



Second Session — Thirty-First Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

26 Elizabeth II

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Harry E. Graham  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXVI No. 100**

**2:30 p.m. Thursday, July 20, 1978**

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, July 20, 1978

**Time: 2:30 p.m.**

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions.

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

**MR. CLERK:** Your Committee met on Wednesday, July 19, 1978 and heard representation on the Bills referred, as follows:

Bill No. 62 — An Act to Amend The Rent Stabilization Act.

Lily Caplan, Manitoba Landlords Association

Paul Graham, Coalition for Rent Control

Brian Hastings, President, HUDAM

Brian Wilford, Apartment Tenants Association

Sidney Silverman, Private Citizen

Dr. L.A. Pauls, Private Citizen

Jim Burgess, Associated Tenants Action Committee

Grant Wichenko

Vic Savino, Law Union

Joey Cyr, UMSU

Bill No. 65 — An Act to Amend The Human Rights Act (2).

Abe Arnold, Man. Association for Rights and Liberties

Prof. Donald Gordon, Afro-Caribbean Association of Manitoba Inc.

Winnie Fung, Family Services of Winnipeg Inc.

Bill No. 29 — The Commodity Futures Act.

R.J. Strong, Amcor Management Corporation

Bill No. 66 — An Act to Amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

Marilyn Thompson, Manitoba Teachers' Society.

On Thursday, July 20, 1978, your Committee considered Bills:

No. 47 — An Act to Amend The Law Society Act.

No. 66 — An Act to Amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

No. 69 — An Act to Amend The Civil Service Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee also considered Bills:

No. 29 — The Commodity Futures Act.

No. 35 — An Act to Amend The Highway Traffic Act (2).

No. 57 — An Act to Amend The Public Schools Act.

No. 60 — An Act to Amend The Liquor Control Act (2).

No. 71 — The Statute Law Amendment Act (1978).

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere):** To the Attorney-General, I'd like to ask that Minister whether, in the light of the decision or position taken by Mr. Justice Dewar in the Forest case and as regards the 1890 legislation, can the Attorney-General say whether this matter is now being reviewed, in the aftermath of that decision, to ascertain whether anything need be done by the Crown at this juncture, or whether it can be left at its present circumstance?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, the decision is being reviewed in order to determine any further action, but I believe that will be up to the plaintiff in the action.

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

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to direct to the Minister of Mines and Environmental Management regarding the statement that Senator Guay made to the Council in the Village of St. Pierre regarding the arsenic situation and the willingness that he expressed on behalf of the Federal Government to assist. I was wondering whether the Minister could indicate to the House the amount of assistance or the type of assistance that is forthcoming from the Federal Government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been in contact with the Federal Minister of the Environment, Mr. Marchand, with respect to the problem that we have with the arsenic at St. Pierre, and I'm disappointed to learn from the Honourable Minister that the Federal Government is unwilling to share in the costs of removal of this compound which is causing so much concern. I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been making an effort, and we as a government have been making an effort to deal with this problem in a quiet and rational fashion without causing undue concern, and my honourable friends in opposition, I think, have realized the difficulty that we face in attempting to deal with this situation, and have chosen not to make it a political issue. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the Liberal Party, who have had senators and candidates out in the area of St. Pierre trying to make this a public issue, and saying that it is time that there was government action, etc., and then when the Liberal government in Ottawa is asked to participate in a solution to the problem, they refuse to do so.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, not with any intention of making it a partisan political issue, but since the matter is a question of public policy, can the Minister say whether he will attempt to pursue a rational — to use his own word — proposal here, by first of all ascertaining which level of government's law it was that caused this arsenic compound to fall into a non-permitted use category. Can the Minister undertake to do that, and having done that, would he then attempt to obtain cost-sharing of responsibility on that basis?

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I know I can tell the House that the legislation that limits the use of this compound is in fact federal legislation that has been in place for some years now, but again, I would not wish to leave the impression that that is the only reason why this compound has not been used, as I pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition some days ago. But it is in fact a federal regulation which at the moment prevents this compound from being used for the purpose that the owners originally had intended.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, since problems of this kind rarely lend themselves to simple, principled, dogmatic positions and solutions, I would like to ask the Minister if he has as yet proposed to the Government of Canada, to the individual company involved, that since the problem exists and must be solved, the cost attendant thereto should be split three ways?

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, as I saw it, the first concern was to take the lead in attempting to resolve what is perceived to be a very serious problem by the people of St. Pierre, even though the situation has existed for a number of years, it is now certainly perceived to be a serious problem. Our interest was in trying to resolve that problem, and then seeing what kind of apportionment we could get on cost sharing. I believe it's correct to say that part of the delay in the past has been over the jurisdictional responsibility for it, and the time had come to try and move past that and deal with the problem, get whatever sharing we could, and in that line, I had contacted the Federal Minister saying we planned to take a lead in attempting to resolve this problem and would they participate in funding on it? The answer I get back is, "no."

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked me about alleged reports of budgetary deficit problems at the Victoria General Hospital and staffing cutbacks. I have checked with the Board of the hospital and am advised that there is no abnormal financial problem, that there have been minimal staffing reductions and that they were undertaken in the interests of sound business management, and that there is no effect or impact on the quality of patient care or services.

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

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister make that statement when it is a known fact that they have a deficit and even the added funds that were given by the government still leave them with a deficit and that the public statement was made that they were cutting down because of the restraint or because of the budget situation, and also because of the money in the contingency ' claim they have no money at all. So how can that be just a normal procedure?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I undertook, as I assured the honourable member I would, to check with the hospital. I checked with the board and if the honourable member is interested in the specific, literal response of the Finance Chairman of the board, it is that the allegations of a deficit and budget crisis are "absolute nonsense." That is my information from the Finance Chairman of the board, which I am relaying to my honourable friend because I told him I would undertake to investigate it. There has been a minimal reduction in staff. Again, quoting directly from that spokesman for the board, "These were undertaken in the interests of sound business principles."

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, do I understand the Minister to make the statement that the Chairman of Finance of the hospital is saying that they did not have a deficit, and secondly, that it is quite normal to refuse to pay overtime and to threaten if there is any overtime that there would be more layoffs? That's normal?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the Finance Chairman of the board did not say to me that there was no deficit. I relayed to him the concerns expressed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, which I presume were relayed by another party to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and they included the references that the honourable member has just made with respect to overtime, etc. The response of the Finance Chairman of the board was that those allegations are "absolute nonsense."

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Can the Minister advise whether or not, with the Decontrol Program, in all areas outside of Brandon and Winnipeg, that effective for rent increases October 1 on, it is still proper or in order for landlords to issue the usual forms that they have been issuing for the past two or three years indicating to the tenant an increase in rent, according to the law of the Province of Manitoba?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West):** Mr. Speaker, the terms of The Landlord and Tenant Act would still apply if that is the thrust of the member's question. While the areas which he describes will be not subject to the guidelines, they will of course be still subject to The Landlord and Tenant Act and to the regulations pertaining thereto.



**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, for further clarification, I am referring to the form issued by the Rent Control Office, R1C2, Notice of Rent History and Landlord's Notice of Rent Increase to Tenant. Is it proper for landlords to continue to use that form in their communication with tenants in the decontrol area?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the amendment to The Rent Stabilization Act is coming before the Law Amendments Committee, perhaps I could take that question as notice and examine those forms and respond to the member.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the Minister been informed of rent increases of 15 percent to 20 percent effective October 1, the day after the commencement of the Decontrol Program in the areas outside of Brandon and the City of Winnipeg?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, I have had some indication that there may be rents being proposed in that category. We are advising those who have brought this to our attention of the action that is open to them. That action, of course, cannot be undertaken until the Act before us becomes law, at which time the terms of the new amendment to The Rent Stabilization Act will become effective.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Selkirk with a fourth question.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a month or two ago when I posed questions relating to the Decontrol Program outside Brandon and the City of Winnipeg, the Minister had indicated that he would be monitoring such increases. Can the Minister indicated to the House who is doing the monitoring, by what means, and when would we expect to receive a report from that monitoring agency pertaining to rent increases outside Brandon and the City of Winnipeg?

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, the monitoring will be done by the Rent Review Agency. The way in which that monitoring will be carried out will be determined on the basis of the experience subsequent to the passage of this current legislation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs responsible for the Rent Review Board. With respect to the matter of alleged abuses of the Rent Control Program, I would like to pass on to the Minister material which deals with abuses, particularly those of one firm. I ask the Minister to look at this material and to determine what further action might be warranted in this matter.

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

**MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Health who took as notice a question from me quite some time ago in regard to the concerns of the Community of Amaranth with regard to the Amaranth Work Activity Project which was to be phased out and transferred out. Does the Minister have any information for me on that particular subject matter at this time?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, as far as I can determine and as far as I can go in giving my honourable friend information at this point on that subject, I would say that the present intention is to phase out the Amaranth Work Activity Project on the 30th of September. However, the project itself is being shifted to another site in Portage la Prairie. That is the current plan.

**MR. ADAM:** I wonder if the Minister could advise the reason for transferring the project from the environment of Amaranth where it has been so successful, to Portage la Prairie? What was the reason for that transfer?

**MR. SHERMAN:** The reasons were economic, Mr. Speaker, related to the product, the production of the work activity project itself, and to the possible utilization of energies in the project in a more populated, larger market area of the province. I can investigate it further for my honourable friend.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the First Minister whether he could indicate whether or not his government is planning any major changes in the Civil Service once the House is no longer in session, that is, are there any major hirings or firings planned once the session is over?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, any changes in the administration of the Government of Manitoba will be announced as and when they take place.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Meer for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could confirm that there are plans to transfer, demote, fire or otherwise replace six Deputy Ministers or Assistant Deputy Ministers once the House is no longer in session.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the First Minister whether or not civil servants in the Department of Renewable Resources and Northern Affairs have received what could, in effect, be notices — 36 employees have received what could be, in effect, notices that their employment will terminate on September 22nd.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to take that last question as notice for the Minister concerned.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Meer for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force.

Is it a fact that the Chairman of the Board of the Victoria Hospital is or was a member of a sub-committee of the Task Force dealing with health?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for the Task Force.

**HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (River Heights):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the chairman of the board is Mr. Hugh Sutherland. Yes, I believe he was a member of one of the review teams of the Task Force.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education. Can the Minister confirm that a number of contractors in the construction industry are using the private sector Youth Employment Program to hire students to cross picket lines and to do work that is normally done by unionized workers?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I answer that question as, "No."

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. When I was passing the material on to him, you then passed it on to the Member for Ste. Rose, and I wasn't able to hear whether the Minister did undertake to look at that material I passed on to him to determine whether further action was required on this matter of alleged abuses.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West):** Yes, Mr. Speaker.



**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Thank you, Mr. Minister. I would like to thank the Minister for that undertaking.

My further question is to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. On July 14th, tenders closed for those seven lots in St. Vital that RC was selling. Is the Minister in a position now to inform the members of the House if the lots were sold, and for what price?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

**HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek):** Mr. Speaker, the tenders that have been received are being examined by the Board of Directors of MHRC today. There will be a recommendation made to myself as Minister after they have examined them at which time I'll be able to answer the honourable member's question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, during the debate on Supplementary Supply, the Meer for The Pas asked a number of question relative to payments to The Manitoba Metis Federation, and I would like to table the answers to those questions.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Meer for Brandon East.

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the fast diminishing Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Can the Honourable Minister advise the House now if and when the Critical Home Repair Program will again be accepting new applications?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Before I allow the Honourable Minister to answer, I would like to refer the Honourable Member for Brandon East to Citation 171(a), where a request, oral or written, must not be ironical, rhetorical, offensive or contain epithet innuendos, satire or ridicule. Would the Honourable Meer for Brandon East care to rephrase his question?

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your observation or point of order; I only wish it would apply to those who are providing the answers as well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing.

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I'll try to diplomatically say that I wouldn't ordinarily answer sarcastic questions, but I realize where it comes from.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the honourable member that if he had been in the House many times, he would have heard many times that we hope to open the Critical Home Repair Program at the end of July. I had told the House that we hoped the applications would be down to 2,500, at which time we could start again. I'd like to report that it looks like we're going to make our target. And that's for the benefit of the meer who could have heard it many times before.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for his statement. I heard him say on many occasions that he hoped it would begin. I was trusting he could be a little bit more definitive.

I would like to ask the Honourable Minister that when the program opens up to new applications, is it the intention of the Corporation to hire some of the staff that were laid off I believe as of around March 31st from the MHRC in order to assist in coping with increased influx of applications?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** No, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, then, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise at all whether there has been any change in the personnel of the Critical Home Repair inspection staff? Have any people been added to that particular staff in the last few weeks?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** One, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the restraint program of the government and the Honourable Minister, who is a meer of this government so concerned with restraint, could he explain why he had to add one staff after laying off several on March 31st, and with no new applications coming in?

**MR. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, mainly because of the concerns of the honourable members opposite that we weren't getting things done fast enough.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Meer for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, this morning I asked the Minister of Public Works a question that is very important for the remote communities in regard to employment in one community. I wonder if he has an answer to that question this afternoon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to speak to my staff, the Deputy Minister, about the subject matter, and I am told that that matter will be straightened up over this weekend, and that there will be, during the course of the six to eight weeks' work that is being done on the Cormorant School, local people hired to do that work. One supervisory person from the Department of Public Works will be there to supervise the work, and local people will be hired for that project.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Meer for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to very much thank the Minister for his reply. I wonder if there was any commitment made to the Cormorant Lodge for a long-term use of that facility by the outside labourers, whether he has a commitment to live with from the Cormorant Lodge where he was housing the outside labourers?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, those are further details that I am not aware of. I would undertake to get those answers for the member and perhaps be able to transmit them to him personally during the course of the day.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, while the Minister is being so co-operative, I'll just check with him to see if he's had a chance to check on the Easterville road and the problems relating thereto that I asked him about recently.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. THOMAS BARROW:** My question is to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Regarding the jurisdiction between the company and the FM and S where the ore body lies in two provinces, and as the Minister is aware, I asked this question a month ago. They cover those three jurisdictions: Saskatchewan, Manitoba and federal. The Minister promised to look into this. I wonder if she made any progress.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, I have done some checking into it but there's quite a few ramifications and there haven't been any settlement as to what jurisdiction it would be under other than the present.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Meer for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question also to the Minister of Labour. I would like to thank the Minister for the report she tabled yesterday and for confirming our observations and concerns at the levels of lead poisoning in the air. Lead in the air is highly excessive, indeed as high as 59 times according to the report tabled. My question to the Minister is, are these figures indicative of long-term levels — since this is a two-day sample taken on January 19th and January 20th, this year — is this two-day sample indicative of the long-term prevalent situation or is it not?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.



**MRS. PRICE:** I can't answer that directly. I can tell the Member for Brandon East that the company has been closed from mid-January until the middle of August doing all the necessary changes and renovations as requested and ordered by the department and we are going to be having a further investigation the beginning of September.<sup>3</sup>

**MR. EVANS:** I thank the Honourable Minister for that information, Mr. Speaker. On June 2nd, in reply to a question from the members of the Opposition asking for the report that was tabled yesterday, the Minister said that she would also provide — and I'm using her phrase — “and all the preventatives that go with it,” — this is on Page 3096 of Hansard — and I gather she's referring to the work improvement orders, and I'm wondering if the Honourable Minister could provide us with the work improvement orders. I believe these are public documents in the sense that they are made available to unions.

**MRS. PRICE:** Before I made that commitment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to check into it.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you. One supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the same subject of the possibilities of lead contamination, can the Honourable Minister confirm that there are other plants being operated within the province that have higher levels of lead in the air than indeed Canadian Bronze has been found to have which previously had been thought to be fairly clean!?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, I haven't had any complaints to that effect.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a fourth question.

**MR. EVANS:** A final supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister has indicated she hasn't had any complaints. Would she be prepared, through her Workplace Safety and Health Division personnel, would she be prepared to conduct a survey, a comprehensive survey just to see what the situation is with regard to other plants where there may be a fairly high hazard potential?

**MRS. PRICE:** Mr. Speaker, our inspectors are going around daily not only answering complaints but working with the safety committees in the different workplaces and they're keeping a very close watch on it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Two days ago I asked him if his department would inquire into whether a book dealing with children and children's diet which had been banned or been withdrawn from the market in Eastern Canada was available for sale in Winnipeg and if he would look into it. There is a report in today's papers that the book is on sale in Winnipeg and still on sale. I would ask him if his government has undertaken an investigation and has issued any orders that the book be withdrawn from Winnipeg bookstores.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

**MR. MCGILL:** Mr. Speaker, the member is referring to a question he asked in connection with a baby book entitled, “Let's Have Healthy Children.” The action which I believe was a voluntary action on the part of the publishers in the United States to withdraw that book as the result of a death of a child in Florida. Mr. Speaker, my department has made investigations in this connection. We have been in touch with the Consumer Services Branch of the Federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and with the Health Protection Branch of the Health and Welfare Canada Department, to inquire, Mr. Speaker, whether either unit would be involved in any way with the recall of the book. I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that neither has any involvement. My department has also spoken with the Registrar of the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Manitoba to inquire whether the College has dealt with, or could deal with the issue in an instantaneous fashion. The answer was no on both counts. It was Dr. Morrison's opinion that because of the media coverage the issue would likely be brought to the attention of pediatricians.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge asked if the department would contact book stores to find out whether the book is on sale and should be withdrawn. We have not undertaken to contact stores but this could be done but I would point out that because the action on the part of the publisher is voluntary and because we have no immediate authority or grounds upon which to ask

for the immediate withdrawal of this book, we would depend upon the actions already initiated by the publisher.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Considering that there was a death of a child in the United States and I believe that there was also reported cases of serious illnesses of children in Ontario who had followed the advice or recommendations contained in this book, taking those facts into account, could the Department of Consumer Affairs not undertake to contact book dealers in the City of Winnipeg, or in the province, to ask them if they do have books on their shelves that they be withdrawn until such a time as the department can receive advice from medical authorities as to whether the recommendations are legitimate or should be followed or whether in fact that they do construe a danger to children and should the department not take that precautionary step to ensure that there would be no ill-effects by readers of that particular publication.

**MR. MCGILL:** Well, Mr. Speaker, judging by press reports very recently I gather that some research has been done with respect to the availability of the book in the Winnipeg book stores. We can, of course, make a further check on stores and would ask perhaps, as the Member suggests, that this be a voluntary withdrawal because we have no authority under law at this point to demand such a withdrawal. But I am certainly aware that the questions being asked by the member has given this matter some publicity and has had an effect already upon drawing attention to what may be a serious difficulty in respect to the advice given in this particular book.

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

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Education whether, with respect to elementary grades only, does the government have a policy of, if not prohibiting certainly but discouraging any further centralization of elementary grade schools in this province beyond what exists already?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, there is no particular policy in that regard as far as I'm concerned.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, if there is no particular policy, can the Minister advise whether, with respect to any disputes which may arise at the present time, so as it not be hypothetical, I would say with respect to a dispute which has arisen, bearing on the question of whether there should or should not be further centralization of elementary grades, can the Minister say then whether it will be the government's intention to leave such matters entirely to the Divisional Boards, or whether the government will encourage the referring of it to a Board of Reference?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that cases vary, and I'm not sure of the particular case that the Leader of the Opposition is alluding to, but in one particular case, this has gone to the Board of Reference as being handled at this time.

**MR. SCHREYER:** A further supplementary. Flowing from the Minister's answer to the first question, I would ask the Minister then if the program which was initiated approximately three to four years ago known as the Rural Small School Retention Program, under which program the province did make funds available to cover any relatively minor differentials in cost as a consequence of keeping smaller elementary schools of three or more classrooms open, whether that program has been discontinued, then, in its entirety?.

**MR. COSENS:** Not at all, Mr. Speaker. We are still providing special grants to small schools, and I imagine this is what the Leader of the Opposition is referring to.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Then, Mr. Speaker, in the event, then, that it is now confirmed that this Rural Elementary Small Schools Retention Program still exists, is operational, can the Minister say whether it is relevant to, and will be applied to such cases where elementary — and I am referring strictly to elementary schools, elementary grades — where situations arise where rural smaller elementary schools are slated to be closed down?.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the application



of the Small Schools grant over the last three years has been rather general in nature. In other words, the grants have been given to the school division; the school division then decides, in its wisdom, how that particular grant will be spent.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Given then, Mr. Speaker, that this Rural Elementary Small Schools Program still exists, can the Minister confirm that in a case where a division faces a decision as to whether to close down a smaller elementary school or make application for some marginal assistance to alleviate all or part of the cost of differential and the cost of operation, would such a division receive a favourable reply?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, it's rather difficult to answer a question that contains that many "ifs" in it. We would have to look rather carefully at all of the specifics, all of the details of the particular case, and if the Leader of the Opposition wishes to give me a particular case and the details in support of it, then we could look at that.

**MR. SCHREYER:** I would then ask if the Minister would be prepared to look at one of the problems along these lines that is current at the present time in the Pelly Trails School Division to ascertain whether the program, which is three or four years old, of providing some funding to divisions to retain smaller elementary schools, wherever they may exist, would be relevant, applicable and available?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to look at the factors the Leader of the Opposition mentions.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. Would he undertake a search for another missing musical instrument, that is, Premier Greenway's mouth organ or kazoo, which has not been seen or heard from since the honourable gentleman left office in 1900? And would he delegate the task . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that under Citation 171(a), a question must not be ironical, rhetorical, offensive, or contain epithet, innuendo, satire or ridicule.

Does the Honourable Member for Elmwood have another question?

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, the other day there was a piano that disappeared and was fortunately found within a few hours, and I'm drawing to the attention of the Minister, a missing mouth organ, that's been missing for 78 years, and I'm wondering whether either he, his staff, or his Legislative assistant, the Member for Wolseley, would attempt to find it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, the answer will be lost to my honourable friend, the Member for Elmwood, but I assure him, not to members on this side of the House. The mouth organ will be found next Tuesday at 2:30.

#### **WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY BY THE MEMBER FOR THE PAS**

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, during debate on Supplementary Supply the Member for The Pas asked a number of questions relative to payments to the Manitoba Metis Federation.

I would like to table my answers to the questions, so raised.

1. Question: Why was the \$130,800 now being requested for the Manitoba Metis Federation in the second Supplementary Estimates not provided for in the Main Estimates?

Answer: This core funding grant for the Manitoba Metis Federation was provided for in the Agriculture Main Estimates in recent years. The amount provided in 1977-78 was \$100,400. However, the previous administration had made a commitment to provide an additional \$30,400 making a total of \$130,800 to match the amount provided to the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood. The \$30,400 was not paid out in 1977-78 and therefore had to be provided for in the 1978-79 Estimates. After considering this matter a decision was made to delete these amounts from Agriculture main estimates, as it was not deemed appropriate to continue funding from that department. A subsequent decision was taken to provide funding from Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and



Services by way of Special Warrant or Supplementary Supply, as the Main Estimates had already been finalized. Since the House is still sitting it was deemed appropriate to include this amount in the second Supplementary Supply Bill.

2. Question: What is the total annual Provincial Support being provided to the Manitoba Metis Federation in 1978-79?

Answer: Department of Northern Affairs, Core Fund — \$130,800. Department of Education, Support Grant — \$60,000. Department of Education, Bursaries — \$30,000.00. Total \$220,800.00.

3. Question: Where in the Estimates is there an amount to pay the \$3.00 per capita Special Grants?

Answer: The Special per capita Grant for northern and remote communities and Indian Bands is funded by the Department of Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources and Transportation Services. For 1978-79 a total of \$135,000 has been provided for this purpose out of appropriation 19-6-f Grants and Purchased Services.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time for question period having expired, I call on the Honourable Government House Leader. The first order of business?

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill No. 5.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 5, and the proposed amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I think I should advise my honourable friend that we do not intend to accept any adjournments on this debate.

**MR. SCHREYER:** On a point of order, Sir, relative to House business, could the Government House Leader indicate when it is his intention to call Bill 45? —(Interjection)— Not this sitting?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** . . . sitting, Mr. Speaker, but if my honourable friends want to deal with it, I am prepared to call it.

### BILL NO. 5 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, many arguments have been used with respect to this legislation. Perhaps some of them have been too sophisticated and some of them have been too philosophical so I intend, Mr. Speaker, to deal with some very simple points and I indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I am speaking on this motion for a hoist which will permit all honourable members to both dispose of the bill and yet, if they feel that there is some doubt about voting against the bill, they needn't vote against the bill, they can vote for the hoist and still deal with the question in such a way that it gives them at least the satisfaction, in their minds perhaps, that they were not voting against the bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me relate to you a personal experience which I think is very substantive to the bill in question. I have five children, Mr. Speaker. MY ELDEST SON IS NOW  $\frac{1}{4}$ %. At approximately the age of four, there was one occasion on which we were watching television and eight o'clock came along and we said to him, "You have to go up to bed now." And he said, "I would like to stay up and watch television." We said, "No, you have to go up to bed." He said, "When will I be able to stay up and watch television?" And we said, "When you get to be a big boy."

Now, Mr. Speaker, within about two days, my same son, who was then four years of age, was acting up on another question and was behaving in a way which his parents thought was not satisfactory and they said to him, "Arthur, stop behaving like a child, you're a big boy now." And he said, "If I'm a big boy, why can't I stay up and watch television?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all, that is a true story. It is a very true story and I want you to see how fast, not an 18-year-old, but a four-year-old recognizes the question of responsibility and recognizes the hypocrisy with which adults sometimes deal with children.

I am now going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, another true story, which happened not that many years ago but very recently. I was in Dauphin, Manitoba; I was in court and I was awaiting a hearing where a 14-year-old boy was charged with murder. The question at the hearing was whether this 14-year-old was going to be charged in adult court and in juvenile court, and the argument of the

Crown was that this 14-year-old, who was under the age when people are considered adults, the argument of the Crown was that he can be best dealt with, in view of his particular character and in view of the particular history of the case, that he can be best dealt with in adult court.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we were telling this boy was that he was old enough and was deemed by society to have the responsibility of making a decision which could result in him spending life imprisonment, and if the Honourable Member for St. Matthews would have his way, be sentenced to death. And if that seems peculiar to the honourable members I want you to know that there was a 14-year-old boy in Canada sentenced to death in Adult Court. So what our society said to him was that we deem you to have the responsibility to make the kind of decision upon which we will sentence you to death if you make the wrong decision, and if you make a decision which displeases us, but you don't have the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to make a decision as to whether you want to have a drink which contains alcoholic beverages, which all of the adults in society are drinking around you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the fundamental question that we are dealing with. Those who are trying to make this a question that this House is divided between those who want 18-year-olds to drink and those who say that 18-year-olds should not drink, are raising a false premise, Mr. Speaker. It has never been proven — as a matter of fact, the opposite has been proven — that restrictive drinking laws stop people from drinking. If restrictive drinking laws stop people from drinking, why are we saying 18 years of age? Mr. Speaker, why aren't we saying 35 years of age? Is it good to drink at 34? Do we not have terrible problems in our society with people drinking at 34? Have you not heard of accidents involving people at the age of 34, maiming, killing and destroying people on the highways?

Well, if it is logical that by restricting the age of drinking by law we can stop drinking, Mr. Speaker, if that's the case, then the honourable member's bill doesn't go far enough. We could do much better. We could go much beyond and we could be less hypocritical. Because, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing to the young people in society is giving them a lesson in hypocrisy and teaching them to be irresponsible.

I said the other day, Mr. Speaker, that I had a quotation from one of Ibsen's books, which dealt with freedom and responsibility, and that quotation, Mr. Speaker, is directly relevant to the issue that is before us. The play that I take it from is "The Lady From The Sea," and I explained the circumstances to honourable members when I last spoke. A man and his wife were on the verge of a crisis because an old flame of hers appeared and she was asking her husband to give her the freedom of making the decision as to whether she would go with him. Her husband said "no" and she was put in a terrible position, and she argued it out with him. Finally, her husband gave her the right to make the decision for herself.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read the direct excerpt from the play, starting from the point that I have now mentioned. He is now going to release her and the stranger is waiting for her to accompany him, and he says, this is Wangel, which is the name of the husband, "Your thoughts went in other directions but now, now you are set wholly free from me and mine. Now your own true life can return to its right groove again, for now you can choose in freedom and on your own responsibility, Ellida," which was the name of his wife. Ellida answers, "In freedom and on my own responsibility? Responsibility, this transforms everything." And the man who is waiting in the wings says, "Do you hear Ellida? The bell is ringing for the last time. Come away." Ellida turns towards him, looks fixedly at him, and says with determination in her voice, "I can never go with you after this." The stranger, "You will not go?" "Oh, after this I can never leave you," to her husband, Wangel.

The stranger, "It is all over then?" And she says, "Yes," the wife, "over for all time."

"I see it. There is something here that is stronger than my will," this is what the stranger says. Ellida, "Your will has no longer a feather's weight with me. For me you are a dead man who has come home from the sea and who is returning to it again, but I am no longer in terror of you. You fascinate me no more."

Remember those words. "You fascinate me no more." That she was fascinated because she was restricted and she was prohibited, and she said, "You fascinate me no more." And Wangel says, "Ellida, your mind is like the sea; it has its ebb and flow. What brought the transformation, Ellida?"

"Oh, do you not understand that this transformation came, that it had to come, when I could choose in freedom."

"And the unknown, it fascinates you no longer?"

"It neither fascinates me nor frightens me. I could have seen into it and gone into it if I had wished to. I was free to choose it, and therefore I was able to reject it."

Mr. Speaker, repeat, and know what freedom means and know how it affects the mind, because it does affect the mind in this way. "I was free to choose it, and therefore I was able to reject it." and it is no freedom, Mr. Speaker, to choose when there is a law that's saying it is restricted. And I say that you, to all of the young people in our society, are creating irresponsibility and you



are not creating that ingredient which would allow for maturity and responsibility by the kind of restriction that you seek to impose in this law.

Wangel says, "I begin to understand you by degrees. You think and conceive in images, invisible pictures. Your longing and yearning for the sea, the fascination that he, the stranger, possessed for you must have been the expression of an awakening and growing need for freedom within you, and nothing else."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are the two words that are so important in this passage from one of the most profound playwrights that history has ever created, a man who wrote "An Enemy of the People," a man who wrote "The Pillars of Society," "Hedda Gabler," "A Doll's House." — in Europe, Mr. Speaker, certainly the Scandinavian equivalent to Shakespeare and to Goethe, of German origin. But the words, Mr. Speaker, are side by side. "In freedom and on my own responsibility." I repeat, responsibility. This transforms everything. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that we will do far more for the youngsters of our society and for society generally if we tell them that we recognize their responsibility and we cannot, Mr. Speaker, and I have heard it from members on the other side, talk with forked tongue. You are sufficiently responsible, and let's forget the old chestnut of being conscripted and going to war and dying for one's country. You are deemed by society to have the responsibility to make a decision to commit premeditated murder, and therefore be hanged. I now quote the words of the Member for St. Matthews, "death for death," and I do not speak hypothetically. The fact is that we have hanged people under the 18 years of age, not recently, but certainly it was done in the good old days of capital punishment. What we are saying, Mr. Speaker, that we deem them to have that responsibility but we don't deem them to have the responsibility of doing what all of the pillars in society are doing. It's worse, Mr. Speaker, if we said that we are going to prevent you, I mean it would make some sense to say that we are going to restrict you from doing what we can't do. We are going to say that thou shalt not murder, which none of us is able to do, but we are going to go much further' Mr. Speaker, we are going to say, "Thou shalt not drink, and thou shalt not have the right to make a decision as to whether you will drink or not," something that is done in all of the best places where the pillars of society meet, and engage in company with one another. And we will say to the 18 year-olds in this society, that you do not have the responsibility to make that kind of a decision.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members, I suggest, they do not know what they do. They will not be able to perceive the kind of physiological change that will take place in the youth of this community. I didn't say, Mr. Speaker, — somebody said that I said they will rebel against society — I say that youth, when given a restriction that means nothing, does not accept that restriction, and this restriction means nothing and will create a fascination which is referred to by Ibsen, and will create irresponsible drinking. This bill, if passed, will result in more irresponsible drinking amongst teenager or whatever age, than you have today, and I ask the honourable members to ask to get the logic of the situation to these teenagers in our society. Yes, by the same people who say that you are deemed not responsible enough to drink, you are deemed responsible enough to make a decision for which we will hang you, but you are not deemed responsible enough to drink.

Well, Mr. Speaker, those people who think that kind of admonition will carry any weight, I say with some degree of sorrow that I merely say that they are wrong, Mr. Speaker. That they are wrong, that I would ask them to reconsider on the very basis of those principles which govern them, that they believe that freedom brings the best results over the age of 19. Why over the age of 19? Why is freedom not as positive a motivating feature of society for 18 yearolds, and if they say to me, "Why don't I say 17 year-olds?" Yes, Mr. Speaker, for 17 year-olds. I would go down, but right now we're deciding whether or not we're going up, and I say —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I would say to my honourable friend, the Member for St. Matthews, that this society would have better habits with regard to drinking if liquor was regarded as a commodity like chocolate bars are, that we would have better attitudes and better drinking habits if that were the case, Mr. Speaker. And if the honourable member says that that is a problem for him, it is only a problem for him.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek said, Mr. Speaker, "Why don't we ask the people who are involved with these children?" Mr. Speaker, I was a lay social worker for a period of ten years. I worked as the junior division head, the young adult division head in all of the social activities at the YMHA Community Centre for a period of 10 years. So I was involved with those people. I believe that I have had more experience with young people in this area of activity than has had any honourable member in this House, because, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't in the school atmosphere, it was in the free from school atmosphere, the completely social atmosphere where the kind of thing that we are talking about is more likely to happen than in the school atmosphere. I say, Mr. Speaker, to honourable members, that they learned something from themselves first of all, from what they have said about being a free Manitoban, and they learned something from history; that they go to those periods of time when liquor was



restricted and see what the results of those restrictions were.

And, Mr. Speaker, it will never be determined by statistics. The Honourable Member for Morris, the House Leader, makes a very strong point. In the last analysis, it will be determined by subjectivity and by your own knowledge and understanding of human affairs, by everything that you have read and seen, and everything that you have done. I can point to more succinct thesis on the subject than I did with regard to the lines which I read from Ibsen, Mr. Speaker, which are a fitting closing to the remarks that I want to make: "Do you not understand that the transformation came, that it had to come, when I could choose in freedom. I was free to choose it, and therefore I was able to reject it." If there is not the freedom to choose it, Mr. Speaker, there will not be a rejection, there will be a fascination and an allurements, and irresponsibility will give way to responsibility and maturity.

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

**MR. GEORGE MINAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the Honourable Member for St. Johns believes that he has affected me on my decision on how I am going to vote on this — I'm sorry, for Inkster, my apologies to the Honourable Member for Inkster — Mr. Speaker, I will be voting on the hoist in favour of it, and I might say I had made up my mind prior to hearing the Honourable Member for Inkster present his views on the reasons for his amendment.

My comments will be very brief. The reason I am supporting the hoist is that I have spent quite a bit of time making up my mind on how I was going to vote on this bill. I feel that if the problem of drinking at 18 years is such a major problem, then I believe then we should raise the age of majority because I believe once that you are declared an adult by law, then you should have the responsibilities that adults have in our law and that there are laws that govern the misuse of alcohol by adults presently on the books that cover this problem.

So for this reason I will support the hoist in the hopes that if there is a major problem in this age group, then we look at raising the age of majority to be coincidental with the age of being allowed to drink. Mr. Speaker, to make it clear, if the hoist amendment should be lost, I'll be voting against the main motion before us.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**MR. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no intention of speaking at length, but I couldn't help but note that with some peculiar appropriateness, while we debate the question of whether our young people should or should not drink at a certain age, our public galleries got filled up — or have the choice to drink at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster, to use Ibsen's language, does continue to fascinate me in his speech this afternoon because he insists on seeing the world in such black and white terms. He really does, and that of course does surprise me because we are not talking about restricting anybody's drinking habits here. We're not talking about the desirability of children drinking with their families from the age of two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. It is law in this province that you can take your family, your youngsters with you and if you are dining out and if you are having dinner as a family, to have them be part of the family setting in this instance, of sharing in a glass or wine or a bottle of wine. We are not talking, Mr. Speaker, about hanging people or not hanging people, or killing people or not killing people — not even, thank goodness, talking about going to war or not going to war, we have laid that one to rest, as the Member for Inkster has said.

What we are talking about is, as societies have done in ages past and will continue to do, in our imperfect way, select those kind of rules and regulations that we choose to live by. We decided that age 16 ought to be an appropriate age before young people can drive cars or can be licensed for motor vehicles. We decide all kinds of arbitrary ages which wouldn't stand the test of the arguments that the Member for Inkster brings to this question. Virtually all other jurisdictions have chosen arbitrary ages, and there aren't losses of freedom or any great deviation or standards of responsibility or irresponsibility that can be detected between Ontario youth or Saskatchewan as to Manitoba youth. I wish I could say that because of our youth' which has the responsibility and the privilege and the freedom to choose or to reject at age 18 to drink or not to drink in our public premises, are a notch better than our cousins in Saskatchewan. But I think the Honourable Member for Inkster will at least concede to that point, that we can't say that. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I have won my share portion of the argument because I don't think there is enough of this to win for anybody, but by conceding that there is no difference between here and Saskatchewan, the Member for Inkster has also just shot down his own very eloquent speech, shot down his own very eloquent arguments about the irresponsible measure that we are considering here.

Mr. Speaker, all we are considering is taking into account certain undesirable social pressures' social practices that have to do with the time period and the way our school system is structured, and how our school system is structured, that have led other jurisdictions that have had the drinking



age reduced, to in a very pragmatic and practical way, recognize this problem and raise the drinking age to take it outside of the realm of the average high school student, the Grade 12 students.

And that really is the only reason that I would have to indicate my support for the bill, because it is a problem in that area. I refuse to tackle it or approach it on the basis that the Member for Inkster wishes to attack it. I refuse to go along with the arguments that the Member for St. James proposes on the subject matter. I am simply prepared to take what seems to me eminent good common sense advice that obviously persuaded most legislators, Sir, and not reactionary Tories, but an NDP administration in Saskatchewan to do it, a Conservative administration in Ontario, other democratic or republican state legislators in the United States. So it isn't a question of partisan doctrine or position; it's a question of recognizing a specific area of difficulty that's been brought to our attention by parents, by educators, by law enforcement people. I can't defend the rightness of it being 17, 18 or 19; I won't try to do that. But more and more jurisdictions have simply found it the better way to resolve or not to welcome some of the difficulties that we have. There is nothing in the bill that says to our youngsters, "Thou shalt not drink," as the Honourable Member for Inkster intoned in this House. There is nothing that prevents anybody from drinking or choosing to drink in the confines of his family, or indeed under other private circumstances. What it does say is that he will not drink in certain public premises. —(Interjection)— That's right. It's like the Motor Vehicle Registrar says, "And you will not drive a certain vehicle under certain circumstances." And I suspect that will change. There will be pressure eventually to change the driving privileges perhaps upwards from 16 to 18.

And for some of you urban members who don't understand why it is 16, in fact why it was 14 at one time, at that time we had a larger rural population and rural boys and girls were driving their fathers' trucks and tractors on the farms of Manitoba — that's why we have to permit youngsters to drive at age 16 today, simply for that pragmatic reason that 20 years ago, 30 years ago, when the first licenses were beginning to be granted, when enforced regulations and laws were being drawn up, that we were to conduct our mode or application of how we allow our citizens to use a motor vehicle, it was practical and pragmatic to recognize that in a more pioneer and rural setting, robust 15 and 16 year-old boys and girls were very much part of the farm and team effort and that there would have been an outcry to suggest that they shouldn't be able to have what in effect has become, in many instances, a lethal weapon in their hands, a motor vehicle. So we licensed people to drive at 16 for those reasons. They're part of our heritage, part of our culture, part of our agricultural background quite frankly.

And we've got a problem with the proliferation of beverage rooms, very often within access and in the neighbourhoods of our high schools, and there is nothing that prevents a teacher or an educator to prevent the entire Grade 12 class, in many instances, from spending the afternoons or lunch hours enjoying a few beers. And I say that's a problem. It's a problem to the educators, it's a concern to the parents who think at that point at least that their children are still under the control and under the authority of the school system. Now if we want to change that, if you want to cut it off, send our youngsters at the Grade 11 level into the university setting, that's a different matter. But I'm saying, for the time period that we're working with right now, that's why the pressure to raise the age is upon us. And I must tell you also that the politics of it, of course, and I haven't referred to it, but the politics of that there can be no doubt, it is heavily, heavily weighted in favour of raising the drinking age, as other jurisdictions have found out across the province. I would say as high as 85 percent of the general population on this question would answer very positive, yes, to the raising of the drinking age.

Now I have always been a politician. I don't apologize for being a politician. I suppose in that sense, I'm the same as the Member for Inkster. I don't mind at all voting for a measure that I know a substantial majority of the people in Manitoba would ask me, and particularly in my constituency, would ask me to vote for.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I think that the course of action which obviously makes the most sense at this point in time is in fact to delay or, if not, to eliminate the proposed legislation. Each of us in our own way will arrive at what we're going to do in terms of putting the question and whether or not we favour it if it were put at this time.

You know, I listened with some interest to the two previous speakers and I find that it's sort of a treat to occasionally hear the Minister of Public Works give a straight speech — I believe that was a straight speech, Mr. Speaker, it's very hard to tell. Ninety percent of the time I don't believe the Minister when he's speaking; I don't believe he's in fact being serious, but I believe that on this occasion he was. He said that he wasn't afraid to set standards and I am also one of those who is not afraid to set standards or vote on legislation that either by implication, implicitly or explicitly, suggests a proper course of conduct.



You know, I've talked to a lot of people recently. I've talked to students, and in fact for the past six weeks I've been teaching from 9 o'clock to just before 3 o'clock in the Winnipeg School Division and I have been dealing with people, many of whom are about 18 and spoken to many of them who have just recently come out of the high school system and so on and I see no evidence of this great suggestion about what a serious problem drinking is in our high schools, that there is somehow or other drunkenness in the school system or it's a chronic problem. I didn't see that chronic problem when I was a student; I don't see it as a teacher; I don't see it as a legislator or as a citizen in the Province of Manitoba. There have always been students, Mr. Speaker, who drank on rare occasions and went to school. I suppose that happens most frequently at night when there are dances, etc., but during the day I think that is a very rare occurrence and it certainly does not warrant legislation in an attempt to eradicate this so-called "problem."

If that's the problem, and that is the problem posed by the Member for Emerson, if you read his speech, it comes down to that one point. He talks about his concern for people in his area, about how they're being forced to accept American dollars. They're coming up over the border and drinking dry the pubs of Emerson constituency. Well, you know, of course that's not true during the beer strike, but he's worried about that, that these people are complaining that they're making extra profits and so on, and I find that hard to believe. But his central argument, his main point, is that he's bringing it in because of his concern for his own kids. You know, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me as rather ironic that the member who represents Steinbach, I believe — no, not Steinbach, the Minister of Tourism, who brought in the proposed resolution before, this vital concern about young people drinking, and yet in the same area that these honourable gentlemen come from, we had a major attempt at a drug bust. What are you going to do about the drug bust? I mean, what are you going to do about students or anybody smoking marijuana and other kinds of drugs, using other kinds of drugs and so on. What are you going to do about it? Legislate it out? Well, it is legislated out, Mr. Speaker, it's illegal now; it always has been, maybe will be for a considerable period of time. Well, what are they going to do about that? I know what they're going to do, they're going to bring in a resolution that no one can smoke marijuana or use drugs during school hours

**A MEMBER:** Right.

**MR. DOERN:** . . . and that that in itself will have some effect on the behaviour of students.

**A MEMBER:** Then we'll lock the schools.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, of course that's just rubbish, it will do nothing of the kind. And similarly, this so-called concern, first of all, Mr. Speaker, I say that the problem is first of all minute and that it is exaggerated. I think it's pretty well a figment of the imagination of certain members including the peculiar imagination of the First Minister.

If there is a problem, you know, some of us are teachers here, some of us have had the experience of teaching in the high schools, in the junior high schools of Manitoba and we have some present professors' some people who are teaching courses and so on at the university level, and people there can attend class under the same conditions and in the same state. It doesn't matter whether or not they're 18, they can be 20, or 30, or 40, or 50, they can be students. There are some at the Adult Education Centre that age. There are many students at University who are over 20 and over 30. And you know, what are you going to do about it? You're not going to be legislating for those people. All you really are going to do, Mr. Speaker, is pass legislation which will have, in effect, no real effect on the problem and in fact I think will be tantamount to a loss of confidence and a vote of non-confidence in the younger people of this province and in the enforcement agencies and the parents and the teachers of Manitoba. It's very clear to me, as one who has been in the classroom, that if a student comes into the classroom in a state of intoxication or is misbehaving, for that or any other reason, that it's up to the teacher to discipline that student, to throw him out, to expel him from his classes or from the school; that it's up to the principle and the school board to back up that kind of enforcement; that it's up to the hotel owners to not sell alcoholic beverages to people who are under age; that it's up to the Liquor Commission to enforce the present laws of this province; and that it's up to the police to arrest and detain anybody — no matter how old they are — if they're driving in a state of intoxication. And last, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps most important of all, it's up to the parents to discipline their own children, to give them some guidance and to back up people who are trying to hold young people to a general course of acceptable social behaviour.

You know, in terms of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission which we are directly responsible for in this Chamber, I don't believe that there are enough liquor inspectors and I don't believe that the liquor inspectors are in fact doing an appropriate enough job at the time. I don't think that



they are cracking down hard enough. I recall, I believe it was the Member for Morris who is now the House Leader who, not too long ago, was criticizing the Liquor Control Commission inspectors for carrying on a reign of terror, if those were his words, I believe that's what he said. He thought they were acting in a high-handed manner, that they were too tough and that they were, in effect, terrorizing people who were trying to conduct a viable business operation in the hotel business and in the sale of beverages.

So, when you look at the statistics — and I wish that the Attorney-General were here — when our government came into office, I understand there were something like about 14 inspectors on staff and that a year ago when we left office there was a range of from about 21 to 25 people on staff. Now that figure has decreased by about seven and there are apparently four part-time vacancies and three full-time vacancies. Well how on earth is there supposed to be enforcement of liquor legislation, of any legislation, 18, 19, 21, 35, 50, 65, whatever we're going to consider, how can you have enforcement if you don't have people to enforce the existing legislation. I think we have to have guarantees from the Attorney-General that he's going to be prepared to add that staff because I say, Mr. Speaker, that he should add the staff now. We should tighten up on procedures throughout the province in the liquor stores and inspectors going into the beverage rooms and cocktail lounges, etc., and then let's see what happens. I say that the present law isn't being enforced. I think that there could have been improvements when we were in office. I think in some instances there was not enough stringency although members opposite might agree, certain members might disagree, but certainly right now, it is an almost impossible situation. For instance, keep in mind this particular point, that at present — my information is correct — all of Northern Manitoba is covered by one inspector whose basic residence is in Dauphin. Well plus the Winnipeg office.

Mr. Speaker, when our government was in power we had resident inspectors assigned to the north at Thompson and The Pas. If you're going to take one man or a couple of men and ask them to fly around Northern Manitoba to the main population centres to enforce the liquor laws, I say it's not possible, it's just a joke. So I say that if the government is serious, and again this is a free bill, a free vote, if Members of the government side are serious and if the Attorney General is serious, and I'm certainly serious when I say this, that they should add inspectors to have a full complement and not attempt, two-thirds of their requirements, to enforce the present liquor laws. And if they change it there will be no effect. If they just simply up the cage there will be no effect. If you up the age and tighten up the procedures there may be an effect but the real effect will come from tightening up the procedures.

Mr. Speaker, how many people are we talking about. My understanding of the present population in Manitoba of 18-year olds — I take this from an earlier figure of a few years ago and add a few to it — there probably are about 20,000 people, 20,000 people that we are going to affect if we take away this privilege or right, whatever it is, of these young people to drink, I think, in an intelligent and supervised fashion. Because you can always drink at any age in any fashion that you like, providing you don't do it in public or providing you don't get caught.

Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, I think that this legislation is also going to in effect be a devastating blow, or if not devastating at least a painful blow, inflicted on the businessmen that the members opposite purport to represent. They are going to, in effect, reduce the market for people who will be inhabiting, I suppose, the pubs and the cocktail lounges, etc. And on top of a beer strike, on top of a beer strike which is hitting all the hotel owners pretty hard at present, you're going to give them the additional present of reducing their market. And I suppose the temptation will be significant on the part of some people to be somewhat lax. If they're lax now in enforcing the legislation that's 18, when it goes up to 19 the temptation might be even greater.

But that isn't the point, Mr. Speaker. The point is really the question of principle and then the practical effects of what we are talking about. In principle, I am for voting at 18 and drinking at 18, that's in principle. But now we're debating a practical measure, the practical measure is that by increasing the drinking age to 19 we're going to crack down on drinking in the schools and on anti-social behaviour on the part of young people in Manitoba. That's the premise. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that if this legislation passes, if there is a vote at this time and it passes, then I say in a year or so, or in a couple of years, we will all be saying, "What happened? There's been no improvement. We're having the same problems. Kids are going to school . . ."

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member has three minutes.

**MR. DOERN:** Thank you. We will still be here, we will still be concerned about the same problems. You will still be saying that there are students going to school who have had a few drinks; they'll still be saying that they're drinking under age in the beverage rooms of Manitoba, that there is still drunken driving, that there are still all kinds of unethical and anti-social and undesirable



behaviour, that will be said. But if, if, Mr. Speaker, we introduce a proper identification card which I have talked about, which the Member for St. Matthews has talked about, I think the Member for Fort Rouge has talked about, other people have said this is one of the best things that could be done. If we take that sort of measure, and we introduce that and we put in enough liquor inspectors, and the order goes out from the Legislature and from the Attorney-General that there's going to be a crack-down through law enforcement agencies, and through the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission on their inspectors, on their people who sell liquor to the public in their stores, and in terms of enforcing present legislation, there will be a real effect, a better effect and a stronger effect than simply uping the age.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I simply say that I am against this original proposal, in principle, and in terms of the practical effect, I do not believe for a moment that it will have a desirable effect. I believe that all the problems will be the same, if not compounded. So I say that I think the best things we can do is to not implement this legislation at this time, to vote in favour of the six-month hoist and to undertake other measures before we decide to take what I regard would be a wrong step of simply increasing the age of drinking.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, very briefly, on this subject matter that is before us. I find it rather interesting that it appears to me that the problem in the country is real and in the urban or the larger centres, if you listen to the honourable members opposite, the problems of liquor don't exist amongst teenagers. I find it, as I watch the members speak and the locations they come from, that that seems to be the fact that people that live in this city, the members that come from the city, basically don't see it as a problem but I can assure you in the rural parts of this province it is a problem and a very serious problem. I don't know how we can resolve it but I have documentation, I brought it last time when I spoke on this bill, I have more documentation with me this time on this particular bill and possibly it should be dealt with at two levels, an urban problem and a rural problem. Maybe we are barking up into the trees and that the problem doesn't exist in the city at all, but I certainly say it does in the country.

By eliminating this legislation and giving the bill a six-month hoist certainly isn't going to solve the problem as has been related by the member who presented that bill.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, it is rather strange that this bill has come in on two different occasions, two different years, both by rural members, both by rural members, not a member from an urban community but by rural members. So I say, it is a problem in the rural parts of this province and I don't think that I have the authority from the people in my constituency to stand here today and support a hoist bill which will just sweep the problem under the rug for another year. I don't think that's what we're sent here for. I think we're here to deal with the matter and it's one that we shouldn't, just by this simple six-month hoist program, say well, let's sweep it under the rug for another year and let's not get involved again because it isn't a problem in my constituency.

So I suggest, such as the Honourable Member for St. James raised a moment ago, raising the age of majority is still not going to solve the problem. I find it rather strange, Mr. Speaker, that years ago when we used to open the liquor bill up in this Legislature, the churches and the temperance people, the missionary societies used to be here in large numbers to deal with matters pertaining to liquor. For some strange reason, the last three or four years that group no longer appears on the scene. I recognize that we can't, as legislators alone, deal with this problem by ourselves. If the churches of the province and the temperance people and those that want to monitor these difficulties are not going to get involved, we, as legislators, will not solve the problem by ourselves. It will not be. But I know there's certainly a general trend of the reduction of the drinking ages across Canada and the United States and it runs all the way from 18 to 21, but I daresay there are very few rural communities in this province, you travel today and you go and ask them if they don't have some problems with the alcohol consumption amongst young people.m\$

I can read a letter here that came from the principal of one of the larger schools in my constituency and read excerpts from it as he tells me what happened in the last 12 months. He said the rather common reaction of "there's no problem appears to be more a myth than fact. He said, "I would wonder whether it is not really a way of saying: 'I don't want to get involved.'" And that's the principle of one of the schools writing me a letter and suggesting that using that type of a dream or of an approach to the question, "I don't want to get involved." He said, "As of last week's meeting we reviewed the names of 9 senior students who were suspended for two weeks because of the result of a couple of mickeys and some beer at noon hour."

He goes on, and he said, "And another day some concerned parents alerted us that their sons had been, as well as a few other students, simply spent the afternoon drinking rather than being at school. During examinations in January, he points out here, "two boys undertook to buy some wine at the local liquor store, consume it, and then appeared in the afternoon to write their examinations."



Now gentlemen, Mr. Speaker. if those are not simple facts that there are some problems in our educational system with the age of drinking then I think that we'd better take another approach to the whole matter and I do apologize, it may not be a problem amongst the urban members but I certainly see it as a problem and I think that possibly, as the Member for Elmwood said, that we are not maybe enforcing it as well as we can, but the enforcement of it doesn't seem to solve the problem.

So I certainly can't support the hoist motion. I think parents, educators, students, have drawn to my attention and more or less basically tell me, as their MLA, that I should recognize the problem and I should be standing up and doing something on their behalf. So, Mr. Speaker, I'll be opposing the hoist motion and supporting the bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong debate on this. What we're dealing with is the suggestion that this be hoisted for six months and frankly I think it's an excellent idea. You know what bothers me about this whole approach is that I think we're trying to salve our conscience here. I think that's basically what you're doing. We're not trying to resolve a problem, we're trying to be nice guys, we're trying to salve our conscience, say, "We did something."

I'm reminded when I was in the Soviet Union in 1972 as part of a Canadian delegation, education delegation, I asked them about whether they had a problem in their school system or at the universities with regard to drugs. I didn't specify hard drugs or soft drugs and they said, "Oh, absolutely not." And I said, "Now, come on, this is worldwide. We know that soft drugs in particular are becoming very prevalent." And they said, "Oh, no, we haven't got a problem there." I said, "Well, how can that be?" They said, "It's against the law, and if it's against the law, it doesn't exist." And that's what we're trying to do here. We're saying that because it's going to be against the law for an 18-year old to go to a beverage room or into a beer parlour or to the liquor store, that therefore the problem is going to disappear." How naive are we? It's not going to disappear.

You know, the examples that the Member for Roblin gave out, the princip who alsaid nine students, that some students would rather drink or spent an afternoon drinking trather than going to school, what he's talking about is truancy and I have news for him, that's taking place all the time. I don't know about him — I won't cast doubts on him — but I know I played hookey many a time

**A MEMBER:** Shame.

**MR. MILLER:** . . . and I may not have gone to a beer parlour but I sure as hell went to a theatre, and I suspect that I've lots of company in this august Assembly.

**SOME MEMBERS:** No, no.

**MR. MILLER:** I suspect — I didn't say I'm sure — I suspect. There are some that are holier-than-thou, and I wouldn't impute anything to them, that's true.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, what bothers me, as I say, that this is really an attempt to, not to really deal with a problem but to say, "Well, we have outlawed it and therefore the problem disappears."

**MR. GREEN:** It's like anti-semitism.

**MR. MILLER:** You know, it's like my colleague says, like anti-semitism. You pass a law that says there shall not be any bias, there's no bias. If there's no bias, it doesn't exist. And, you know, this is how people can hide. —(Interjection)— Yes, in the Soviet Union certainly there is no bias against anyone, only I'd hate to live there. Because in fact it is a lot of nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill passes an 18-year old who may go to the liquor store and buy some alcoholic beverage will be tried, if he's caught he'll be tried, he'll be tried not as a juvenile, because he's an adult. He's now achieved the age of majority. He's tried in Adult Court because he is, in fact, an adult under our law. He signs contracts and he will be held to them. He signs agreements and he will be sued. He makes a purchase and if he doesn't pay, he will be sued, and if there is a fine, he will have to pay it, and if there is a jail sentence attached to it, he'll have to go to jail. So, Mr. Speaker, if a young lad of 18 does what he otherwise will do in every other instance, in this case, however, he is contravening a law, he is a juvenile, we consider him a juvenile, but he will be tried and convicted as if he were an adult. There's a total inconsistency here, Mr. Speaker.



It's a consistency that I say, with all respect to honourable members, if there is a problem this isn't going to solve it. It may ease your conscience, it may salve your conscience, it may make you feel good, you may be able to go back to your constituents and say, "We outlawed it," but the problem is not going to go away if there is a problem.

You know, I haven't heard the word "marijuana" spoken in this debate, or "pot." Do you think there's a problem with liquor? Let me tell you, the prevalency of marijuana, soft drugs, being used by teenagers today in our society, is greater, is greater in my opinion than liquor.

**MR. GREEN:** But it's illegal.

**MR. MILLER:** But it's illegal so it doesn't exist. That's the point. That's the point I'm trying to make. We say it doesn't exist because it's illegal. Well nonsense. Go to your junior high schools, go to your high schools, go to your universities and you'll see it everywhere and I predict the day will come, in the not too distant future, when the Federal Government will place marijuana, soft drugs, under the Food and Drug Administration, it will be decriminalized . . .

**A MEMBER:** Then it will be all right.

**MR. MILLER:** . . . because it's inevitable, just as prohibition didn't work, similarly the Canada prohibition on soft drugs isn't going to work and the prohibition of this kind isn't going to work. The student who wants to imbibe will imbibe. And let me tell you, I'm not prepared, really, to simply casually say, "Well, let's do it, I'll go to bed tonight feeling better." The fact of the matter is that if there is a problem then it is a problem of the home, it's a problem of the school, it's a problem of society and you're not going to solve that problem by standing here in all solemnity and saying, "Yea," and passing rejecting a motion for a six-month hoist and then voting to outlaw and make illegal a particular sort of cultural activity in our society. The fact of the matter is, I've never liked, I still don't like, now the Minister of Public Works indicated, it's political, it's good politics. Well, he and I don't share the same view. I'm sorry, I feel I'm elected here to show some leadership and not just to follow. I've done that all my public life and by some reason, which I can't frankly understand, I have been re-elected too.

**A MEMBER:** I can't understand it either.

**MR. MILLER:** He can't understand it either, but I've taken some very unpopular decisions in my time because I felt it was right to do so. So the fact that 80 percent, or 60 percent, or 95 percent of people may at the moment jump on that bandwagon doesn't mean that I have to jump on that bandwagon.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just some slight little thing which people like to make it out, I think it's a serious one. I think that a six-month hoist is certainly in order and if during that six-month period, I say to the members opposite, dig into it, don't just come up with a letter from some principal or other. Talk to your students, talk to your 18-year olds, find out whether it's prevalent. I don't want to see a law passed for 100 18-year olds in the province and 18,000 should be affected, because that's what you're dealing with, these are the figures. There's about 18,000 to 20,000 18-year olds. How many of those really create a problem? Since when are we going to pass laws which are going to affect 18,000 because there are problems with 100 or 150.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I think we're approaching this the wrong way. I would support the hoist because I think it makes sense. I don't think we should blindly jump into it. And simply because some other jurisdictions have done it, I don't know what the results are there yet. With all due respect to some of the figures we've been given the proof is not yet in and there are some jurisdictions where it is 21. Well, maybe we should go to 21. Certainly if we move at all on this then change the age of majority. Do not treat them as half or seven-eighths adult when they are juvenile and put them in a position where they are acting as adults under the age of majority, but when they contravene this particular law, they are treated as juveniles but charged and convicted as if they were adults.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the six-month hoist.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Meer for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I intend to be very very brief. I want to ensure that my position and my vote will be understood so I would like to take a minute or so.

I might say, first of all, that I have no ideology hangup on this, I've no great pangs of conscience. I'm not worried about advantage or disadvantages, political advantages or disadvantages, but I am concerned with the problem. I say to the Member for Roblin that all of us, I think all of us — I

think he was making a point, I understood what he was saying — but all of us in the city also feel that there is a real problem.

Last year when this was brought in I explained the same thing, that it wasn't a question of ideology and so on, but that I was going to support the bill because I said that I wouldn't want to let the honourable member give us the impression that if this bill is passed then there's no problem, because he said, "Let's not sweep the problem under the rug." There will be a problem. I said that I would support it. I mentioned in caucus and I can reveal that now, to our caucus, that I would not support it, to some of the people that were doing a bit of lobbying, that I wouldn't support it if there were some changes to make sure that the law would be enforced and I think that is the best way to rectify it, to get to the root of the problem, to make sure that there's more enforcement of the law. I said if that wasn't the case then I would support this bill, not that I thought it was a cure-all, but if there is any doubt in my mind, I felt that it might do a little bit of good because I was concerned, I've seen what alcohol could do, I've seen that to people pretty close to me and so on and I felt that it could help some, and that if I was wrong, that if it didn't help, it wouldn't do any harm. And that was the position that I took. This year it was brought in again. This year I made exactly the same speech. I will not back down. I haven't changed my mind. I will support the bill. I will support the bill if it comes to a vote.

But I want to say that I think that I'm being consistent. I will also support the hoist. I will support the hoist. Now there are different people, there are certain people — and it's been explained in this House — they support a hoist. They bring in a motion for different reasons, some of them to have another chance to speak a second time, as was done in another debate, and some of them — and they admit it — it is to kill the bill. But there is also another group that are saying, "Well, all right, let's look at it, let's see what can be done and then if not, we'll bring it back." Now I would support the hoist because I feel exactly the way I did when I spoke earlier in this debate this year and last year, that I would like to see this government — and this is a new government and I hope they'll be more successful than the past government — I would like to see them before the next session come in with some new ways to make sure that the laws will be enforced, the present laws that we have. It's no use making laws if they're not going to be enforced.

So I don't know exactly what kind of support my honourable friend has from the other side. If he has a fair amount, or a good support, it's going to go through and I'm going to vote for it. This thing will be defeated and then the bill will come in and I'll vote for it. If it doesn't go through it means that there are other people on the government side — that's the only way it's not going to go through — that they feel maybe they should have another look at it, that maybe they can bring more teeth in the laws in enforcing the laws and they plan to do that and I would be satisfied on this. But I feel, as I say, I feel the same, I will support, I will vote in favour of the hoist, hoping that this government, this new government, the Attorney-General, this was brought in by the Deputy Speaker, the Member for Radisson, that he felt it was the enforcement, and even members that are supporting the bill and I was one of them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that if this is passed, this hoist is passed, that the government will come in, by the way, to have the enforcement. If not, if the government feels that it can't be done well then the member will have enough support, they will vote against this and when the bill comes up I will support the bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take much time. I have already spoken once on this bill but I think members would recognize I also am in a peculiar position where there are times when I have to voice more than one line of argument on behalf of our caucus. —(Interjection)— That's right.

But I did want to say something though because I was tempted by some of the remarks that were made in the debate today, and I think it does deserve a response, and I excuse myself, Mr. Speaker, if I use a more contemporary grammatical allusion than the Member for Inkster, who referred back to Ibsen, which I thought contained very appropriate choice of phrases to act as the theme of his speech. I would go back to an American playwright, William Inge, who wrote a play called "The Rainmaker" which opens up where there was one of these evangelical preachers who becomes known as one of the great, sort of, moralists of his time and has great capacity to rise up in righteous indignation against the sins and inequities of society, usually with a totally and complete sort of rigidity about the position in which he stood, and one of the comments that comes from that play, which I have always remembered because it sometimes reminds me of things I hear in this House, he said, "That man is so busy being right he forgets what's good." And Mr. Speaker, that is the problem, that sometime we are so busy in this House trying to be right, we forget what is good.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, . . . some of the, I would have to say, the answers that have been



expressed by proponents of this particular bill. I say this not to be harsh or critical of them but I assume, as does the Minister of Highways, that we are dealing with a pragmatic problem. And the pragmatic problem is, how do you cope with the problem and difficulty of young people drinking? Not just young people, but the general question of alcoholism and the serious tragedies that have ensued from that problem in our society. I assumed, Mr. Speaker, that when the bill was introduced, the proposer of that bill and the advocates of it were equally of a mind that it is a major problem and they saw this as the solution. But I assume that they would not in any way bother to — that they wouldn't simply deal with the question, not in a singular way, but deal with it in a total way. And I found to my surprise that after we'd initiated the bill and gone to debate, and we got to the Estimates of the Minister of Health and Social Development where we dealt with the Estimates of the Alcohol Foundation of Manitoba, and we found the government had cut those Estimates by close to 20 percent, where some members of this House spent many hours dealing with how do you cope with the problems of alcoholism? I did not see the member who moved this bill dealing with that debate. I didn't see the Member for Roblin dealing with it. He has told us, he has risen in this House to say, "Well, the urban members obviously don't care, and they don't see the problem of drunkenness amongst their young people." Well, we do, Mr. Speaker, and I spent seven or eight hours in this House, during the debate on those Estimates, trying to deal with that problem, and I didn't see the Member for Roblin around at the same time. Nor did I see the proponent of this bill.

So Mr. Speaker, I had to conclude that maybe they're not all that serious in terms of the problem of alcoholism and the problem of drinking. It may be that there could be other reasons for simply providing the bill. And I would plead with the Minister of Highways, if he's interested in pragmatic solutions, and looking for ways of dealing with the issue, then he should maybe reconsider his vote. Because I think the first requirement of anybody who takes that position is to ask themselves, how adequate are the solutions that we are now applying in the Province of Manitoba? And one thing came very clear from those debates on Estimates, that we do not have adequate solutions at all; we neither spend enough money, nor have enough incentive or enough support for the kind of problems that exist. In fact, we're cutting back. The Minister of Highways and the Member for Roblin, said, "A terrible problem in the schools," and yet one of the first programs that was cut back in this year's budget is the preventive education programs in our schools. Now, how do they justify that stand? How do we justify cutting back on education on alcoholism in the schools, and at the same time vote for raising the age? How do you reconcile that basic, sort of contradiction? That you have to, because if you're concerned about young people drinking, then you should be concerned about it in all facets.

I will add one piece of advice, perhaps, from urban young people and teenagers, who I spent a lot of time talking to about this issue, because they are as much concerned about it as anyone in rural Manitoba. They are simply saying, "This measure won't work. If you think you're going to solve the problem of our own peer group drinking at this age by raising the age, then you don't know what you are talking about." And they simply saw it as a facile piece of hypocrisy by politicians who are trying to make a name, or trying to make a gesture, and not really come to grips with the real issue that exists. And they were asking for measures, Mr. Speaker, they were asking the people in this Legislature to come to grips with the issue, to deal with the problems adequately, to deal with them as they should be dealt with, not simply to make a gesture in order to win some votes of the folks back home.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why I oppose the bill. I do not think that the proposer of this bill has demonstrated to this House that he is totally and completely committed to dealing with the problem of drinking amongst young people, dealing with it in all its aspects and all its ways, but simply trying to put forward a motion which is going to catch a little bit of headlines, sort of, in the weekly paper. And if I felt that there was really a concerted, direct effort on the part of that member and his colleagues to come to grips with the issue, to deal with the total issue of drinking in our society, and to support measures by this government — you know, we have the facts and figures have been brought out by other members, that we derive \$70 million worth of revenue from the sale of alcohol in the Province of Manitoba, and we cut back the expenditures for the Alcohol Foundation by 20 percent. Now, that does not demonstrate to me that anyone is being serious about the problem of drinking in the Province of Manitoba, and certainly not the government. So when the day comes that we can show that we have tried a full scale of measures and they have been found wanting, and the only other thing is left, then we'll deal with the age. But we're going at it the wrong way, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I would reiterate my opposition to this bill and support the hoist.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The motion before the House is an amendment to Bill No. 5, that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" in the first line and substituting the following: "Bill No. 5, An Act to Amend The Liquor Control Act, be



not now read a second time but be read this day six months hence."

**QUESTION put on the sub-amendment and carried.**

**MR. DRIEDGER:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Has the member got support? —(Interjection)— Call in the members.

The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that all the words after the "that" in the first line of Bill No. 5 be deleted, and the substitution to read as follows: "Bill No. 5, An Act to Amend The Liquor Control Act, be not now read a second time, but be read this day six months hence."

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

**YEAS:** *Messrs. Adam, Axworthy, Barrow, Bostrom, Boyce, Cherniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Hyde, Jenkins, Kovnats, McBryde, Miller, Minaker, Parasiuk, Pawley, Spivak, Steen, Uskiw.*

**NAYS:** *Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Brown, Cosens, Craik, Domino, Driedger, Enns, Galbraith, Gourlay, Johnston, Jorgenson, Lyon, McGill, McKenzie, Mercier, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Wilson.*

**MR. CLERK:** Yeas 24, Nays 21.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I declare the motion carried.  
The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would call third readings on amended Bills 10 and 68.

### THIRD READINGS — AMENDED BILLS

**BILLS 10, 34, 40, 42, 52, 54 and 56** as amended, ere each read a third time and passed.

**BILL 67** was read a third time and passed. (on division)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to further debate the bill, I simply want it on the record that the official opposition opposes that legislation.

**BILL 68** was read a third time and passed. (on division)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to record that we are opposed to that measure, as well, and want it recorded.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 53.

**MOTION presented and carried,** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, with the Hon. Member for Radisson in the Chair.

### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

**CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats:** The matter before the House is Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba)(2). Page-by-page? Agreed? (Agreed)

**BILL NO. 53 was read page-by-page and passed.**

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### THIRD READINGS

**BILL 53** was read a third time and passed.

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

**MR. MINAKER:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House — unfortunately when we were approving page-by-page, the Legislative Solicitor was not able to contact me. Under Clause 67(2) in the first line there is a typographic error where it says, "Where a corporation is guilty of a first offence," it should in actual fact be "is guilty of an offence." I wonder how we could maybe get that typographic error corrected so that in the first line of 67(2), "Where a corporation is guilty of a first offence," that the words "a first" be deleted . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I believe the correct procedure is to revert back to Committee stage.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, we asked for leave, we have received leave.

**MR. SPEAKER:** It's nothing more than just a correction in the typing, then. Are you ready for the question on third reading? The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I'd just like to comment that this has been a vexatious problem, not only in Winnipeg and in Manitoba but in other provinces and I deplore the fact that it took the Federal Government so long to bring in their legislation, which is an attempt to prevent the usuary that has been taking place up to now.

According to the newspapers, there have some prosecutions launched — or civil action taken, I'm not sure which — this last winter after the last tax discounting season. This is a seasonal business, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know what the results have been in that connection.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the passing of this bill will not solve the problem unless there is proper enforcement and proper monitoring, and I would expect that between the Minister of Finance and the Attorney-General there will be continuous monitoring as is provided under this Act, and that there will be a constant effort to ensure that the tax discounters do not blithely ignore the legislation, as I believe they have done in the past, and do as they please with people who are subject to the pressures that are brought about by the easy, quick refund money advertising that has taken place in the past.

So I would like to urge and actually impose an obligation on the Minister of Finance and the Attorney-General to enforce this law, and to make sure that the people who are supposed to be protected by the law will indeed have the benefit of government efforts to ensure that this new law will be effective.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say on the point made that is precisely why the legislation has been changed. The Act that was passed a few years ago was found this year to be unenforceable and there is even some concern that the federal Act itself will not be as completely enforceable as they had thought. The bill that has been presented by the Member for St. James is tighter legislation than the federal legislation, but the advice that the Attorney-General received on the former legislation in Manitoba was that we would not be able to make it stick and that was the purpose of the Member for St. James bringing in the new Act. So another year will tell us, and passing the Act now allows us to get into business prior to the next season.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**BILLS** 13, 16, 63 were each read a third time and passed.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, I was in another committee when this bill was being reviewed by Private Bills' Committee and again, unfortunately, we don't have Hansard so I don't even know what was discussed in committee. I would not make a big issue of it, Mr. Speaker, but I do think that this is a shortcut which is taken to get around the legal problem. I don't like this shortcut because it means that the Legislature is making it possible for the club to confiscate the rights of members. There are people who are shareholders on the record.

I read the Hansard on the speech given by the mover of this bill where he said that there are estates involved and I think that whatever is done should have been done under the supervision of a court or of a public trustee. I think there are ways to have done it so that it would be clear that the rights of individuals who cannot receive notice, will have been protected. I don't think there is any great harm done, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter of principle here which has been ignored. I recall, I think it was when the Member for Inkster spoke, that he called on the Attorney-General to be available to give his opinion because the Attorney-General is charged with the general responsibility. When I spoke, I think I also referred to the Minister of Consumer Affairs who is responsible for the Provincial Secretary's Office. The Premier, a former Attorney-General, also is involved in this and I would like to hear why it is that the government, the responsible Ministers, could not come up with a solution to this problem, and I don't deny that there is a problem, but a solution to this problem which will ensure that a third party or an outside party or a governmentally appointed body would protect the rights of the people who clearly, by the entire purpose of this Act, are being adversely affected by the power given to the directors of this club or this corporation, as it is, to impose an annual fee and upon non-payment of that fee, to confiscate the shares that are owned by people who admittedly will never and are not likely to and will not have received notice of the effect of what was happening.

Mr. Speaker, I think, on the record probably, the share value was \$100.00. It may be now, and I don't know whether that evidence was given — I know I asked for it — whether the amount per share is worth \$2.00 or is worth \$2,000.00. I don't know that. But the principal is one that should have been protected and I have not heard that the Minister of Consumer Affairs nor the Attorney-General nor, as I say, the Premier who was an Attorney-General have ensured that there is that kind of protection.

One thing I did when I spoke on this bill on second reading was to suggest that there cannot be urgency in this since the charter was granted in 1921, and since the problem of course, by affluxion of time, has become accentuated but one more year would not have done any harm, I would have thought that the responsible Ministers, whom I have indicated, would have seen to it that this bill was pulled, given a six-month hoist, or laid over so that they could ensure that by the next session, the proper legislative action could be taken after it is certain that the people whose shares will be confiscated — I used that word several times, I mean it in that very sense — will have been protected.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment. Unfortunately this is a situation in which many curling clubs have found themselves by having incorporated as share capital companies many years ago when the ability to incorporate as a non-profit corporation was not available. With voluntary officers, they have all found themselves in a position where they are unable to trace original shareholders and the shareholders have never been acknowledged as an important part of the curling club operations. It has always been the annual membership list that have been the important persons in the operations of curling clubs. The provision that is outlined in The Corporations Act is a very difficult one to follow, simply because of the amount of time involved, and the result is always the same, Mr. Speaker, as long as the corporations are confined to non-profit organizations, I frankly don't see any harm in this kind of procedure as a savings to the volunteer non-profit organizations that are involved.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried. (On Division)**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**BILL NO. 55 — AN ACT FOR THE RELIEF OF  
INGIBJORG ELIZABETH ALDA HAWES**



**MR. DAVID BLAKE** presented Bill No. 55, An Act for the relief Relief of Ingibjorg Elizabeth Alda Hawes, for third reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I consider this one of the worst cases made out for this type of bill, than many others I have seen both pass and failed in this House. There has become a tendency in this House, and I have been witness to it and I'm sure I have been party to it, of feeling, well, there is relief asked and it is a sad a pathetic case so let's grant relief. In this case, of all, Mr. Speaker, I have learned and I have a newspaper report because, again, I was not able to be present during the discussion on that — the report and the Hansard report on the debate, indicates that there was the clear fault of a lawyer in not commencing action in time. But, Mr. Speaker, I have found nothing about why that lawyer wasn't sued, and now that we lawyers are under a compulsion to pay an insurance fee for fault —(Interjection)— for malpractice, for negligence — that's what I was looking for — there is no indication that there was any effort made to collect from the insurer, who I believe works with the Law Society. You cannot get a licence to operate, which is what lawyers do, you know, to do business, to carry on in the practice of their profession, unless annually the fee is paid, and together with that there is a reimbursement fund established, and there is insurance, compulsory insurance, required to be purchased, except by special waiver.

I have not heard anything about the lawyer being sued, about the Law Society being sued, and about a failure. I would think, Mr. Speaker, again, this matter has dragged, I believe, since 1973 — I think that is the year of the accident. I would have thought that in all wisdom of the . . . again, I charge government officials with a greater responsibility, to see to it that the lawyer was sued, that the Law Society was involved in somehow looking to the insurer to pay, and then, if there was still grievous damages suffered by the person for whom this bill is being brought, then would be an occasion to come back into the House with a bill for the Act for the Relief of this lady, and apparently she has suffered badly.

I have to say that this bill is probably an Act for the Relief of this lady who was injured, and for the relief of the lawyer who was at fault, and for the relief of the Law Society insurer who apparently is being absolved of any obligation to pay. I think that therefore the bill is premature and I would have thought that before it was brought in, there would have been action taken or a legal opinion expressed that no action is possible' but in this case I think it was suggested by the mover of the motion that what is the sense of suing — I may be quoting wrongly — as I understood it, he said something like, what's the sense of suing for \$1 million when the lawyer isn't able to pay it? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that in the interests of the legal profession and in the interests of the administration of justice and in the principles involved in passing Acts for the Relief of in this Legislature, there ought to be a proper investigation made and assurance that people at fault are first charged with the responsibility for fault, and then I can understand, Acts for the relief of.

I read the comments by the Member for Inkster on this and he, too, has indicated that he feels that there has to be a strong reason given and that what was proposed was inadequate. It seems to me the Law Society ought to be brought into the picture or, as the Member for Inkster said, and I hesitated for a minute because I wanted to remember clearly what he said, he said either change the Statute of Limitations or stop every time that somebody comes with An Act for the Relief of, that we stop passing those so easily.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MR. WILSON:** Just very briefly, to respond to the Member for St. Johns, the problem that we had on the committee dealing with this, was that evidence before us indicated that while the Law Society generally carries insurance for their members, that due to an error and mixup in the office that may very well be — it was suggested that Mrs. Hawes would not be able to get any money from the Law Society because they had dropped their insurer, namely Traveller's Insurance, in favour of another company, a new company, for a cheaper rate and why they attempted to do this, I don't know, but the agreement was that Traveller's Insurance would not accept any cases prior to June 1, 1977, and that the new insurance company would not accept any cases but only those after June 1, 1977, so in fact there is a vacuum there and due to an error by the Law Society, Mr. Shewchuk obviously doesn't have any insurance and it was suggested that he would not be able to pay.

Dealing with the facts before our committee, it seemed to be that a year from now, Mrs. Hawes will be seeking the same relief from this committee because it would seem to me we were going

to put her through hell in that we were going to ask her to have to appear in front of the board of inquisition, or the Law Society grievance committee, which would question her regarding why the Law Society should be paying her any money, and unless she was able to retain expensive legal help — I understand she may not qualify for Legal Aid — it could be a serious financial nightmare for her.

So it seemed to me, in support of my colleague from Minnedosa, that dealing with the very severe hardship of this case, we felt that Mrs. Hawes, if she didn't get relief this year, would come back next year because of the possible word on the street that unfortunately members of the Law Society do not seem to ever want to pay out to aggrieved people and I would suggest — and I'm crystal balling, and this these are my own personal comments — that Mrs. Hawes will not be successful in her particular striving for funds to the extent that she would have got from Autopac, from the Law Society.

So with those few comments, I wanted to say that while I agree that relief possibly may be premature, when you have a feeling regarding the evidence that is before you, that the so-called premature relief would be solved if she was successful, I felt that in light of the fact of the mistake by the Law Society, that this woman would not have any coverage and she would be back a year from now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Johns, in my view, is absolutely right, but in this particular case, and I wanted to put it on the record that usually I don't support such motions, but nevertheless the justice of the situation is that this woman has already been deprived because the system is not working in this particular instance, and when the Member for St. Johns says there is probable cause for action against the lawyer and against the Law Society and others, perhaps, nevertheless that's a long, lengthy process and as he pointed out, there have been several years go by already.

I supported this in committee and I support it in the House, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. BLAKE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, just a closing word. I think the members opposite have said —(Interjection)—

**QUESTION put, MOTION lost.**

### THIRD READINGS

**BILL NO. 37** was read a third time and passed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 17, please.

### REPORT STAGE

#### **BILL NO. 17 — AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE BRANDON GENERAL HOSPITAL**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. SAUL A. MILLER:** Mr. Chairman, I move seconded by the Member for St. Boniface, that Section 3 of Bill 17 be struck out and the following section be substituted therefor:

Mr. Speaker, it's a very lengthy amendment and really I don't want to take the time of the House. I think everybody has a copy, so if it can be considered as read, I would just like to explain what I have in mind. (Agreed)

Board of Director.

3(1) The affairs of the corporation shall be managed by a board of 15 directors of whom 6 shall be elected from life members, 2 shall be the directors mentioned under subsection (3) and 7 shall be persons appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

3(2) Each year the members of the corporation at the annual meeting of the corporation shall elect 2 life members as directors for a term expiring on the day of the annual meeting held in the 3rd year after the year of the election and such other directors for shorter terms of office as may



be required to fill vacancies in the elected directors.

3(3) The Mayor of the City of Brandon and one other member of the council of the City of Brandon appointed by resolution of the council are ex-officio directors of the corporation.

3(4) Every municipality, other than the City of Brandon, that makes grants to the corporation in accordance with an Act to provide for the making of grants in the Brandon General Hospital, being Chapter 76 of the Statutes of Manitoba, 1968, and every other municipality that makes an annual grant to the corporation of such sums as may from time to time be established for the purposes of this subsection in the by-laws of the corporation, is entitled to be represented at the annual meeting, and any other general meeting, of the members of the corporation by one member of the council of that municipality appointed by resolution of the council and that person is ex-officio a member of the corporation and has all the privileges of a member of the corporation.

3(7) If an elected director resigns, dies, or moves from the community, the remaining directors may appoint another life member of the corporation as a substitute director to hold office until the next annual meeting of the corporation.

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, this does not really change the bill itself. Basically the bill, the Brandon General Hospital needs a new bill, I recognize that and I am not in opposition to it. They are living under a very old bill back to 1883 and amended back in 1890, so certainly it needs updating and I don't quarrel with that. However, I think that just as we a very few minutes ago dealt with a bill introduced by the Member for Rock Lake, the one dealing with the Wawanesa and District Memorial Hospital Association, that bill did have in it a concept which I think is more up to date and that is that citizens, all citizens, have a right to participate and be members of the board, not just a select few, a certain number.

The way this Bill 17, the Brandon General Hospital Bill now reads, the only people who can be members of boards of directors are two members representing the Brandon Council and those who are known as life members. Life members are people who make a contribution. Again, this in a sense harkens back to the times when hospitals were built by private effort, by an organization or by the generosity of a particular person or by an endowment of one kind or another. That day is long past. There may be the odd funds raised during the construction of a hospital to furnish a room or something of that similar nature, but by and large, hospitals today are paid through the public purse, they're paid through the Consolidated Fund, they're paid by the taxes which all citizens pay, be it income tax, corporate tax, sales tax, liquor tax, whatever licensing, whatever it is.

And so to continue the kind of self-perpetuating very limited kind of board of directors that this bill, even in its modern, updated version, seems to suggest, is, I think, wrong. What I am suggesting is basically this, that there shall be two from the Brandon City Council because they are elected people and reflect the community, that as well there should be six elected from the life members. I recognize their interest in this and I recognize they have a role to play but that seven should be nominated or named by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council as in the case of the Health Sciences Centre, as in the case of Seven Oaks Hospital and as in the case of other, Wawanesa which has just passed. Because it makes sense that the hospital boards are not the private preserve of a select few number of people of a self-perpetuating body. So for that reason, I make this amendment, this being a Private Members' Bill I bring in this amendment to broaden the base of the hospital to make it more truly and in fact to recognize what it is. It is a general hospital serving the Brandon area and it represents all the people in Manitoba but certainly serves the people in Brandon and, as I say, it's financed entirely from the Consolidated Fund of the province. So the province, through its appointments should make representation and I've no doubt at all, the Cabinet will get names submitted to it, recommendations, they'll go through it and they'll place people on there who they know have an interest in the hospital as they do at the Health Sciences Centre.

I'm recognizing the value of those members who have spent many years on the board and they still have representation, and the Brandon Council which, because they too are an elected body and have an interest will also be members of the board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was not a member of the committee that dealt with this bill in the hearings. I don't believe anyone from Brandon appeared on this bill although I did speak to somebody from the hospital. I indicated the nature of the amendment that I was going to bring in, and I indicated that it is my intention to bring it in at report stage.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to hold this up. I urge members to support this amendment because I think it improves the bill. It brings Brandon Hospital more in tune with the times as they are today and as I say, we just finished a few minutes ago passing the Wawanesa District Hospital which embodies in it the new concept that these institutions are publicly owned and should not be governed by a select group, self-perpetuating, as they have in the past. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Shall the amendment be concurred in? The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there's a disposition to conclude the debate and the disposition of this particular bill before 5:30.

**QUESTION put on the amendment and lost.**

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, the House Leader has advised me that he wishes to come back into the House at 8 o'clock but go immediately to committee and I've indicated to him that I will make my best efforts to go immediately to committee but the honourable member knows that there are members in the Chamber who have a right to certain procedures, but I announce publicly that we will attempt to go as quickly as we can into committee when we come here tonight with the House waiting for us.

### **BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. FOX:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a change on Law Amendments. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface to be taken off and the Member for Selkirk to be placed thereon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is that agreeable? (Agreed)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 8 o'clock tonight.