically how hay loss due to deer starving is involved but I will take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health in charge of lotteries. In light of the many problems that's come to light recently in Ontario, would the Minister advise the House if a boy or girl under the age of majority . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The question is asking for a legal opinion.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, I'll rephrase the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: I ask the Minister what would happen to a boy or girl in this province . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Same difference. Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister and I wonder if he could advise whether the Women's Tri-Service organization that plans to build a \$30,000 Tri-Service monument, Women's Tri-Service monument, are going to be subject to \$1,500 of sales tax in the construction of the monument.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that as notice. My recollection is that the Crown in the right of the Province has made land available and I think has undertaken to make a grant commensurate with sister provinces to the immediate east and west, or east or west, but I shall take that as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask the question in the hope that the Minister of Agriculture may have had a change in heart. Is the Minister of Agriculture prepared to furnish the Opposition with the feasibility studies on the Crocus Foods project at Selkirk, today?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I suggest he try me tomorrow.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I will.

MR. SPEAKER: That was a supplementary answer, not a question. Orders for Return or Address for Papers first. The Honourable Member for Virden.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

MR. MORRIS McGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I move for the Member for Minnedosa, seconded by the Member for Birtle-Russell, that a humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence between the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Government dealing with all forms of assistance or subsidy for northern fishermen of Manitoba.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that this Order for Return, or Address for Papers actually, is acceptable with the usual standard provision that it requires concurrence from the other level of government.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, so ordered.

Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. The Honourable Member for Brandon West on his behalf.

ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. EDWARD McGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

1. What has been the number of housing starts financed under the supervision of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation since inception, i.e. starts of dwelling units as defined by Statistics Canada, catalogue 64-002.
2. The total number of housing starts for each fiscal year since inception.
3. The number of family housing starts in Winnipeg in each fiscal year since inception.
4. The number of elderly persons housing starts in Winnipeg in each fiscal year since inception.
5. The total number of public housing starts in Winnipeg in each fiscal year since inception.
6. The number of family housing starts in rural Manitoba (i.e. outside Winnipeg) in each fiscal year since inception.
7. The number of elderly persons housing starts in rural Manitoba in each fiscal year since inception.
8. The number of remote housing starts in each fiscal year since inception.
9. The total number of public housing starts in rural Manitoba in each fiscal year since inception.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'll be prepared to accept this Order for Return. I'm wondering whether the member could indicate whether it would be in order to have the information put forward on the calendar year rather than the fiscal year because CMHC operates on a calendar year basis, January to December. If that would be in order, we'll accept it this way.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable? The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. McGILL: Mr. Speaker, that would be agreeable.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if it meets with the concurrence of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and Point Douglas, I would suggest that we could accept the two Orders as printed as read without going through the necessity of reading them.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Moved and agreed to that the two further Orders for Return by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge and Point Douglas be agreed to. So ordered.

ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. AXWORTHY -

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

1. a) Foundation grants for each Manitoba School Division for the 1975 fiscal year.
- b) Equalization for each Manitoba School Division for the 1975 fiscal year.
- c) Balanced assessment per pupil for each Manitoba School Division for the 1975 fiscal year.
2. a) Foundation grants for each Manitoba School Division for the 1976 fiscal year.
- b) Equalization grants for each Manitoba School Division for the 1976 fiscal year.
- c) Balanced assessment per pupil for each Manitoba School Division for the 1976 fiscal year.

MR. MALINOWSKI -

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

1. How many Nursing Home beds were there in Manitoba in June 1969?
2. How many Nursing Home beds are there in Manitoba today?
3. How many Nursing Home beds were subsidized by the Government of Manitoba in June 1969?
4. How many Nursing Home beds are subsidized by the Government of Manitoba today?
5. What is the nature and intent of the current subsidy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader wish to go down the Order Paper.

BILL NO. 26 - AN ACT RESPECTING THE CITY OF BRANDON

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 26, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 26. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

BILL NO. 26 was read a third time and passed.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 17 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 17. Proposed by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, over the last few days we've had a lot of good thoughts and comments on this bill and I'll just add a few of my thoughts in probably closing debate on behalf of this group.--(Interjection)--Well it might be well. My thoughts, that come from a slightly different base, are, I think I could say, of a slightly boozy breath of past experience, would be probably putting it . . . and also I feel fairly strong on this. I'm a parent of four teenagers and as we go along year after year for political gain doing things that are continually opening doors that create problems to adult persons but also to the youth of our nation. And I am one who has a great faith and respect for the youth and it does annoy me when we see us continually doing these things that's making their problems just a little bigger.

When we think of the wine, home deliveries of wine, surely this is not a time that it's necessary. I can see it for clubs or organizations because it does save considerable to get the glasses and everything but when it comes down right to the home deliveries, I can just think of many people I know that have a real wino problem. And this would just--(Interjection)--Well this is the worst of all the drinking problems that I know; that is the way I think of it, as the last step, and I certainly do feel saddened for that class of persons. Being one who is at least accused of being down near those depths some years ago, I didn't leave it but some did, and I think I did see many of my friends who went down the route because liquor and the way of getting liquor is so much

BILL 17

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) easier. I just wonder why this has to come in at this time.

We continually see more advertising to sell more booze, to create more drinking problems, and for what? Is that really the good? Every government needs more money to do things, but do we need to do it that route? Do we need to advertise to sell booze? I would like to see all the doors closed of advertising, and I'm sure the booze would sell itself.

And yet we see in the Estimates of the Correctional Minister where he gets some \$3.5 million. Is that a fair balance when you look at our Estimate Book and see where the net profit is some \$46 million, and is three and a half going to do any part of the question that \$46 million in profits do harm. I say not; that this increase should be a good deal better to balance off the problems. Certainly liquor has been with all of us. It was with me, and it wasn't as open, and some of us abuse it, some people will abuse it regardless.

I think getting back to the youth, we know in Saskatchewan the age is 18, and this is repeating what many of my colleagues have said, Ontario is thinking and talking very strongly of raising it to 19, and if there was a move in this area, you would certainly have my support. Because I said when this bill came in, it was a problem to the Grade 12 students, and it's still a problem today, where it's an "in thing" with the students to go out and have their Friday noon pub parties or chowder club parties at noon, but I don't think it adds anything to our educational system. If it adds anything, it adds a great deal of expense to kids that could well spend that noon hour upgrading that particular weak subject rather than be going . . . and certainly not all students do that, but a lot are doing it.

As the Honourable Member for Emerson said on Friday last, I believe, raising the age to 19 would be like going against the current, or the stream. Well, Mr. Speaker, I always maintain if one has a point, push for it regardless of the backlash or the current trend of the day. Because that's the only way one gets . . . If we're here with the responsibility we must think ourselves, do our thing, and if it's going against the current, the trend, I say I'm all for it. And I think our party will be making more to say in the Committee stage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on Bill 17, an Act to Amend the Liquor Control Act, and I'm somewhat in agreement with the remarks made by the Member for Virden.

First of all - and I apologize, I wasn't in the House and I didn't hear the Minister give us the explanation on the second reading - but I don't really know the reason for wanting to change the law so that wine deliveries can be made in the manner that is prescribed in the bill. I really don't understand it. I haven't heard any great outcry for such a change. I can't recall one person complaining that it was difficult in order to have to go to the Liquor Commission and purchase the wine, and to show that of course that the person was over the age of eighteen. Now perhaps this may please the winos on North Main, I don't know. They may be very happy that they don't have to make the daily trip down to the liquor store, they can pick up the phone. Perhaps it may please some under age drinkers who want to get hold of liquor and they have to do it illegally, because they'll be able to get it by mail; they'll be able to have it delivered, have their orders delivered. So I think that the Liquor Control Act is pretty broad as it is.

Now we have beer home delivery, and if we have wine home delivery, why not throw it wide open and have whiskey too. You know, what's the difference? There's no difference. It's the same principle, and we're talking about the principle. So the one point I make is: I haven't heard an outcry for this type of service.

When one looks at the Annual Report some interesting facts emerge. On Page 31 in the Annual Report, the financial statement, it compares the sales for '74 and '75, and then there's a breakdown, but the total sales in 1975 were over \$49 million. No, gross profit, pardon me, over \$49 million. In '74, \$42 million, and so there was an increase of about 15 percent roughly in gross profit. But then in the breakdown of spirits, wine,

BILL 17

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) and beer sales, it's interesting to note that in 1975 wine sales fell off by seven percent, Sales of spirits went up from, or the profit on the sales of spirits went up to nearly \$37 million from a little over \$30 million. So there's a big increase in profit in the sale of spirits. In the sale of beer, there was increase, not much, but the gross profit went up to 8.4 million from 7.3 million. So wine was the only category that dropped off in sales. Well it almost looks like this is a way of picking up sales. It's a sales pitch. It's got nothing to do with what the community wants. It looks like it's a blatant attempt to whip up the sales.--(Interjection)-- This is not the reason. If that is the reason, well then we shouldn't be having a Liquor Control Act. If we want to flog the booze for all it's worth.--(Interjection)--That's right. That's right. I think it's a silly thing to be thinking of.

I would like to know if the Minister has copies of the recent studies that were done in Ontario about the drinking problems in the eighteen and over age group. I wonder if he has considered their experience. I wonder what he has done to study the problem in Manitoba here. I would like to know what the experience has been for the last few years, when we decreased the drinking age from twenty-one to eighteen. We should have this information made available to the Members of the House so that we can make some decisions too. Now if the government has this information they should make it available. If they haven't got it, then perhaps they'd tell if they haven't got it, and tell us that they are going to try and gather some facts and figures on what the problems are.

You know, examining the report, roughly there's enough drinking room in the pubs and cabarets and clubs across the province. I think there is about two square feet for every citizen in the province. There's lots of drinking outlets. There's lots of them. There's lots of outlets for people who want to purchase. Between vendors and government stores - I've made the figures here - there are 593 of these types of outlets in the province. So there's no great difficulty in anybody being too far away or too inconvenient to get down to a vendor or to a government liquor store. So you know, it boggles the mind really, to use an expression of the Premier's, it boggles the mind as to why this sort of amendment is coming in Bill 17.

You know, Mr. Speaker, again I refer you to the report, and on Page 19 there's a list of hotels by name, and the suspensions that have been meted out for them and the reasons, and there's some interesting . . . There should be some comment made here on the way justice is meted out by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission. For example, the Sutherland Hotel in Winnipeg had its license suspended for two days for short measures of liquor. Two days for cheating customers, eh? But I see another hotel, the New Corona Cafe, with a restaurant beer and wine license, was suspended for four consecutive Sundays, which you think are their best sales days, because liquor sales not incidental to food sales and a proper billing system not in use. In other words they were gypping the Liquor Control Commission. So the Commission suspends one for gypping the customer two days, suspends the other for gypping the Liquor Control Commission four days. I've heard the term "rough justice" that's odd justice, very odd justice. And I could quote on, there's several more examples, but I won't burden the members.--(Interjection)--Well, I'll give you another one. I'll give you some more. Sure. Charleswood Beverage Hotel suspended two days, service to intoxication on two separate occasions and short measures of draft beer. Gypping the customer again, eh? Now here's another one. Two days suspension, short measure in shot glasses, the Voyageur Inn, gypping the customer. Well here we are again, the Sutherland Hotel appears again. Restaurant beer and wine license suspended for four consecutive Sundays because liquor sales not incidental to food sales, unsanitary washrooms, and get this, proper billing system not used. They may have been gypping the Liquor Commission. So they get four days, but gyp the customer, two days.--(Interjection)--Well, I'm going by the report. Well, it seems to me the main one is that it was beating the profit margin on the Commission. That was the big concern. That's the main concern.

Now, I don't particularly agree that they should close the hotel that maybe has 30 or 40 employees and these people are making their living; I believe that they should

BILL 17

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) switch to a system of fines, and hit them \$500 or a \$1,000 on the first offence, and it should go as high as \$5,000 if they persist, and teach them that they are not to cheat people, and they are not to cheat the Commission. We need enforcement. We need enforcement. We don't need making it easier for people to get ahold of wine. The ordinary average person has no difficulty whatsoever going to his nearest liquor store or vendor, they're pretty well scattered all over the province.

So I'm not supporting this bill. I would hope that the Minister would reconsider and take out anything with relation to telephone, mail, or any other means of ordering wine, and wine delivery. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on at least some of the speaker's going back to the 19th of March, 1976, when we started to discuss on the second reading Bill 17. I believe we started with the Honourable Member for Roblin, who is not in the House but hopefully will read comments in Hansard. He spoke to some length in regard to the age of majority in regard to allowing or not allowing eighteen year old individuals or over the privileges of drinking in a public place. He posed certain questions pertaining to the responsibility of the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission and other members of the board, and asking who the Chairman is responsible to, who he's appointed by, and what are the responsibilities of the other members of the Commission. The Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission and other members, the two other members of the Liquor Control Commission, are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council; the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission is responsible to the other members of the Commission, as he is to the Minister responsible; the responsibilities of himself and the other members of the Commission are either struck out in the Act itself, regulations and policies arrived at and determined by the Commission and myself in regard to internal policies of the Liquor Control Commission. That's one of the points the bill, Mr. Speaker, deals with, is in regard to the responsibility of members of the Commission, that is, the Chairman of the Commission and other people that may be appointed in the future to take certain responsibility in regard to the Licensing Board and related functions of the Liquor Control Commission.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia he too discussed his possibility of voting against one section at least of the bill before us, being the section dealing with the possibility of delivering wines, delivering wine to the residents by a licensee. Mr. Chairman, if we look at the section that we have in Bill 17 pertaining to receiving orders for wine, the section reads as follows: "The licensee under a Wine Retail License may receive orders for wine by telephone, mail, or other means, at any time on any day on which a wine store is not prohibited from being open under subsection 2;" and in the regard to the delivery of wine, "as will be determined by the Liquor Control Commission and subject to such terms as the Commission may prescribe for our two wineries in Manitoba, a licensee under a wine retail license may deliver wine to the residence of the purchaser thereof, or to an address designated by him at any time when a wine store is not prohibited from being open under subsection 2." And there's another section dealing with "related wine accessories," like wine glasses, and cheese, and so on.

What we're really saying by wanting to amend the Liquor Control Act is that we're allowing breweries to deliver beer at residences, and there has been a request by our two Manitoba wineries to have the same privilege given to them, and the request was made to the Liquor Control Commission and they in turn made the same request to I, the Minister responsible, and that's the reason why it's before the House in the form of an amendment to the Liquor Control Act. There will be certain conditions prescribed by the Commission that our two wine companies in Manitoba will have to adhere to before such a provision is proclaimed.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia was wanting more controls instead of less controls pertaining to the liquor laws in the Province of Manitoba, and he indicated that he was not aware of, and I hope I'm quoting him in the right context, "not aware of

BILL 17

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) drinking problems, and he was not aware of any study that was being conducted." I indicated in introducing Bill 17 for a second reading, that we had had a report presented to us by Justice Rhodes Smith, and a Committee appointed before I became Minister responsible, and since I've been appointed, I've appointed an In-House Committee to review the Liquor Control Act, regulations, policies of the Committee, policies of the Commission, and to equally review the report given to me by Justice Rhodes Smith, in view of having more adequate recommendations made to myself pertaining to either amendments to the Act that could be made in the future and/or regulations of the Commission, but more particularly in regard to the internal policies of the Commission. So I'm hoping that this report could be submitted to me within a month or so, and hopefully that we can take internal decisions to alter the internal policies of the Commission, not necessarily to make it more stringent for consumers, but make it more manageable by the Liquor Control Commission in regard to all sectors of the industry.

I'd like to inform the honourable member although we do have a section called 109(1) Subsection 6 in the bill before us, that I have not caved in the wineseller, I was only attempting to be consistent in having a section dealing with our two wineries, as it is with the brewers in the Province of Manitoba.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye, on the 24th of March talked about the involvement by the youth in the problems of liquor in the Province of Manitoba, and hopefully that that can be had by means of the inquiry or the study, the internal, in-House study being conducted now, and hopefully that we can get the wisdom of the youth involved in the process of administering the Act, and formulating policies for the Commission.

The honourable member was wanting the names of offending hotels, which were tabled in the House just recently, so he has answers to that question. He was advocating an ID card system, and I can inform the honourable member that legislation was passed in this House approximately two years ago making it possible for an identification card that I'm informed will be prepared and offered by the Manitoba Hotel Association. They've taken it upon themselves to actually produce a card that will conform with the sections of the bill that was accepted by this House and yet not proclaimed, and then market the card, make it available at cost to individuals in the province that do want to purchase it.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye was indicating that the Hotel Association was not requesting a change in the - I'm sorry. He was indicating that the Hotel Association, to his knowledge, was not wanting changes as indicated in the bill. And I could produce for the honourable member recommendations made by the Hotel Association that do request most, if not all, the sections that are contained within this bill. And the Hotel Association, to my knowledge, have not made a requisition in the form of a resolution to lower the age of majority in the Province of Manitoba, and if that was his point I can indicate to him that that was not made by a resolution of the Hotel Association or by any other hotel that I'm aware of. I don't base my personal opinion on necessarily what I hear from the Hotel Association or from any hotel in the Province of Manitoba, and I don't personally endorse a revision in the age of majority in the Province of Manitoba. I believe that the problems that we have with some of the youth drinking excessively in the Province of Manitoba has nothing to do with the age itself, but the lack of education by different levels in society, and more particularly the parent or the guardians of those so-called minors below 18 years old, and certainly in some cases with the lack of authority in the different schools in the Province of Manitoba, like indicated by some members that you have students in Grade 12 or beyond that are drinking excessively. I don't blame the age of majority for that. I think the majority of younger people, 18, 19 years old, are responsible. I think they're drinking more openly today than they were, say, prior to the amendment to the Age of Majority, and this may cause a more visible offence to the general public. But I don't believe that the government generally - I know I'm not endorsing or requesting a revision of the Age of Majority.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye was seeking tougher legislation pertaining to liquor laws in the Province of Manitoba. Again I'm not in a position to accept or reject his plea for stricter laws pertaining to liquor, I'm only indicating to him and other members of the House that I'm hoping that the in-House committee will find proof

BILL 17

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) that a toughening of the Act, or a loosening of the Act in certain areas, is warranted, but I'm not in the position at this time to indicate that I for one would like to toughen up the Act in any way, shape or form.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would answer a question. Would he not agree that by lowering the drinking age to 18 we have made it much more easy for the people in the age group of 15 or 16, they have much more easy accessibility to alcohol than they did when the drinking age was 21.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't personally endorse that feeling. I believe that prior to the changes of the age of majority, that, depending on the individual, a youngster then could purchase by different means, liquor, as much as he can today. It was sometimes more difficult for a 16 or 17 year old to be recognized as a 21 year old individual then. But I know I for one, when I was 17 years old, I looked to be at least 21, and I'm not going to give you my history, but I don't personally endorse the abuse of individuals being more today as it was prior to then. But I do believe sincerely that the youngsters of today, if we can call them youngsters, 18 and 19, are drinking more openly than they were then.

The Honourable Member for Pembina indicated that he would legislate, and I hope that he will correct me if I misunderstood his comments, that he would legislate liquor out of the province. That's the way I got his comment, that he would legislate liquor out of the province. And then he went on to say that he would certainly want more control pertaining to liquor laws in the Province of Manitoba. Now I haven't got Hansard before me, Mr. Speaker, but that's the comment that I have here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Since the honourable member was stating what I said, I said, "If I thought it would be possible to control it, I would legislate it out, but since it isn't I would be prepared to do these other things."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, I for one, Mr. Speaker, having been born during the Depression and raised during the latter part of the Depression I certainly wouldn't attempt to legislate liquor out of the province; it's unworkable today. I think we have a system of controlling much more than we had back in the 30s and the 40s.

MR. ENNS: We had more fun in those days.

MR. TOUPIN: Possibly, like the Honourable Member for Lakeside indicates, that we had more fun, but we had more problems in regard to bad liquor. I can recall a lot of my constituents getting ill on bad moonshine, and we see less of that today than we did then.

The Honourable Member for Pembina accused us of wanting to get more votes by lowering the age of majority from 21 to 18. Well I can indicate to the honourable member that I supported the bill to lower the age of majority from 21 to 18 and I didn't anticipate getting more votes from that, although I'm glad to have noticed in 1973 that I did.

The honourable member equally mentioned that 10 percent of employees are creating 80 percent of our provincial problems. Well I would certainly like to have the honourable member, either privately or in public, when he speaks on my Estimates give the source of those statistics pertaining to provincial problems caused by 10 percent of provincial employees causing 80 percent of their problems.

The honourable member indicated that the Liquor Control Commission was not being sincere with Manitobans in charging more for less fortified wines and they being more expensive than the more, say, the higher proof wines in the Province of Manitoba. Well actually that was an intent in the event that we wanted to promote, that is the Liquor Control Commission wanted to promote, the less fortified wines in the Province of Manitoba, and the price of wine is based on the percentage content of alcohol. So if the honourable member has a case to argue otherwise, I'd like him to cite it.

The honourable member indicated that he feels that drinking leads to other types of chemical abuse, like drugs, marijuana, and so on. I don't happen to endorse that; I've

BILL 17

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) drank for many years, not excessively, but I love wines, and I have a few drinks of hard stuff; I've been smoking since 1954 and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. TOUPIN: . . . I've never been high on drugs and I never had the intent of using drugs. So I only use my example for others. It may lead other people to other types of drugs, but I don't necessarily endorse that conviction of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

The honourable member indicates that he'd like to crack down on liquor control vendors. Well again, that's somewhat of a comment that the honourable member used to make to me when I was Minister responsible for Welfare in this province. He used to indicate that he knew of abuse, of people abusing welfare, and I've always indicated to the honourable member that if he knows of any liquor vendors in the Province of Manitoba that are breaking any sections of the Act or regulations, that I'd welcome him informing me of those individuals because the license can be withdrawn, not only suspended, but withdrawn from a liquor vendor, whether it be in the rural or the urban areas of the province.

And equally the honourable member was favouring the raising of the drinking age from 18 to 19 years old.--(Interjection)--There was an honourable member in the back of me, the Deputy Speaker was favouring the increase to 21 years old. So that would rectify all their problems, he says.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry spoke on the 26th of March and he was in favour of most of the section calling them administrative in nature, which he's completely right. The majority of the sections before us are administrative in nature.

He was against the delivery of wine by our two wineries. He was not voting against most of the sections, so I'm led to believe that the honourable member will vote against that section, being section 109(1)(6) and 109(1)(7) in committee, but would support the bill on third reading. That's the impression I got from the honourable member, because he had grave objections to the delivery of wine by our two wineries but yet seemed to endorse and give me support in regard to the administrative sections that were needed in the bill.

The honourable member questioned me in regard to cost of curtailing abuse pertaining to this type of chemical, and he was asking if \$200,000 per year would help to rectify some of the problems that the Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitation is faced with. I can indicate to the honourable member that the Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitation has appointed a person from the Alcoholism Foundation to sit on the in-House committee pertaining to the review of the Act, regulations and policies of the Commission in hope that we jointly, that is his department and the Liquor Control Commission, can arrive at some recommendations, not only for the Liquor Control Commission but equally for the departments and agencies of government that are concerned and willing to help curtail abuse pertaining to alcohol excess.

The Honourable Member for Emerson, I believe, cited that he was against the raising of the Age of Majority and he gave several reasons. As he indicated there, since 10 years I believe, we've been allowed to take with us minors in licensed restaurants, like his daughter can be taken into a licensed restaurant and allowed to have a drink of wine or beer as long as she's authorized by her father or mother or guardian, and that's not something that seems to be detrimental or brought to bear in regard to the amendments of this bill. He feels that this is better than to leave kids drink on the sly, and I hope I'm using his terminology. It's done more openly with parents and guardians and he feels in his own mind that this is a better educational process than to just leave it at the whim of the individual without proper education.

The Honourable Member for Virden who spoke today indicated that he's a parent of four teenagers and he feels that we're making it worse for children in regard to the liquor laws that we have in the Province of Manitoba. I would wonder what sections of the bill that we have before us, Mr. Speaker, makes it worse for youngsters in the Province of Manitoba. In regard to beer, the honourable member, or anyone in society that is considered to be an adult, can order beer and have it delivered; they will now be allowed under certain conditions to order wine and have that delivered. Now it's

BILL 17

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) really up to the parents or the guardians of those individuals to attempt to educate their children to drink moderately, whether it be at home or in a public place. So I go back to my personal feelings that abuse in anything is more a question of education than laws that will curtail same.

The honourable member favours closing all doors to advertising. Well I can indicate to the honourable member that I'm of the same opinion, that I don't endorse opening up the laws pertaining to advertising. I for one would certainly limit it more than it is now, certainly not recommend more advertising of any type of liquor in the Province of Manitoba. And as the honourable member has noticed I've never advocated the contrary to what I'm citing now.

The honourable member was questioning if the amount of \$3.5 million in the budget of the Honourable Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitation was enough to curtail abuse, and I would say not, because the \$3.5 million is not all set aside for the treatment of those suffering from chemical abuse, but it is actually for inmates and many other purposes than to treat individuals suffering from the causes of alcohol. So I would certainly endorse more funds to be set aside for helping those suffering from chemical abuse.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie was equally against the delivery of wine by our two wineries in the Province of Manitoba. I would only indicate to the honourable member that he's certainly free as a member of this House to certainly vote against that section in committee, but I would ask him to support me in the balance of the bill because the balance of the bill is certainly needed for a better administration of the Act but that section there is certainly a section that he has convictions on and I don't deny him the right to attempt to encourage his other members to vote against it. But the other sections don't have anything to do with liberalizing the Act itself apart from that section dealing with the delivery of wine.

The honourable member questioned me pertaining to other provinces in Canada, and more particularly Ontario. I'd like to indicate to the honourable member that I've not personally reviewed the liquor laws of Ontario, although I have from Quebec, laws there. I've looked at the laws in Ontario but I haven't seen on sight the problems in Ontario but I have in Quebec. I spent a few days there visiting the different sectors of the industry, and I didn't like what I'd seen in Quebec, and I'm hoping to avoid a lot of the pitfalls that they've experienced over the years.

The in-House Committee is reviewing the acts and regulations of many provinces in Canada and hopefully that we can take and leave from those provinces, take what we figure to be better legislation and attempt to avoid those sections of the Act that causes problems pertaining to the consumers.

The honourable member made reference to the Liquor Control Commission's report tabled in the House last week and indicated that he seems to favour a policy of fine instead of closure. I too would want to look at a fine structure but not leaving aside the possibility of withdrawing the license of an individual temporarily or permanently, and that will certainly be done.

The report that the honourable member was quoting is a report not for the year ended December 31st. I can indicate that, as an example, the sale of wine in the Province of Manitoba up to December 31st has increased. So he won't be able to tell me next year that because we amended a certain section of the Act that we've increased the sale of wine; that has started already, not in that report but in the more up-to-date report that I received from the Commission. There's an increase of sale of wine in the Province of Manitoba I believe by about 20 percent, which is not indicated in that report, but there seems to be a trend in Manitoba to buy more wine than there is say, spirits, other forms of spirits.

I'm hoping that the in-House Committee will look at the joint possibility of fine and withdrawing of license before they report back to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable members for participating in the debate of second reading of this bill and I still hope that although they seem to be somewhat against one section of the bill, that they voice that opinion, by voting against it in

BILL 17

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) Law Amendments but still support the bill in principle on third reading.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister permit a question? The Minister gave as a reason for the giving wineries the right to deliver wine to the home, was because they asked for this. So I ask the Minister the question: If distilleries asked for the same method of operating, would he grant that also?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well Mr. Speaker, again, in regard to the reason why that section is before us, I believe it was two-fold. First of all there was a recommendation of the Liquor Control Commission to so amend the Act; secondly there was a request by our two wineries in the province to have the same privilege as the breweries. If there was a request by other sectors of the liquor industry in the province to have the same privilege, I'd be willing to look at it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions to the Honourable the Minister before he closes debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It's closed. The debate is closed.

MR. McKENZIE: Or rather, can the Minister advise the House when we can expect the Rhodes Smith Report. And the second question Mr. Speaker: The in-House report, when we could expect that? And thirdly, are there any members of the opposition in that group doing the in-House study?

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the Justice Rhodes Smith Report was not commissioned by myself, it was commissioned by the previous Minister and the Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitation. And it is an in-House Committee Report which is not intended to be made public, the same as the report of the committee that I've appointed, it's an in-House Committee, and that I don't intend to publish their report but I certainly intend to report to members the result of the recommendations that I accept, and to make that known either in the form of a bill at the next session or amendments to the regulations of the Liquor Control Commission.

MR. McKENZIE: A final question. I wonder then, could the Minister give us some type of a sub-report of these findings in the next interval between that and the time he brings in the legislation, of what his findings are in these in-House studies.

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I could certainly do that when the time is felt desirable before the presentation of any major amendments to the Act.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 18 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18. The Honourable Minister of Mines will be closing debate.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was very very pleased to hear the reaction to the presentation of this bill. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I had very little concerns that it was the right measure to take, that even suggested concerns would have certainly been wiped away by the participation of honourable members in this debate and the things that were said relative to the existing situation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that legislation as I see it is generally for the enactment of laws to do things by law differently than they are being done at the present time. There are many people who bring forward legislation for an informational effect, to try to use legislation as a means of highlighting certain matters, and although I'm not attempting to downgrade that reason for legislation I tend to feel that that is a less important feature of legislation.

With respect to this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, it would appear that although it was not intended that the educative effect, or the informational effect of the bill is possibly much more important than I had reason to believe when it was first presented.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's necessary in the democratic process for there

BILL 18

(MR. GREEN cont'd) to be a good understanding as to what the issues are, what the conflicts are, what the problems are, so that the people can make a more intelligent judgment as to what they want to happen. And where for one reason or another, Mr. Speaker, there exists a great deal of confusion, and I'm not even going to attempt to attribute blame for this confusion - as a matter of fact, I'm willing to accept responsibility for that blame on the part of the existing government. If there is existing confusion as a result of legislation which we have on the book, or an administrative practice which we have on the book, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the interests of the democratic process that that confusion be cleared up and that the public then have a better understanding as to what the issues are.

With respect to the right of a municipality to deal with contaminants or with the right for them to take measures with regard to insecticides, I believe that there exists, Mr. Speaker, and it has been confirmed, confirmed in this House, that there exists a great deal of confusion and that this bill is therefore very necessary for the purpose of eliminating that confusion. The confusion exists, Mr. Speaker. We note that the members of the Liberal Party, although there are only three, are split on this bill. We note that the members--(Interjection)--Pardon me?--(Interjection)--Three. Well two out of the three are fools anyway, so there is only one there. They can take their pick as to which two they are. It really doesn't matter. But in any event today - I apologize for that remark, Mr. Speaker. Two out of the three are fools by the definition of somebody else not by my definition. I have always respected the authority of the electorate to choose their representative, even if he happens to be my representative, the Member for Wolseley. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal caucus is split, the Conservative caucus is split, and the debate has illuminated if that is a proper word, illuminated confusion in the minds of honourable members as to what the situation is.

The following three myths, Mr. Speaker, have come out of this debate:

The first myth is, that the Clean Environment Commission somehow prevented the City of Winnipeg from spraying for mosquitoes; that there was an order of the Clean Environment Commission which had the effect of preventing the city from spraying for mosquitoes. That is one myth.

The second myth is, Mr. Speaker, that the City of Winnipeg wanted desperately to use the methoxychlor to spray for mosquitoes, that the city wanted to do this.

And the third myth, Mr. Speaker, is that in 1975, the City of Winnipeg pressured the Provincial Government into engaging in a spring program to eliminate mosquito nuisance in the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, those are three myths that have been highlighted in the debate and may I say, and I intend to demonstrate to honourable members, that all of those things are completely false. All three are false. And when we have false assumptions being debated by members of this House - and I assume that the members of this House are debating sincerely - then I say, that if it is my fault I accept the blame; if it is somebody else's fault, let that at least come out, but then there is a responsibility on the part of legislators to clear that matter up.

Mr. Speaker, I really intended to let some of this go by until I heard the Member for Fort Garry, who made the following comments. "I think last summer we faced an emergency and I believe, Sir, that the Clean Environment Commission has been tried and found wanting. I believe that the Clean Environment Commission works to an excellent level of capacity and talent in the area of abstract ideas. I believe that it functions very effectively as a catalyst for discussion and argument, but I don't believe, Sir, that the Clean Environment Commission has demonstrated that it is capable of responding efficiently to emergencies." Now this, Mr. Speaker, and I do have some responsibility to deal with the public citizens who have been appointed to that board and who have done a job. I believe that I have some responsibility of dealing with those charges which have been registered by the Member for Fort Garry. The Clean Environment Commission, Mr. Speaker, has never made an order, and this is really the argument that I have with the Member for Fort Rouge as well, who seems to suggest that methoxychlor spraying was prevented by the Clean Environment Commission and now the doors

BILL 18

(MR. GREEN cont'd) are being opened. Mr. Speaker, that is 100 miles from the truth.

The Clean Environment Commission, and the person who can best demonstrate it is the Member for St. James. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside said that his previous minister, Mr. Witney, enacted this bill, was going to protect the environment through a Clean Environment Commission, and that he was prepared to stand the heat, and the present Minister is heat-shy, cop-out, political coward - you can add whatever adjectives you want, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with that - and that somehow this Act is now being undone. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that neither Mr. Witney nor any member of this Legislature ever had the intention of affecting the City of Winnipeg Mosquito Abatement Program with the Clean Environment Act. Because, Mr. Speaker, between 1969 and 1972 the Member for St. James was the Chairman of the Works and Operations Committee, not through all of those years, of the Works and Operations Committee of the City of Winnipeg and said that they always sprayed for mosquitoes and that he never asked the Clean Environment Commission. And, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that between 1963 and July of 1973, all of the years when this piece of legislation that the Honourable Member for Lakeside thinks was in existence - and I'm going to show him that it wasn't - it wasn't, Mr. Speaker, and I will prove it to the honourable member; that the honourable member says that this legislation was in existence in the form in which he says that Buck Witney accepted responsibility.

The City of Winnipeg did whatever spraying they wanted to do and in many of those years, Mr. Speaker, never sprayed in residential areas to try to prevent the spread of mosquitoes, although there were mosquitoes in the City of Winnipeg every year. It was in 1973, after the 1st of July, Mr. Speaker, well into the month of July, after they had received the numerous calls from citizens and were told by their administration that it won't do you any good anyway, and the councillors said, well if it'll keep the people quiet we don't care if it kills mosquitoes, that they decided to make an application to the Clean Environment Commission after the first week in July. And the honourable member knows that it's correct. There are members in the House who were on that council. And what happened, Mr. Speaker, is they made the application well after it could have had any effect if hearings were to be held on whether or not they could spray for mosquitoes. And it was only some months later that the Clean Environment Commission made an order, which incidentally, Mr. Speaker, did not prevent the use of methoxychlor for the spraying for mosquitoes. It set out a very complicated procedure, which I feel was not correct, as to how mosquito spraying should take place, but it did not prevent the spraying for mosquitoes. And when the city appealed, and the residents appealed, it came to the Minister by virtue of the appeal procedure, it was I who asked the Municipal Board to advise on the question as to whether they could outline this procedure. The Municipal Board said, "No." The order that was made by the Clean Environment Commission was for the year 1973, and it was made, Mr. Speaker, the final order, that is after the appeal, I believe in the month of February or March for the previous summer, and specifically contained a section telling the city that if they wanted to spray they would be permitted to apply again to the Clean Environment Commission. And I sent the city a letter telling them that they could spray, that they could apply to the Clean Environment Commission. But, Mr. Speaker, the Councillors of the City of Winnipeg had as far as they were concerned all that they wanted. They had an order which said that they couldn't spray in 1973, which was months after the event, and they had a statement to be able to make to the people of Winnipeg that the reasons that they were not spraying is not because they didn't want to, but because the Clean Environment Commission had prevented them from doing so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1974, an application was made by the Town of Pinawa for Methylene spraying of mosquitoes. The application was granted by the Clean Environment Commission. I wrote the City of Winnipeg in 1974 that if they wished to go to the Commission they should be aware of this order. They ignored the letter because they didn't want to apply. In 1975, Mr. Speaker, they did exactly the same thing. It wasn't again until the month of July, when it was made abundantly clear to anybody who phoned

BILL 18

(MR. GREEN cont'd) my office and see whether there was confusion. A responsible member of the Legislature, the Member for Crescentwood, also a City Councillor, said that when he received a call about the mosquitoes, he told them to phone Sid Green. Now, Mr. Speaker--(Interjection)--Yes - if the Honourable Member for Crescentwood is confused,--(Interjection)--is confused. Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is true. When there is confusion, when the Member for Crescentwood, and when other people can try - and believe me they didn't succeed very much because there are very few people of that impression, and from now on there will be no problem with respect to it - when a member of the Legislature can apparently believe that that is the case when his council has not applied, and has never been prevented from spraying, then indeed there is confusion; a responsible member of the legislature is confused.

In 1975 the City of Winnipeg applied again, long after the mosquito problem had arisen, and were they prevented from spraying for mosquitoes? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry thinks that the Clean Environment Commission made an order preventing them?

MR. SHERMAN: No. I did not.

MR. GREEN: As a matter of fact, the Clean Environment Commission made an order saying that they could spray. They could pick a season, and spray. And then the Member for Fort Garry, or other members in this House have said, that there was pressure, the Mayor brought trucks down, and that caused the province to spray. Mr. Speaker, I mean, do honourable members really believe this or are they making fun of me? Because if they really believe it, then I have to tell them that the spraying for mosquitoes in the City of Winnipeg by the province had nothing to do with the City of Winnipeg, had nothing to do with pressure from the Mayor, the orders to spray went out before the Mayor and his trucks came down here. It was because, Mr. Speaker, it had nothing to do with mosquitoes or with the mosquito nuisance. As a matter of fact by that time, as somebody in the House had said, I think it was about August 15th, there really was an end to the mosquito nuisance and the City of Winnipeg said, we're going to wait for next year until they are a nuisance before we spray.

What happened was, Mr. Speaker, that the Health Department said that the presence of a certain type of mosquito caused a health danger, and that the spraying had to take - not in the City of Winnipeg, but in the city and various other places in the province, and Mr. Speaker, for that kind of an emergency, I tell you that this bill changes nothing. It was not the City of Winnipeg, not the Clean Environment Commission that dealt with that question, the Province was told by the Health Department that there was a presence of a certain type of mosquito, not a mosquito nuisance, which did not exist in July, and which they never called an emergency in July, and that given that particular problem, that it was best to use every available method regardless of its proven effectiveness, and helicopter spraying, aerial spraying, other types of spraying, were engaged in throughout the province, not just in the City of Winnipeg.

So if the honourable member believed that that came as a result of pressure from the City of Winnipeg, or that that was really effective in reducing the mosquitoes, then I want him to know, Mr. Speaker, that the biggest joke of all was that after this spraying program, which we had no choice but to undertake because when the Department of Health tells you that there is a danger of an epidemic, that you are to take every possible means, it is very difficult to avoid engaging in every type of means available, that a week after that spraying program, we had peculiar weather and the worst mosquito infestation that we've ever had at the end of August of any summer. Well, that may be an exaggeration, I can't remember every summer, but certainly the mosquito infestation at the end of August after the spraying was just as heavy as the mosquito infestation that we had at the beginning of July. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't that the mosquitoes were destroyed by the spraying but that every possible measure with regard to a particular mosquito was followed.

BILL 18

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

So, Mr. Speaker, we have this confusion, and if the honourable members, the Member for Lakeside, the Member for - I think even the Member for St. James, certainly the Member for Fort Rouge, they say, Mr. Speaker, that this was some type of political cowardice, this was a cop-out, you know, he can at least, if he does not wish to credit me with having the courage of my position, then at least he should credit me with a certain amount of foresight. When we presented the bill, we knew that the Member for Fort Rouge would say, cowardice; I didn't know what the Member for Lakeside would say, but I knew it would be fair, and at least if he is saying that we were not willing to take the heat, let him at least know that we were willing to take that type of heat. Mr. Speaker, I admit that that is not very hot, you know, the statement from the Member for Lakeside, and the Member for Fort Rouge, that I'm a political coward. Now, I admit that that is not a great deal of heat, but at least we were willing to take that type of heat, Mr. Speaker, because what we are doing is correct; what we are doing was what the original intention was.

Mr. Speaker, the original bill that the member refers to was brought in by Buck Witney. It did not have an appeal to the Minister, because I assume Buck Witney did not want the heat. But three years later, Mr. Speaker, the original appeal was for the Municipal Board. The Clean Environment Commission was directly under the Minister of Health, and the appeal was to the Municipal Board, and that appeal was binding. We brought in an amendment in 1973, and we said, we cannot get off the hook by doing what Buck Witney did, and to stay out of the kitchen by sending it to the Municipal Board, because the Municipal Board is not ultimately responsible for the people of the Province of Manitoba.

So what we said was the following: That we are willing to go to the Clean Environment Commission, we are willing that all of the evidence be heard; we are willing that there be examination and cross examination; we are willing to have the Clean Environment Commission make an order, and that it will be appealable, not to the Municipal Board but to the Minister. And it is the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council that now decides the appeals from the Clean Environment Commission. That was never the case under Buck Witney. It was never the case. So the honourable member is saying, that Buck Witney brought in this great courageous legislation which copped the thing out - and I suppose he was a member of the government at that time - to the Municipal Board where they could then say, we never did it, it was done by the Municipal Board. We brought it back in, and now the honourable member and the Member for Fort Rouge seems to have so much confidence in me.--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, so much confidence, that they say that it should still be decided by the Minister of Environmental Management rather than by the Council of the City of Winnipeg.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something in that. There is something in that that I propose to deal with that because that really is one of the problems with this legislation. We have set up a system for the Clean Environment Commission to be able to act as a semi-quasi judicial board, and that that was a judicial board that would be available to a municipality, and it still is available to the municipality under this amendment, to go and have the thing heard out in a judicial sort of way so that they could then answer the citizens of Winnipeg that we've had this out, and the Clean Environment Commission has made this order, and we respect it, and we are going to follow it. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the only way in which a commission of this kind can operate if it affects public representatives. Not if it affects private companies, but if it affects public representatives, then the process has to have the support of those public representatives. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, have a Clean Environment Commission, which is respected and whose orders are respected, if the elected representatives of the Municipal Council go to the press and made public statements that they're a bunch of idiots, they're a bunch of communists, and that they don't know anything, they're a bunch of academics, or what have you, and the elected representatives of the City of Thompson, say, let's ignore them, let's make whatever order we want to, let's do what we want and let them sue us. If a commission, a quasi judicial commission, their orders are to be respected, then the

BILL 18

(MR. GREEN cont'd) lawmakers have to respect them, Mr. Speaker, and the lawmakers, and I was willing, Mr. Speaker, quite willing to say, and I did through the years 1974 and the beginnings of 1975, I was quite willing to say to the public of Manitoba, "Look your city councillors they have some political problems, they can't accept responsibility for mosquitoes, we've got broad shoulders, we will accept it. The Clean Environment Commission will make an order, and we will deal with that order. We will not upset, and have not upset, the environmental orders of the Commission." The City of Winnipeg were not satisfied to have the blame lifted from their shoulders in that respect, they not only wanted the blame lifted from their shoulders, but they wanted to express vituperations, condemnations, hateful remarks, bringing into disrepute the public appointed Clean Environment Commission to the extent, Mr. Speaker, where all of the newspapers, both dailies, the Winnipeg Free Press and the Winnipeg Tribune, called this some kind of tyranny by a minority, even though they have never prevented spraying, and called into disrepute the orders of the Clean Environment Commission.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, that the City of Winnipeg or the other municipalities, if they wanted this type of facility and they wanted to respect it, it was a very useful thing; the province still has it and the province still respects it, and if we disagree, then we accept responsibility for the changing of the order and would have done so. I submit, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Member for Fort Rouge and for the Member for Lakeside, that this shows a greater courage in dealing with the question than was shown by the previous administration. If they want to try to make something of it, they can do so - you know, with the Member for Fort Rouge as distinct from the Member for Lakeside, he has it both ways. If we listen to the pressures that are presented, if we listen to the pressures that are brought upon us by whatever group, then he . . . that we are cop-outs and that we are not courageous. If we don't listen to the pressures, then he says that we are not responding to these people who are giving good suggestions to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, following the precedent of the Minister who is very careful about what is said, there is nowhere in my remarks made on this bill that I either said that the Minister was a coward or a cop-out, and I think that unless he can find direct reference to that, he should withdraw those remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I remember very clearly that the word coward was not used. All of the incidence of cowardice were used, and I have taken those incidence and put them into the words which they expressed, and I do not withdraw that at all. But if he will look at his remarks, that's what he will find.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: On a point of privilege, Sir, I just want to indicate to the Honourable Minister that I used all of those remarks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that those remarks were used by the two honourable members, you know, neither of which I would want to respond to in the same way, but the political courage of whom, both of whom, I would be willing to stand my own record with as against theirs, before any impartial tribunal of my choosing.

Mr. Speaker, you know, the members have got a good thing; I don't want to remove it from them. They have a Minister who is presenting a bill, which they can attempt to show is an Act of responding to pressure. That is one of the things that they have got. They have used it. I don't think they have used it with any great effect, and I am merely responding to them by indicating that that is not the reason. You know, you can't have it both ways. You can't both say it, and then not accept the return argument and the fact is that that is the way the Member for Fort Rouge argues. If we don't respond, then he says we are not listening to the minority, or we are not paying any attention, we have no patience for the minority; and if we do respond, he says that we are acting under political pressures. You know, when he took those minority remarks, Mr. Speaker, you know - and this is a bit of a diversion - I hope he would have seen

BILL 18

(MR. GREEN cont'd) Ibsen's play on television last night "An Enemy of the People" in which the problem of the minority was expressed, and which play, Mr. Speaker, I happen to regard as one of the profoundest pieces of literature that I have ever read, and I was pleased to see it performed on several occasions, and whose views with regard to minority rights, and the attempt by the minority to be able to try to influence, and to indeed become the majority, I have always respected. Not only have I respected them philosophically, Mr. Speaker, but I believe I have acted that way, and can give the occasions, chapter and verse when I have acted that way. But let's remember what Ibsen said, and I'm glad he was so specific as he was. He said, "The liberal majority is never right. Never right." And I'm glad he used the word "liberal majority is never right," because the liberal majority becomes the consensus; it becomes a movement of different rights; it becomes what everybody is prepared to accept, not what is right.

But he never said, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the liberal majority never being right. A view with which I'm fully in accord. He never suggested that the minority should then govern. He never suggested that the minority should govern, and that's all I have said. I said that the minority should be protected, that the minority should be facilitated, that the minority should be listened to, that the minority should not be stepped on, but I do not agree that the minority should govern. I believe that the best system of government that we know of is that of a majority government. Now because the liberal majority is never right, doesn't mean that the liberal majority never governs. As a matter of fact they always govern. But they are then--(Interjection)--Mr. Speaker, I have said that they always govern whoever is in power, that we end up with some type of mutual consensus being arrived at, and whatever right positions there are, sort of mixed up in a general position.

And I agree with that, but that was the position that he took and that is the position that I take, vis-a-vis the minority groups. I think that they may be right, but they have to become accepted, they have to fight to be accepted and they have to get their views across. And, Mr. Speaker, then they become part, possibly, of the liberal majority, which as Ibsen said is never right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge dealt with this boundaries question, that there is never a way of determining the boundary. Well that's true, but how has that affected the orders that have been passed by the Clean Environment Commission over the past three years where they've permitted spraying in cemeteries, in golf courses within the City of Winnipeg. You can't spray just in a golf course or just in a cemetery. And there are infinite particles of the material that mix with other particles, but surely you cannot use that as an argument, surely that can't become the basis of legislation. All that is being said in this legislation is that if it can reasonably be ascertained that you are not affecting another municipality, you can proceed. And what we will do, Mr. Speaker, it's required that it be filed with the Department of Environmental Management, we will see to it that the spray works away from the streams, not towards the streams, and that has always been done. We will see that the spray is towards the boundaries and not against the boundaries and that is things that have been done with parks and cemeteries. But we can't base a piece of legislation on the fact that if there is smoke coming out of the chimney of my honourable member's house that this is going to affect the environment in Churchill, which it will. Just like I suppose if you throw a pebble into the sea it affects the other element of water despite--(Interjection)--Of course. But you have to then, Mr. Speaker, base your policy on something that is rationable and which is practical. And all that is being done here is that we are saying that if they are using an approved pesticide - and we still have a right to say that it is disapproved - that if they are using it in the manner in which it has been approved, if they are using it within their own boundaries, if they are the elected representatives of the people then we will permit that use.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, if any one of these factors was not present we would not be passing this legislation. I go further. If the Clean Environment Commission, Mr. Speaker, had in fact decided that methoxychlor should not be used, I doubt that I would be bringing in this legislation. But they have never made such a decision. As a matter of fact the Clean Environment Commission in this particular case appeared, and I say the word "appeared", to base its decision not on the harmful effects of methoxychlor but on whether or not it did any good with regard to mosquitoes. And with all respect to the Commission, Mr. Speaker, that was never one of its considerations. As to whether or not the elected representatives of Winnipeg were

BILL 18

(MR. GREEN cont'd) wasting their time with a spraying program had really nothing to do with the Clean Environment Commission. What they were concerned with was whether methoxychlor in the atmosphere under the terms and conditions it was being used constituted a contaminant which they should prevent. And none of their decisions ever registered that type of findings, in each case they found that it could be used.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, if a contaminant can be used, if it's not going to affect somebody else's boundary, if the people who are using it are responsible to the electorate, then I don't give a cottonpicking darn as to whether the Honourable Member for Lakeside wants to call it cowardice or not. It is sensible legislation, and he has nobody else to confirm, he need go no further to confirm my opinion than the Member for Sturgeon Creek, the Member for Fort Garry, although for different reasons. The member who he's sitting talking to now, the Member for St. James, if he doesn't believe me, if he says that this is really an act of cowardice - he wants to even use the word, he now even wants to use the word, because I have facilitated it for him - then at least as a coward, I have many friends. . .

A MEMBER: So did Judas.

MR. GREEN: So did Judas, Mr. Speaker, I thought that Judas acted alone, and that perhaps after he got some converts.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the reason that we are legislating - whether my honourable friend will believe it or not or even if he believes it, whether he will concede it or not - is because it makes good sense. The one feature of this legislation which everybody has ignored and which is just as important a feature is that the municipalities had impositions imposed on them by the Clean Environment Commission with regard to solid waste disposal. The Clean Environment Commission makes the regulation but they don't have to raise the taxes for paying for the system. It seems to me that if it's a public body and it doesn't affect somebody else, and people want to say that it is a nuisance and it looks terrible, and the people in the municipality are willing to have that themselves appear that way, and I am not sure that they will, then, Mr. Speaker, we should let the public body do that, because we will get more responsible government.

Mr. Speaker is signalling. I will be finished before 5:30, but I think that I am entitled to speak in any event.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I only indicated that Private Members' Hour starts in five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Oh, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the legislation that we are pursuing here may have arisen out of each of us learning something from the use of a statute which didn't in fact clearly set out what should be done, and that we have learnt something from the inadequacies of the previous statute. But whether my honourable friends want to call it cop-outs or cowardice or whatever they would have, it makes good sense, Mr. Speaker. And if something makes good sense, then I would hope that I have enough courage to present it to the legislature and ask for its enactment, even though I knew that the Honourable Member for Lakeside would call me a coward for doing it.

QUESTION put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 23. We have five minutes. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand. Bill No. 36, second reading. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would require probably 15 minutes to introduce this bill, if you want to just call it 4:30 for Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: Having agreed it's 4:30, we'll go into Private Members' Hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION NO. 8

MR. SPEAKER: The first item is Resolution No. 8. The Honourable Member for Wolseley has 10 minutes left. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I left off the other day in commenting on some of the remarks made by the Member for Point Douglas and used the opportunity for the break in time to research and found that the Member for Point Douglas has been beating this drum, as appeared last year on April 11, 1975 on which he discussed, besides the curfew having a legal driving age of 18, and he talked about the impossibility of using prison labour because it might raise heck with the trade unions. And he talked about young people because of movies and television, that he felt that crime today paid. And he spoke about the respect that the children seem to have lost for the thrust from the parents, churches and schools.

So picking up from that, I couldn't help but want to in my short period of time offer some solutions, because I felt that the motherhood nature of this particular motion - I'm referring to some of his comments in which he said that this resolution was our policy, namely members opposite were endorsing this. Then he went on to talk about identifying the fact that society was unconcerned about the children of today and that we were possibly without some effective prevention for this and he thought there should be a better understanding of one's cultural identity and heritage. I would hope that the member in his closing remarks would comment what he meant by those remarks.

I see also that he referred to many biblical quotations and said, "Lead us not into temptation," and I felt that at this particular time, to the Member from Point Douglas, that we really don't need his prayers, what we need is policemen, what we need is money. And I'm talking about the City of Winnipeg, we need something practical. I think as a member of the government, the controlling body, that something practical could be done by members opposite.

When you deal with a curfew by-law for municipalities, I assume he was talking about the City of Winnipeg because he spoke of certain sections. In his resolution he says, "certain areas, particular areas," so by that I felt that he possibly meant the City of Winnipeg.

Well the whole idea of Bill 36 was to have the City of Winnipeg one with the strength of many, and we assumed that because of the new City of Winnipeg Act that there was going to be, as the First Minister pointed out, large savings by having one great big city. But it seems today that the city is extremely pressed for funds, and I think that the main solution to his resolution would be that the province should give a per capita grant for protection only. In other words, give a grant for the protection of our citizens, and maybe if there was some funds available we wouldn't have a 39 percent increase in violent crime in the city.

I realize that crime doesn't seem to get votes to members opposite but it's the kind of needy type of per capita grant that is certainly needed. When one looks at the priorities, I would say that we really need in his particular area, Point Douglas, we need policemen on the beat. As long as you have a shortage of policemen you're going to have a cruiser car system, and I would say that you'd pretty well have to - and the unions are responsible, they want a two-man or two-person cruiser, and I would suggest that in low crime rate areas of the city that this particular union demand is unnecessary and is creating the policemen shorage that we have which was estimated the other day in the newspaper as 266 men.

I think if we look at the member's resolution, we're talking about the entire costs of this machinery and the priorities. If we are one with the strength of many, and that's what the Act says, we would need 13 child squads. Now I have to refer to my police comments - these were comments from the police - that said parents held responsible, and if the parents aren't going to be held responsible in any statute then the by-law loses it's meaning.

They also pointed out that between 12 p.m. and 2 a.m. is a very low percentage of delinquency. They also quoted the fact that if we expect young people to mature in a proper way, then we have to show them that we can trust them, and by that I'm talking about the police indicating that they're hoping the young people in our city get to trust their policemen and confide in them.

RESOLUTION 8

(MR. WILSON cont'd)

Finally, they felt that if we were to turn around and ask young people to respect the law then we shouldn't have special squads lurking around the city trying to pick up children. And I say, because these involve problems, because a lot of these children will have a note, and certainly any curfew by-law does indicate that if they have a note to stay out late for a church social or whatever, then they certainly are not picked up. And a lot of the times when the police pick up these young people - in the report that I have which I hope to be able to read - they find that the parents aren't home, and the result is that the police department become the largest baby sitting agency in the province.

To further go against the annual resolution from the Member for Point Douglas, the city councillors indicated to the media, and it was reported, that they indicated no support for the curfew. And again we go back to the point that the council had that the child squads would seem to lower the respect for the law enforcement. It was pointed out that five and six o'clock at night seem to be the greatest hour of delinquency in our city, so if we were going to have these child squads that's the time they should be operating around and breaking up the corner gangs and what have you. And I ask how could the police tell their age? Are we to train policemen in guessing at ages, and what if the young people outfoxed them and played games and got into the false ID situation.

I just wanted at this time, if I could refer to a letter of October 1st in which they got a report across Canada. It seemed that the solution to this whole thing was that if you were to look at the different cities, that Halifax Police Department they have a curfew by-law but it isn't enforced but when we got to Hamilton we found out the key to it all, they don't have a by-law but they use a section of the Child Welfare Act of the Province of Manitoba. So every time that I began to read material it pointed out that it was a provincial problem, something that you members opposite have to solve, you have to amend the Child Welfare Act. And that would be the situation that you should be looking at.

Their letter makes the comment that their department has on occasion used the second offence portion of the statute, namely the Child Welfare Act, to lay charges against the parents and the parents are convicted and fined. This seems to be the particular solution throughout this letter that seems to be the one that I would favour.

Medicine Hat has a by-law and they indicated that it hasn't been enforced for 15 some odd years. And Ottawa again, they don't have a curfew by-law, they enforce the Child Welfare Act. Peterborough has no curfew by-law; Quebec has a by-law they haven't enforced for 15 years; Regina does not have a curfew by-law; Toronto and Thunder Bay both enforce the Child Welfare Act; and the rest of the cities like Brandon does not have a curfew by-law, Calgary does not have a curfew by-law; the only one that seems to have one which would share the Member for Point Douglas's concern is Lethbridge, they ring a bell at the top of the fire hall, or a siren, and possibly he might want to, if he's unsuccessful in getting his resolution through, might have the local fire hall in his area install a siren and he could take the credit for having this warning buzzer to all the people in the area to get off the streets.

So with the little time that I have left I would like to speak about what I consider the solutions, and one I talked about was the amendments to the Child Welfare Act. I think besides members opposite convincing that crime prevention is one of the keys, and therefore the City of Winnipeg, if you're going to sit by and let the city councillors take all the flack for our streets not being safe, then you are really playing politics with crime prevention. I would suggest to you that you have a duty to have a per capita grant for police protection and underline it as such, so that if you're skeptical of the ability of the councillors in the City of Winnipeg to spend the money on police protection, spell out the grant as for protection only and that way there we'll get to the problem, we'll get part of the 266 men and maybe get the foot soldiers that the Member for Point Douglas is talking about. I think that we need increased convictions.

If we get the amendment to the Child Welfare Act we possibly even have to look at vouchers for food, vouchers for baby sitting services, and I know this doesn't sit too well with people that are against vouchers. But I think we need more agency involvement

RESOLUTION 8

(MR. WILSON cont'd) such as the Main Street Project; I think we need more outreach programs from the churches, and I would really think that any member who is accepting his responsibility and had a strong voice, and certainly if I was a member of the governing body I would see to it that my area got the proper protection, and if I had to I would go out and take photographs and have witnesses to the fact that there is a particular problem in my area, but I do think that the member cannot in all honesty say that if you're going to have Bill 36 which is going to say one, with the strength of many, and you're going to have the city councillors all demanding equal service across the city, then you've got to go at it from a provincial level. You've got to set the rules of the game from your level, you've got to give money to the city, and spell out what it's for.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is expired. The honourable member have leave. Proceed. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, when I first heard this resolution talked about I decided I'd say a few words. However, my interpretation of the resolution is quite different from the Member from Wolseley . . . been raised in a rural area, we had a curfew in our town, and I've known other towns to have them, but this is referring to the City of Winnipeg Act and I'm not so sure that it would apply there. But we used to have a curfew and we still do in the Town of Manitou, and you know it really works well, because with Daylight Saving Time your children go out after supper and they're playing and they actually have no way of knowing what time to come home because they aren't all carrying wrist watches, and when the siren blows they know that's the time they're to get home, if that's the time . . . usually they're told to come home then. And I think it helps quite a bit because I know as our family grew up in town it wasn't always a matter of thinking that you were keeping them out of problems or getting into, you know, involved with police or anything like that, it wasn't that but it just seemed to be a real good thing in the town because it was just something like saying, well there's the siren, it's 9:00 o'clock, that was the time you're supposed to go home so a lot of the children went home then. Then if there was children knocking around in the town and possibly getting into trouble, we had policing. A policeman could just say, "Listen young fellow, it's time you're on your way home it's after the curfew." And he had a reason to tell him maybe he was to go home, because it was after curfew. But it really wasn't a thing that we enforced, and it was something that really never - what shall we say, it never became a big issue. Well we still have the curfew, and we still find it's very nice. It's a siren, it goes at 12:00 noon. And it's a mighty good thing if a person's downtown even himself and supposed to be home for dinner and hears that siren, well he knows it's time for him to go too. So I look at a curfew in a slightly different way but I think it's something that any municipality or town should be able to pass on their own whenever they like if they felt it was a benefit to them.

So with those few remarks, I think that I'd be in favour of giving each individual municipality or town, or whatever it is, an opportunity to have such a by-law and to enforce it if they wanted to or to use it as they saw fit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

HON. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Minister responsible for Corrections and Rehabilitation) (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, while the motion is worded in the abstract, nevertheless I don't think it's proper to indicate that you're going to support something which you have no intention of looking at. Albeit, I agree with the Member for Pembina that, you know, curfews do have some advantages. My children have curfews, all five of them, and my whole family that I grew up with, we had curfews. But you may have noticed in the paper here recently where the Winnipeg School Board is taking six parents, I believe it is, to court relative to the Truancy Act. I guess being a fundamentalist in some ways, if laws or statutes change people then all we really need is an original . . . up here sort of thing. But it is a problem. I share the concerns of the Member for Wolseley in that regard.

One of the people on Portage Avenue last fall at 11:30 at night asked me to come down and have a cup of coffee. And there were oh, about 150 younger people between the Mall Hotel and Carleton Street. They really weren't doing anything wrong

RESOLUTION 8

(MR. BOYCE cont'd). . . . except walking around on the street. They were relatively young - while I'm no authority on age by the appearance of people, I would hazard a guess that they'd be between twelve and fifteen. But I share the businessmen's concern because with the number of younger people there they made it difficult for people to stop and use his establishment. This man has a rather large investment and it wasn't too good for his business that these children are running around it on Portage Avenue.

Nevertheless, if we keep looking to laws to solve human problems instead of looking at perhaps where the responsibility lies, I personally don't think we're going to do too much. The responsibility of parents to raise their children I think is forgotten by many. You've heard me mention this before, that I think that all governments can do, regardless of what the government is, or what stripe it is, is to muster the resources of the community to help either an individual or a family, or a group within the community, municipality, province, or anything else. Even a school system should in my view be nothing but an extension of the family. The absolute right of a parent to educate the child should I think be enshrined in law instead of taking more and more of the responsibility away from the family.

It is true of human systems as well as it is of chemical or physical systems, that all systems move to the expenditure of least energy. This is true of a family system. Somebody wants to take the responsibility for raising the children, oft-times people are only too anxious to give that responsibility over.

There was an interesting survey done in Winnipeg, oh it was either last year or the year before, to see where the children were in the evening. And the surprising part of this particular survey wasn't where the children were, it was where the parents were, because they found many of the children at home and many of the parents, the children didn't know where they were.

The City of Winnipeg under the Winnipeg Act of course is charged with the responsibility of law and order. I find interesting the comments of the Member for Wolseley that perhaps we should look towards the initiation of a grant formula to look at protection. But when we're dealing with young people I have heard all across the country, and it really cuts across all political lines that there still is the feeling that with younger people, and in this context I have a group of people 12, 15 years old because really this is where most of the mischievousness occurs, is that we should still try and deal with children in a developmental way rather than a punitive way, rather than in a police way.

I digress a moment, Mr. Speaker. One of the most interesting things or one of the best places we have in Manitoba in this regard in my judgment, is in Leaf Rapids and the reason perhaps is because it's a new community there starting to do things the way people used to do it of old. If a younger person gets in a little mischief the probation people take him home to the parents and they talk to the parents and of course the neighbours and friends of the parent try and help them.

When we were young in the City of Winnipeg - I can't remember this gentleman's name - but in the north end of Winnipeg we had a chap by the name of Pete the Cop, and the last time I saw him - I guess it was because of my relative small size - he looked like he was about nine feet tall. He used to catch younger people in some kind of mischief and he'd take him home to the parents and he'd say, you know, I caught this young fellow of yours misbehaving and it's your responsibility to see that he doesn't misbehave. But as has been pointed out by several members, we get more and more complex.

The police if they can't find a parent at home they have this child and if they don't do something with that child to protect themselves, they may become liable. And of course with the idea of people having greater access to legal counsel, they broaden the need for such people as policemen to protect themselves. So where it used to be that a policeman could apprehend a child doing something rather mischievous and could take that child home, the matter could be dealt with in that way, even to the point of turning the child over to an older brother or sister. But once a policeman intervenes, he's almost placed in the position where he has to take him over to the Youth Centre for his own protection because of the possibility of him being involved legally is becoming more and more a concern.

This is rather abstruse, Mr. Speaker, but there's an article in the paper today

RESOLUTION 8

(MR. BOYCE cont'd)about the effect of malpractice, or the necessity rather of malpractice insurance because of the Watergate type of thing. Now what relationship has that got between what we're talking about and the point I was trying to make earlier.

Now the legal profession in providing their services to the community build up a custom, they built up one custom in suing for doctors. I see in California now they're suing each other for malpractice, and this type of milieu is creeping into our society, so that it tends in one way to complicate it. We have Legal Aid lawyers putting forth the view, which I personally hope is not generally accepted by governments, that we should put in place adversary system in the juvenile system. But yet this is a slice of the same loaf of bread where people are forced professionally to protect themselves, so a policeman if he apprehends a child and the child is in mischief, there's nobody home that he can give this child over to, then they end up at the Youth Centre.

The necessity of moving the police closer to the community, Mr. Speaker, is one that is shared by many people in the community. I'm certainly glad that the City of Winnipeg has resolved the question of who is to be Chief for the next few years, and I certainly don't want to get into that controversy, but nevertheless it did slow down a couple of projects which the City of Winnipeg officials and their elected people on the various committees and my department have been working on. I'll be going into some of these things when we get around to reviewing my Estimates.

But, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to mention that if I thought that this would solve the problem of children that I would possibly support it, but I don't think it will. So that perhaps for those people who wish to make a contribution I'll leave them a few minutes to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to say a few words on this resolution. I believe the Honourable Member for Wolseley said that the Member for Point Douglas mentioned that the caucus was supporting his resolution? I haven't read through the debate, I wasn't in the House when this occurred, but I must make very clear one fact, and that is that the Honourable Member for Point Douglas does not have caucus support for his resolution. He is proposing his resolution to the House and the members of the House will decide individually whether they support the resolution or not. Now Mr. Speaker, I for one will not support his resolution, and I am not supporting it for some of the reasons that have already been mentioned. The honourable member partly justifies his resolution on grounds that the municipalities outside of Winnipeg already have power under the Municipal Act to impose curfews. Well if I were given the choice, I would remove that provision of the Municipal Act so that there would be uniform treatment of all municipalities throughout the province.

Now one of the principal reasons why I don't favour the curfew is that I think that the legislation in this area is already adequate. If one looks at The Child Welfare Act, contrary to what the Honourable Member for Wolseley was saying, I think there is plenty of power under this Act to deal with the problem of neglected children. And if one reads the sections of the Child Welfare Act, Section 17(1), pardon me, "Section 16. Child in need of protective guardianship. 17(1) Entry without warrant in certain cases. 17(2) Apprehension of child." I think that the authorities, the legal authorities who have the authority to deal with children in neglected situations have plenty of power. And I'll read the Section 17(2). "An officer of a child caring agency or of a Family Court or a Peace Officer who on reasonable and probable grounds believes that a child is in need of protective guardianship may apprehend the child without a warrant and take the child to a place of safety." Mr. Speaker, the law of course always must be enforced by law officers in this case who must make judgments on the spot as to whether the law is being broken. Now that will happen regardless of what law is on the books, but I think that this gives plenty of power to a policeman who encounters a child or several children whom he believes are being neglected. I think that contrary to what the Member for Wolseley says there is plenty of power now in the Child Welfare Act. There is no need for amendments.

RESOLUTION 8

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I did not introduce the resolution. The Member for Point Douglas believes that there is need for a curfew in Winnipeg. He has requests from, I gather a number of his constituents for such a measure, and therefore he is acting in what he believes is the best interests of his constituents. Now I don't happen to agree with him. I'm simply voicing my disagreement.

I agree with the Honourable Minister for Corrections, I believe that the responsibility for disciplining and for bringing up children must rest primarily with the parents, and I think that the curfew tends to impinge upon to some extent that responsibility. And one of the reasons I oppose it is because of that. I believe that when my daughter grows up to the age when she will want to go out at night I will impose a curfew. I don't happen to be a follower of Doctor Spock, I don't believe in permissive principles of child-rearing, I will impose a curfew, and if my daughter violates that curfew she will suffer the consequences. I want the principle responsibility, the weapon of enforcement, I want the principle responsibility placed upon the parents.

The honourable member also made some rather obscure reference, the Honourable Member for Wolseley made some obscure reference to our playing politics with this whole question of, I guess the inadequate financing of police protection in this city, and I find that rather strange. He wants us to tie grants to the city to protective purposes alone. Now to my view that would be impinging to some extent upon the City of Winnipeg's responsibility which it has at present to provide police protection. I think that the policy we have followed is a much more rational one. We have offered, rather than grants tied to specific purposes, we have offered the city the option of levying taxes which they can use for any purpose. They would have complete freedom to determine precisely for what purpose that tax money would be spent. But they must first levy the taxes in order to get that money and that is of course responsible government.

If the City of Winnipeg is short of policemen, now they have judged obviously that they are not, the police force may feel differently, but the city council has judged otherwise obviously. If the city council feels that they are short of policemen, it is their responsibility to provide the policing and it is their responsibility to levy the taxes necessary to provide those policemen. And I will look forward, if they so judge this as a primary need, for their action in this field.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I really only rise to offer a solution to the black and the white of the resolution before us, the right or the left of it, the east or the west of it, or the long and the short of it. And it seems to me there is some worthwhile reasons that have been expressed by individual members for some kind of a curfew. I must agree with the last speaker, I don't believe that we can legislate or should be legislating and using thereby with this kind of legislation needed resources - referring specifically to our peace officers, our police resources - and I suppose pursuing it all the way down the line, getting our courts involved in penalizing parents who are responsible for the children who have broken a curfew law that may or may not or should or should not be enacted in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you in all seriousness that there is something to be said for a guideline. There's something to be said to have it generally known, and to have it formalized to some extent as being a suggestion to our parents and to our children that at a prescribed time, an agreeable time of whatever hour, that the younger set be off the streets. I think, Mr. Speaker, that in many instances this would be appreciated by parents who for one reason or other in this permissive society of ours don't crack the whip the same way that my parents cracked the whip over myself when I was asked to be in at a certain and a prescribed time - and perhaps not enough. So, Mr. Chairman, let's also at least acknowledge this much, that in this day and age it is more difficult I believe, in lieu of the kind of society that we have, for parents to do that. The Honourable Minister responsible for Autopac shakes his head, and I have to agree with him that it is certainly not impossible, that many families have no difficulty in this respect where there is a firm understanding, a good relationship with their parents and children, these kind of laws are meaningless.

RESOLUTION 8

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

But, Mr. Speaker, just as parents used to object every time we went into the period of daylight saving time for instance, that it always presented a bit of a hassle to get their children to maintain their usual normal bedtime hour because we all of a sudden by law tinkered with the place that the sun is in at a given time, and the children would argue with their parents, but Mom it's still daylight out and why should I be called to bed at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly suggest and recommend to the mover of the resolution to consider the advisability of a compromise, of a guidelines that municipalities or the city may wish to use that may well be of help to some parents, who then have some moral reinforcement on their side for attempting to exercise a little greater control with respect to their younger children's hours out on the streets or out of the home.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion has been made, and some of the rural municipalities do it, I believe the Honourable Member from Pembina indicated they have a siren going at 10 o'clock, and it just simply acts as a signal. There are not hoards of local RCMP that converge into Pembina to scour through that vast metropolitan area in search for some child that is breaking the curfew. So, Mr. Speaker, all that is is that it's just a little easy for Aunt Jane or Mom or Dad who has already halfway out the door saying, "Junior it's time to come in, you know the siren sounded five minutes ago." And it does help, Mr. Speaker. You'll find parents use that as a norm, children are out playing ball or they're out just hanging around the street corners and the parents will say, "That's fine, but you're in when the siren sounds."

And again, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that court action commences immediately if somebody is in 15 minutes later - or for some good cause, having attended a concert or a program; or having attended a local meeting of the New Democratic Party's association in company with their parents, and having listened to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources at great length, and the child, that 12 year old, finds himself stumbling home in the dark streets of Pembina at 12:30 that night.

MR. CRAIK: Still in the dark.

MR. ENNS: Still in the dark, as my honourable leader suggests. But I'm not suggesting, and that's why I have to go along with the general sentiment that's expressed, that I really can't buy that kind of an iron fisted iron clad curfew. But the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, as an aid, as an aid, as a guideline to those parents who would find it helpful, to this extent I concur with the honourable the mover of this resolution; that many parents would find it helpful, and it would cost nothing to simply have a resolution passed or a determination of one kind or another expressed by responsible people in the community, whether it's city council or whether it's this Chamber that makes it possible for the city council to so express themselves, to ask the fire chief to lean on the siren for five minutes at 10 o'clock every evening.--(Interjection)--There's endless numbers of people that have sirens, I'm sure there's still sirens around building tops somewhere that are going to warn us of imminent nuclear attacks - and those sirens are intact - or it can be the ringing of a bell in certain areas.

But, Mr. Speaker, the technique is used in different rural communities, small towns and villages, it's used with some effectiveness. I don't think that it is used in a heavy-handed way that ties up law enforcement officers chasing children down the streets of rural Manitoba villages and communities, but if it's found to be worthwhile in those circumstances, I can't really see why we should treat our urban cousins that much differently. I think if there is a suggestion, as there would appear to be, and I would be ill advised not to listen to the Member for Point Douglas's views in this instance, he lives in the area that he has a great deal of concern about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question?

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. GREEN: Would he agree that we should just let the municipality decide whether the sirens should be rung or not.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this is a question of social concern as compared to

RESOLUTION 8

(MR. ENNS cont'd)the environmental concern, and while I'm standing on my feet I'm trying to find out an answer to the Honourable the Minister's interjection. I should have known by now that I should not yield to questions by the Honourable the House Leader on too many occasions, they generally are of an entrapment nature.

Mr. Chairman, in this particular instance I don't have to face that question because the resolution reads specifically that this is the responsibility of the local government, of the municipal government. The resolution merely indicates that action should be considered by this body to allow those responsible locally elected municipal councillors to respond--(Interjection)--To spray children? No, no, not to spray children. To respond to those requests that the mover of this resolution, the Member for Point Douglas, has brought to our attention, if that is a concern.

I rise only, Mr. Speaker, suggesting that there is a halfway measure that could be considered, could be considered by the City Fathers if they chose to. Not to think only in terms of harsh repressive kind of curfew, but a curfew that could be used by parents and children alike as a guideline as to when their activities on the streets should cease and when they should seek the comfort of their shelter, the warmth embrace and loving arms of their parents and sit by the fireside bright to listen to the words of wisdom from those who have, after all, that prime responsibility in guiding them through the difficult facades of their life.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't agree with the honourable last member who spoke, because mostly I never agree with him much anyway. I'm against curfews, I'm against curfews because I was brought up under curfew.

A MEMBER: Look what happened to you.

MR. BARROW: At 9 o'clock the whistle would go and we'd take a special delight in not going home. A lot of us wanted to go, but no way, we were breaking the law, we'd stay out. We made life miserable for the policeman. He couldn't catch us anyway. The curfew, if you're going to follow it through - we worked under the whistle system in the army, we'd be standing at ease, you'd come to attention, slope your rifle and make a left turn, march, stop, present, order your arms and stand on one whistle. Now if they had of followed that through all the corporals, the lance corporals, the sergeants would have been out of jobs if you're going to go that way.

And a good example is the navy, they work on bells, eight bells, everything's done on the bell. And my colleague here from Churchill spent 25 years under those bells, so when this bell - Mr. Speaker, when this bell rings in this House, he doesn't come in the House, he starts mopping the floor in the caucus room.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I will give you a solution to the problem of my Honourable friend from Point Douglas. Here's what happened in Calgary. A young policeman had an idea. He had a beat with rough kids, and what he did when he got in the car - finally he worked his way from the beat into a car - and he made friends with the kids. It wasn't easy with these kids at first, but on a rainy day he'd pack 12 or 13 kids in that car and take them home, he got to know the kids. And then he started little programs with them, they played ball, they played this, they played that, and he got five more interested in this type of thing on different beats. The letters started coming in from the parents about the policemen, they got to respect the police through recreation and a relationship with the policeman that couldn't be beat. I don't think any policeman who has the rough, "you go home or else," will ever make it, but give them a policeman that they like and respect. I'm going to say to the Honourable Minister of Recreation, this is not the problem of the backbenchers or the member who brought this up, recreation is the answer to these things. And it's all right for the Member over there from Pembina to say, "The kids in Pembina go home at 9 o'clock," because those farm kids get up at what 4 o'clock in the morning, they're ready to go home at 9 o'clock. You know this kind of thing.

But, Mr. Speaker, seriously the answer is not in the curfew or the police or anyone to look after the kids, you've got to have someone that will relate to those kids, and if I don't win in the next election I'm going to apply for that type of job. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

RESOLUTION 8

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. TOUPIN: Can I ask the Honourable Member for Flin Flon a question? You made mention of the police officer in Calgary, was that your son?

MR. BARROW: I'm glad you brought that up, my friend, because that was my son, and through this type of thing he was the youngest sergeant in Calgary and six months later he was Sergeant of Detectives, and there was no influence from the Manitoba Government. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to respond in part to the compromise solution put forward by the Member of Lakeside, and before this legislature goes on record of affixing on the Golden Boy a siren that will then blast its way out at 10 o'clock in the morning and driving everyone in the City of Winnipeg into a catatonic state, I think we should perhaps pull back a little bit and ask ourselves the real question which I think the Member for Point Douglas was addressing himself to, and that is, "How do you deal with the problem of juvenile delinquency in the City of Winnipeg?" And I think it is somewhat ironic perhaps even revealing the fact that the only solution that seems to have been offered by the NDP party in this session so far is a curfew; that that perhaps is a more telling tale about the approach of the government, that the only real new solution other than the Autopac garage solution that's come forward is one that suggests a curfew. I think that that, Mr. Speaker, is by far the message that comes out of this particular resolution and debate.

The Member for Point Douglas points to a number of serious concerns like people who live in the City of Winnipeg about the problems that are faced with young people. I think his solution is wrong, I don't think it addresses itself to those problems. But the fact is it seems to be the only solution that has come forward that addresses itself in any way therein, that is the point that members of this House should be concerned about and that we now have proposed an amendment to the absolute curfew requiring police officers, the idea that we should now buy a siren and affix it to the top of City Hall or the Golden Boy or wherever else. And that therefore we act as a warning signal, which I think probably would have more the effect of rather than being a deterrent would probably, going by the Member of Wolseley's remarks that at 10 o'clock it was starting time, when the real action starts, that would just be a very handy and convenient way of saying, okay guys the coast is clear, let's really go now, it's 10 o'clock. I think that's really probably about the only effect it would have.

The seriousness of the problem, Mr. Speaker, goes into some of the real depths of what's taking place in this province which are not being addressed really by any level of government in any way, shape or form. I think we can point to the symptoms that we see with it, the very heavy incidence of alcoholism in the core area, a very very high problem which is not really being addressed in any effective way. The serious problem of schools, the large number of truancies and delinquencies that are going on in the schools, the transients' rate which is not being addressed in any serious way. The difficulty of employment - I think the employment rate for young men and women in that area is now around 18 or 19 percent for unskilled people in that area - that's not really being addressed in any serious way by any levels of government. Those are the problems that give rise to what's happening in the core area.

The problem that the Member from Flin Flon pointed to, recreation is a real problem. We've brought it up before; I think the studies that I've seen done this summer indicate that the basic minimum that recreation groups say should be available for people is about eight acres per 1000 people, the average on the core area is less than one, and many of the community organizations in that area, the business organizations, the community neighborhood groups have all said that there's almost virtually no place for kids to play or go or be seen, or to run it. And yet we can, Mr. Speaker, use the excuse of jurisdictional conflict as a way of saying, then therefore we can't do anything about it. And you know, that has become almost the Canadian syndrome if there's a real serious problem, they can always find a good jurisdictional dispute to make sure that no one is really going to try and solve it and that we can therefore

RESOLUTION 8

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)spend our time passing the buck between city and province, Federal Government and back and forth. Which is really what's happening in this area as well.

The problem that's taking place in the core area is that you've got about 25, 30,000 native people who come in with very different cultural outlooks and very limited education and very limited job prospects. That's where a lot of the problem is in north Point Douglas, parts of my riding and parts of Winnipeg Centre, that's a real source of the problem. Another part of the problem is the large number of immigrant children who have difficulties in the schools, some of the problem is just sheer poverty itself. And you know, Mr. Speaker, for all the money we put in there in welfare and social services, it's not doing anything to solve the problem of poverty. All we're simply doing is creating more dependency and that has been the rock impact of almost all the public investment that has gone in the core area, whether it be Autopac buildings or whether it's the public housing or whether it's social service organizations. The end result has created a sense of dependency, not a sense of self sufficiency, not a sense of being able to respond or deal with one's own problems, to create a whole network from the public and private organizations so the people in that area become dependent upon the rest of us; dependent upon for money, dependent upon treatment, dependent upon their housing but never being able to acquire the ability or capacity or in many cases the feeling that they can do things on their own, in their own respect. If you spent any time as I did this summer, Mr. Speaker, for about two months on the streets of the core area, working with the Police Department, and you talk to the young native youth that reside in that area and their parents, the problem is simply one that they see no hope, there's nothing but a dismal gloomy prospect in front of them, which is not going to be solved by a siren on City Hall or a curfew with more police supplying it, has nothing to say about the kind of feelings that they have.

I would simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak to the debate because I thought that the argument almost spoke for itself that it was simply a peripheral . . .but I did want to address myself in part to the remarks made by the Member for St. Matthews who again suggested that if it was a police problem then the City of Winnipeg should look after it in their own respects. They should raise the money to provide for the police services. Well again I would say based upon some of the work that I was involved in this summer, that that again is a handy rationalization and excuse. It is not a way of adjusting oneself to the problems in the area. Because there are certain specialized kinds of police strategies and organizations that are required in the core area.

The neighborhood team policing concept is one that has been applied in other cities and has had some proven success by putting police officers in a community for a long term period of time, integrating them with the social organizers and workers in the area, relating them to the schools in the area, forming an ability to get to know the community. They provide an informal way of policing in that area.

Mr. Speaker, it takes money to do that. It takes money above and beyond what the City of Winnipeg is apparently willing or able to provide. One of the ways and means by which several American cities have been able to introduce the team policing concept is because their Federal Government in effect passed what they call The Law Enforcement Agency Act in 1972 which did provide special grants to municipalities which has been added to by state governments down there. Now I am very critical of senior level government, not just Provincial Government here, but also the Federal Government. I don't think they're doing enough. I know that they're playing the law and order game on the wrong side of the ledger. They're trying to say that we can combat crime by getting you know tough rather than finding more effective ways of law enforcement. I think to find new ways of law enforcement you have to be prepared to pay for it. Frankly it's the senior levels of government which have more of a taxing power to pay for those kinds of services than does the municipality.--(Interjection)--Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable member since

RESOLUTION 8

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd)he sees a more definite role by other levels of government, meaning the Provincial and Federal Government, as an example pertaining to recreational grants, would he make such Provincial or Federal grants conditional?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to answer that question. I think that if and how senior levels of governments identify particular problems which they feel they have the responsibility to help, then I think they can make conditional grants and they can do this in a variety of areas: in recreation and in education, social services. I would point to an example. I received some interesting material, I guess this morning, from the City of Montreal on the educational program where the Province of Quebec does provide special educational impact grants for dealing with educational problems in the downtown Montreal area. It's just a new program, it's only been going I believe a year or two. But it is having the impact of saying, yes, there is special things happening in downtown Montreal which in a sense are provincial wide responsibilities. Because those who are settling there are in effect rural sort of migrants coming from the rest of the province and settling in the area. Therefore we must bear the responsibility.

I would suggest that in many cases the same is true in the recreation field, that the kind of problems - if I may just to elaborate upon the Minister's question - that the kind of recreation requirements that you find in that area, Mr. Speaker, are very interesting ones because they don't follow in many cases the conventional recreational pattern. The City of Winnipeg gives most of its grants to the community clubs where you have organized sports, hockey and so on. I think what you begin to find in the core areas is that there are different kinds of needs. Many of them are young adult needs. They're beyond the age where they're going to get involved in the kind of normal peewee hockey kind of thing, that they need almost individualized sports, racquet sports, things like that. Places to go. Places to meet people.

One of the great, great vacuums in downtown Winnipeg other than many of the pubs that are supplied, is a place where male can meet female in a relatively compatible surrounding, a pleasant surrounding rather than being forced into those kind of . . . Really, the strip along Main Street where you've got something, what are there, 133 liquor establishments all concentrated in one area, really, Mr. Speaker, it comes close to being an alcoholic cesspool. It's one of the most sort of turgid and depressing sights to sort of see hotel after hotel, in many cases flaunting the liquor laws deliberately and flaunting them consistently and frequently and seeing the kinds of problems that were pointed out, which I saw again with great sadness.

The number of small children hanging outside the door. While there is authority in The Child Welfare Act, I don't think the authority is being implemented because I certainly saw enough children on Main Street at one o'clock in the morning and wondering where the Children's Aid Society was or where the welfare workers were and the police themselves are not going to handle the kids. They simply say, we're not going to get in the social welfare racket.

And so that's the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the things that are happening in that area, I don't pretend are easy of solution. I don't say that you can go in with a great number of panaceas. I have suggested in the past in resolutions we brought in this House last year, that one of the areas where we are not applying solutions is in the area of economic development for the core area, providing the economic wherewithal for people to acquire income, jobs and employment, in many cases working out of occupations and businesses and enterprises that they themselves control as opposed to being dependent upon other people. I think that that would be a strategy which is not being applied at all in this city, that the core area of Winnipeg is becoming an economic wasteland. There is almost virtually no economic activity going in there other than what is publicly pump-primed, someone is putting money in but that again gets into your kind of problem of dependencies again. So we don't have an economic development strategy for the core area. The City of Winnipeg doesn't have one; the province doesn't have one; neither does the Federal Government.

Even the NIP program which is probably the closest we've come to an integrated renewal program, still basically deals in physical reconstruction. It does not integrate

RESOLUTION 8

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd)social and economic reconstruction with it and yet that is, you know, you rebuild people, you don't necessarily rebuild buildings and we don't really have an effective strategy for doing that in our core area.

So I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that I just wanted to rise on the premise that this House would not have been living up to its full responsibilities if we had somehow found ourselves in a state of absent-mindedness, accepting the siren or curfew in this area or listening to the siren's call as a way of solving problems in the core area. I know that the Member from Lakeside was trying to be helpful and perhaps even tricking us a bit but I think that in fact we should at least consider the kinds of things that could be done to go far beyond that. While I sympathize - I do, I sympathize greatly with the kinds of problems and pressures that the Member for Point Douglas will . . .having spent the time in the area, knowing the concerns of the parents in that area. I would simply suggest that I don't think that the application of a curfew answer is the way in which we should be approaching the problem because there is a lot of difficulties to it from the implementation, from the police point, and I think the Member from Wolseley properly pointed that out, it would provide tremendous burdens.

Let me simply point out that the problem in the core area is not a police problem. The police have to deal with the fact that the rest of us are not solving the problems. They have to deal with the consequences of our own ability to develop solutions and develop answers. The police are bearing the brunt in effect of our lack of responsibility and our lack of application. But the answer is not a police one. The answer goes really down to a depth of how ultimately do you dig into that hard core group of people who are so poor and have no hope and no opportunity to do for themselves that they simply then become sort of wards upon the rest of us. We then provide sort of gratuitous results about people on welfare and all the rest of it, when in fact we are doing some very horrible things to people in that area. They are really becoming the victims of our own lack of concern and our own lack of credibility in providing effective solutions.

So, Mr. Speaker, my position is that I would have to vote against the resolution of the Member from Point Douglas, not because I disagree in spirit or in purpose, I just disagree in method. I would only hope that the Member from Point Douglas would take his concern to his caucus and find out if he, along the way, could provide this government with the will and the motivation to provide a much more effective answer to the kinds of problems that he faces in the constituency and which in part I face in mine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, at the outset of this debate I was wondering if we would be able to carry it through. However, your generosity in allowing a pretty wide-ranging debate on this particular subject has enabled members to branch out in all directions and in the light of that realization I wonder, Sir, if I may call it 5:30 and continue my remarks on another occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Is there any advantage, Mr. Speaker, to moving into committee now, for yourself?

MR. SPEAKER: No problem. There's only one bill left on the Order Paper, that's the Attorney-General's, unless you want to go on that.

MR. GREEN: No, I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair for the Department of Labour and the Honourable Member for St. Vital in the Chair for the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

(House adjourned for supper hour.)