

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
9:30 o'clock, Friday, April 28, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry - I beg to present the Eighth Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their eight report: Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 68 - An Act respecting Insurance of Residents of the Province in respect of the costs of Medical Services.

No. 102 - An Act to amend The Health Services Act.

No. 105 - An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

No. 118 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (6).

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also consider Bills:

No. 78 - The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation Act.

No. 93 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (5).

No. 110 - An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

No. 115 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion  
Introduction of Bills

I'd like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery on my right where we have 55 Grade 5 students from the Faraday School. These students are under the direction of Miss Stadnyk and Miss Dickson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to place on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 65 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Burrows, made March 27, 1967.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a motion I'd like to move, be leave, substituting some names on two of the Committees. I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that, by leave, the name of Mr. Stanes be removed from the Special Committee of the House appointed to examine the statutes and regulations governing professional associations, and that the name of Mr. Steen be substituted therefor; and that the name of Mr. McKenzie be removed from the Special Committee of the House to give consideration to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, and that the name of Mr. Hamilton be substituted therefor.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JACOB FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you mind repeating that?

MR. FROESE: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would allow me to tell the House that the Special Committee on Automobile Insurance will meet at 1:30 this afternoon in Room 254. Notices will be sent to the members of the committee.

(MR. EVANS cont'd).....All members of the House are naturally welcome to attend. I expect it will be a short meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Committee of the Whole House.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I asked him yesterday concerning a special problem with frozen fish. Does he have any further information from his department: as to the action that might be taken under either the federal support program or any provincial action?

MR. EVANS: No. There's nothing further. I really don't expect anything further for a day or - well, until the first of the week.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I see that he is engaged in another question period now but maybe somebody could divert his attention to...

Could the Minister advise me whether there were any advertisements regarding public hearings in connection with the Minimum Wage Board prior to the advertisement which appeared in the newspaper of April 27, 1967; or is the Minister aware of any previous advertisements?

MR. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any previous advertisement.

MR. GREEN: Can the Minister -- he can check to see whether there were previous advertisements, but this ad refers to a hearing which will take place on Thursday, May 4, 1967, and it says that: "Those submitting briefs are requested to provide the Chairman with eight copies of the submission at least seven days before the public hearing." Now Mr. Speaker, this ad appeared yesterday so that there would be ...

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable gentleman have a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'll come right to it. Between the date of the advertisement and the date of the public hearing there are seven days, and the advertisement that was published requires eight copies of a brief, at least seven days prior to the hearings, and I just wonder whether this is an attempt to foreclose briefs or what the reason is.

MR. BAIZLEY: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there's been a typographical error.

MR. GREEN: Is the Minister then going to see that there is an ad published which will explain to people when they can submit briefs?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Works. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend could inform the House as to whether or not the curfew law in respect of people being on the grounds of the Legislative Building complex, whether that curfew has been lifted in respect of other than Members of the Legislature in view of the late sittings the House is holding at the present time.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, there is no curfew but if there was one, it has been lifted.

MR. SPEAKER: I have a feeling that the Leader of the New Democratic Party had another thought in mind.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It is quite evident now that we will not reach his department, and he assured the House five months ago, I believe, that he would make a complete report on the Friendly Family Farms. Can we still have that assurance?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, we'll wait and see what progress is made on the estimates first.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works. The answer the honourable gentleman gave me in respect of the curfew, if indeed there is a curfew, if I understood my honourable friend correctly, was that the curfew had been lifted. Now does my honourable friend imply by that that the regulations have been altered from what they were Gazetted as being, or whether it's through ministerial discretion that it has been lifted?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Health. Now that the new Grace Hospital is opened in St. James, could the Minister tell the House as to the exact intentions for the old hospital the one on Sherburn Street?

HON. CHARLES WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, no, I cannot. The matter is under consideration by the Grace Hospital Board at the present time, and the

(MR. WITNEY cont'd).....Manitoba Hospital Commission.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, is there any truth to the rumour that the building is going to be completely torn down and a new one built? A completely new building?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard of the rumour at all.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this question to the Minister of Health as well. Could he inform the House if there are any plans insofar as the hospital at Churchill, Manitoba? I understand that this was originally in the plans; that the Willard Report recommended immediate reconstruction. Has he any plans for it?

MR. WITNEY: Again, Mr. Speaker, the matter of the Churchill Hospital is being negotiated with the Manitoba Hospital Commission and there are various negotiations taking place with the federal authorities too, as the hospital is built in the fort itself. This matter is at the moment with the Manitoba Hospital Commission and the new Chairman of the Board. They submitted a brief and that brief is being answered now.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister give any indication to the House when a decision might be arrived at insofar as the Churchill Hospital?

MR. WITNEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Committee of the Whole House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would propose that we call, as the first item of government business, the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary, which stands adjourned in the name of the Honourable Member from Logan, and I would be hopeful that we could dispose of that matter this morning, if possible, and assuming that the resolution passes, there is another subsequent resolution, a money resolution, that has to be brought in to permit the Statutory Orders Committee to sit after the session to consider the matters contained in this resolution and in other matters that will be referred to that committee. That's why I would like to call it first.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Logan has been delayed this morning. I know that he will be in attendance. I'm sure that he would have no objections at all to any other member desiring to speak on this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, in going back to the contents of the Throne Speech it's rather surprising that this resolution was introduced in the manner in which it appears before us, because on reading the Throne Speech, and I attempted to compare the reference to this matter in the Throne Speech with references to other matters wherein the government proposes to introduce legislation, and I can't really see any great difference. What was said in the Throne Speech is "approval will be sought for policies --" or "It is the intention of my Ministers to place before you certain proposals respecting a civil remedies code." Now, in reading the Throne Speech it appears that this term was used both for what the government proposes to do now and also with reference to legislation that was in itself presented to this House. Therefore, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that what was really said in the Throne Speech is that the government gave notice of its intention to present legislation dealing with the matters referred to in the Citizen's Remedies Code.

Now my Deputy Leader, I know, has covered quite adequately the history behind what has transpired in connection with matters related to this topic and there's no reason to review them again. However, I note that again, when the Honourable Minister introduced his White Paper, the statement was made that the government proposes to introduce legislation providing measures for extending remedies and relief provisions more adequately. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, what is meant here is the introduction of legislation to this House and not to some committee as the resolution states. Then again, some time later, I find it rather surprising to hear the Honourable Minister make the statement, and this I believe was at the time ... in introducing the present resolution, the Honourable Minister states that it is desirable to provide, or to put it in his own words, "that indeed the members of the Legislature ..." I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of referring the White Paper, as I've indicated, to a committee, is to provide an opportunity for the committee and indeed the members of the Legislature itself to express their opinions with respect to the principles which are outlined in the White Paper.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd),....

Now, Mr. Speaker, as has been outlined by my Deputy Leader, as the records of the proceedings of this House show, there has been ample opportunity for members of this House and for interested citizens in the community to present their views on all matters related to, or referred to in the Citizen's Remedies Code, and I would therefore suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this House do support our amendment and bring the legislation to this House and let's proceed with that which we have set out to do two or three years ago and bring it to some satisfactory conclusion rather than delay it in this manner, as no doubt this resolution would do.

It disturbs me also, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution had been on the Order Paper for quite some time. I haven't checked the journals for the exact date that the debate was adjourned but it seems to me that it was at least two or three weeks ago, and surely if the government is really intent on bringing into effect legislation arising from previous committee hearings, from previous deliberations of this House on matters referred to in the White Paper, it should have brought them before this House in ample time for this Legislature to give those matters its consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House that we hold this matter for the Honourable Member for Logan and proceed from there? Agreed.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that that would be understood, that we might come back to it at some later time this morning or in the course of the current Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we continue?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I had anticipated my colleague being here. I don't know if it would be in order for me to take any other line of action than that suggested by the Provincial Secretary, that it be held in his name. Otherwise I don't think that there's any legal right for me to suggest that the matter can be proceeded with while it stands in the name of my colleague for Logan. Possibly this would be the better way of doing it. I would give -- as far as I'm concerned, if the Honourable Member for Logan when he arrives does not wish to take part in the debate and it's agreeable to the House, that it be resurrected even during this morning's Session, I am even -- as far as we're concerned ...

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister has indicated that he is prepared to hold the matter in abeyance. Shall we move to the next item of business?

MR. LYON: ...Mr. Speaker, if there are any others who might wish to speak and in that time perhaps the Member for Logan would show up.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other members wishing to speak to this resolution before we proceed? I take it there are none. Shall we pass on to the next resolution? (Agreed)

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution...

MR. LYON: No, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister is not here. I don't know if the member for ...Oh. If the honourable member was prepared to go ahead we could call that item and make sure that the First Minister got the copy of the address. He will be back this weekend and will probably want to conclude this debate. --(Interjection)-- We'll stand it. I think we have enough work ahead of us in any case on another item. If you would now call the Committee of the Whole House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bills standing on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 38. Is the Committee ready to proceed? (Sections 1, 2 and 3 were read and passed.) The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I hope you bear with us a minute or two so that we can get our bills out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 4--passed; 5--

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Section No. 5 of Bill 38 be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put on this item, I'd like to say a few words on the subject. This is probably the section that received the greatest amount of discussion at the committee stage and on which most of the representations were made. During the course of the committee a number of amendments were proposed, and from the way the amendments were coming I think there was no way of establishing any pattern as to what the desire of the committee was. The motion to delete the section completely was made at the outset and did not pass, but the subsequent motions were some leaning towards more restriction and some leaning towards less restriction. It seems to me, however, that the outcome of the whole thing was that there was complete confusion in the committee, and I had the feeling, as the discussion went on, that in the light of this confusion the feeling on the part of many of the members that we're running up into a compromise here which might not in fact be satisfactory, I had the feeling that if the motion to delete had been moved at the end of this discussion, there would have been every likelihood that the whole section would have been deleted.

On listening to the presentations that were made, I was struck by the fact that I don't recall anyone saying that advertising was a good thing on liquor. The arguments that were given to us as to why there should be advertising were largely economic arguments, saying because other people are doing so, we in Manitoba must do the same. I don't recall at least anyone telling us that there was a moral advantage or any advantage at all in the advertising, except this one: that it is being done elsewhere.

Well Mr. Chairman, I have been one of those who for many years has been urging a national code in this regard and I recognize that this is difficult, and yet when we are faced with a situation like the one that we had where the pressure comes because another province is doing something, I don't think that we can look at it in any other way than to arrive at a national code. Then when you come along to establishing a national code, the argument there is: well, but we have the American states across from us, and the radio and the TV and the magazines from there blow over in here and the result is that there's no point in restricting it in Canada if you have all this pressure from the United States. And you keep on going like this so that the argument all the way down the line is that there's just no point in resisting it.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this sort of an argument can lead us to difficulty and that we should reverse the trend. Now in the field of drugs, for example, it is accepted that there is international control, and the nations of the world have agreed to do this. Now I recognize that drugs are a much more serious problem than alcohol, and yet from our own studies, from the Bracken Commission report, from the national concern in this matter, from the aspects of drinking and driving, from the costs, the social costs of alcohol and so on, I don't think we can say that the problem of liquor is unimportant; it is a very important problem. And I have come to the conclusion that it is not one that we can settle either on a purely provincial basis or a purely national basis. I think that we must look at this on an international basis.

Now I know that many will scoff at this and say, "Oh well, that's impossible." Mr. Chairman, it hasn't proved impossible in other areas. Certainly in the field of drugs, it is working now. Not perfectly, it is true, but at least there is an international control, and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we should reverse the trend here, not only request that there be a national code but request that there be an international code, and unless we do it on that basis there will be always that pressure from an economic standpoint, that "if they do it elsewhere, why don't we do it here?" And there is really no argument against the economic position. I think it was clear from the presentations made to us, in the field particularly of national publications, that this is an economic cost to the province, and I'm sure that all of the members are concerned about this. We desperately need development in Manitoba and to see us lose such development, for example in the printing industry, is one that concerns all of us; and yet if we keep on that way then there will never be any restriction or any control.

So, Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment at this time on the basis that I would request the government to press for a national code and for international control on this matter. I think that the problem is sufficiently serious in the world today that there is no reason that this could not be considered as a United Nations problem, one that would be studied by them and action taken on that level. If we do not proceed in that way then there will always be the argument that someone else is doing it and we ought to do the same. I do this on the basis, Mr. Chairman, that I think that the problem is sufficiently serious, that there was no case made before us that there was any advantage in the advertising; the only case was that it's being done elsewhere.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I didn't say anything on the introduction of the motion. I had thought that I had spoken enough previously and then I realized that it was in committee when I did make my few remarks and not in the Chamber, and I think that it should be established on the record the reasons why I'm proposing the motion. I'm very pleased to hear from my friend the Leader of the Liberal Party and I welcome his support; indeed I welcome the support of any member of the House so inclined to support my contention that liquor advertising will not be to the advantage of the people of Manitoba and particularly the young people of Manitoba.

I realize full well that we are faced with a problem here in Manitoba, that advertisers may be losing revenue as a result of the ban and the prohibition for advertising in Manitoba. I realize quite fully that there is a considerable amount of advertising coming into our province but I suggest that this does not justify the further extension by Manitoba itself.

We pride ourselves, in many respects here in this Legislative Assembly, on firsts. Well, I think in regards of this problem, far better for us for once to be the last. I agree with the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party that what is required is a national or international code insofar as ethics in advertising or advertising itself is concerned. And I say, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the members that were in Law Amendments Committee when we were given very generously a movie showing of the soft sell and the hard sell, courtesy of one of the advertising agencies or news media agencies under the present national code, if you can call it that - it's the code of the Board of Broadcast Governors dealing with TV - I came to the conclusion, I could not help but come to the conclusion that the soft sell was a lot worse than the hard sell; the display left me very very dry in the mouth and I'm sure that it would have affected the inquisitive minds of the younger generation even more. So I say, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the rest of the members of the committee have received from various agencies and organizations requests for advertising and requests against.

I'm often accused as the Leader of this particular group of leaning over backwards for Labour, and I want to say to the committee I had a number of requests by those interested, so far as their daily labour is concerned, to support advertising on their behalf, and I have to weigh this seriously as I'm sure that every other member of the committee had to weigh it, but even in this case I had but to come to the conclusion that advertising of liquor products was unnecessary here in the Province of Manitoba.

I also had another concern. Under our present regulations the breweries are permitted to sponsor youth activities; they're entitled to do certain other services which may be by some considered to be tantamount to advertising, but I think, Mr. Chairman, there's only "X" number of dollars that the industry itself can afford for advertising within the Province of Manitoba. I fear too that some of these services that are being provided would be curtailed or eliminated simply for the fact of the revenues to be used for other types of advertising.

So for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, despite all of the arguments, I'm still of the opinion that I was right when I moved this deletion in the committee. I voted against many - if not all - of the lesser evils because as far as I'm concerned if it's a matter of principle it's a principle from the offset, and while I appreciate very much that the committee eventually did adopt a resolution or an amendment proposed by the Member for Lakeside insofar as the hours of TV advertising are concerned, I think that the committee would be well advised not to start at this particular time and permit any advertising at all.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, I want to say at the outset that I whole-heartedly support the resolution that was brought in by the Honourable Leader of the NDP Party. I want to once again reiterate that I am not a "dry". I only wish that I was in a business that sold as well as beer and wine does without any advertising and I'd be most happy. I believe that beer and wine does not need any further advertising. I believe that if the beer and wine, or the breweries that produce it had wanted it, they would have appeared before Law Amendments Committee. They did not do so. I have heard, perhaps secondhand, that one of the larger breweries in Winnipeg do not want beer advertising. I made it a point to try and find this out. I understand the Free Press are not in favour, or will not accept advertising. The Country Guide will not accept beer and wine advertising; the Family Herald are not in favour; the Western Producer are not in favour; the Co-operator are not in favour; and a week ago Thursday when Mayor Juba and myself had our little get-together out at Russell - the weather was real bad; there was a hockey game on; but nevertheless we had approximately the same turnout as there was in Portage - and at the conclusion of our debate, well I passed Mayor Juba a glass of water and he said, "Is this water?", and I said, "Yes, it's water" - it

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd)....wasn't vodka. However, at the conclusion of our debate I pointed out to the audience that I was not in favour of the liberalization of beer and wine advertising - we keep bringing in this word "liquor" and liquor is not in this bill, it's beer and wine advertising. However: "I represent the people of Birtle-Russell and if the majority of you people here want more liberalized advertising I will support it," and to find this out I passed a ballot out to everybody in the audience, and the result of this vote was three to one that they do not want any further advertising, which confirms my view that this is not necessary. And quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I really honestly and sincerely do not believe we need more beer and wine advertising, and for this reason I am going to support the amendment.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): I'd just like to ask a question of the Minister. The last speaker said that this is only for beer and wine. Is that the case? The advertising doesn't cover the ...

MR. LYON: No. Beer and wine on radio and TV because BBG prohibits spirits.

MR. DESJARDINS: But the bill; the bill doesn't make any ...

MR. LYON: The actual practical effect is that the Board of Broadcast Governors prohibits the advertising of spirits on radio and TV, but spirits, beer and wine may be advertised in printed advertising under this bill and under any of the other advertising sections in other provinces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would wish to rise with the others and get in a word on this question of advertising, and say I think at the outset that there was no one feature that impressed me more during the committee stage of the bill than the almost unanimous request on the part of people who appeared before the committee to delete the advertising clause from the bill. It wasn't unanimous completely, but virtually you could have called it that except for a very small handful of people who appeared.

The best-represented briefs opposed advertising. There were churchmen, laymen, and even, as the honourable member mentioned, newspapers, advertising outlets and radio stations that opposed the advertising. Another interesting feature was that not one, not a single brewery or distillery or winery, came forward to ask for the privilege of advertising in the newspapers or over the radio or television. It was mainly the people who felt that they would profit in whatever way, financially, from the advertising who were pushing it, but by far the greatest proportion of people who appeared were against it and I think that the members who sat in the committee will recall that that was the fact; that was the case; and I think that we would be flying in the face of the general feeling of the citizens of the province to reverse the things that they were asking for and begin to advertise very much against the judgment of these people who appeared in the Law Amendments Committee.

One of the reasons given for suggesting that advertising be permitted is that others allow it; it is now coming into the province from outside. But this is one of the most - I have a word for it - stupid arguments, I think, that can be presented because there are a million things that other people do that we ourselves prefer not to do. The simple reason that others do it is no good reason why we should go ahead and do the same things, and it doesn't hold water. I think that if we want a reason for permitting advertising, there must be something at least a little bit better than that others do it or that it is coming into the province at the present time from outside.

If advertising is permitted there would be just that much more of it, a thing which we do not need. People who want to drink know where to go and get it - I've repeated this on several occasions. People who want to drink, whether it's beer or wine or spirits, know where to go and get it and those who do not now drink need no urging by anyone; by us, as it would be by indirection if we were to allow advertising. They need no urging on our part to begin to drink. If they feel that way inclined they will learn it soon enough without our help, and in many instances they would be far better off without it. Because of these reasons, I would strongly urge that others support this amendment. I myself am trying to do it with both hands if I can get away with it.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a few comments to this bill - to the amendment. I, too, shall support it. I would just like to say that in all the representations that have been made to me by letter or by voice, I've only had one that was in favour of this, and I canvassed a number of members in this Legislature and I believe that I was the one who received most of them. Now I do not know why this occurred. Possibly there are more people that are inclined against advertising in my constituency or for some other

(MR. FOX cont'd). . . . reason which I haven't been able to determine, but I must say that the overwhelming majority of letters, except for the one, were all against advertising and many of them were against extending the hours as well.

I'm just going to speak on the amendment, Mr. Chairman, to say this: that although I was not a member of the Committee on Law Amendments when the representations were made there, I did listen attentively, and I didn't take part in the debate because I didn't feel it was necessary; there was enough being said pro and con. But all those that were in favour of the advertising aspect, not one of them, to the best of my knowledge or recollection, gave us a real good logical reason why they should have the advertising. When they were asked if this would increase the consumption they hedged, and this is the crux of the matter, Mr. Chairman. If it's not going to increase the consumption then why do they want it? And if it is, I think then we have a principle which we must shy away from. As I said, the number of letters that came to me, all of them said "no advertising".

Now when I first made my presentation in the House on the principle of this bill, I stipulated that some of the advertising in that was, aside from liquor advertising, was in poor taste, and until they could really clean up and get down to having some good advertising standards, that I certainly wasn't going to be in favour of advertising of liquor which may deteriorate to the same standards we have in some of the soap commercials and any other commercial you want to have a look at, and for that reason I'm voting in favour of the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to put on the record a letter that was written to the First Minister on April 21st, and it is from the Winnipeg Printing Specialties and Paper Products, Local No. 537, written by one of our province's outstanding trade unionists, Mr. John Raines.

"Dear Honourable Sir: The Manitoba Area District Council of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union of North America have instructed me to write you concerning our views on wine, beer, and liquor advertising in newspapers, magazines and periodicals in Manitoba. Our Council, representing about 800 graphic arts workers in Manitoba, feels that such advertising should be allowed for the following reasons:

"(1) That such advertising would bring into Manitoba revenue of substantial proportion which, due to present restrictions, is flowing into other provinces and into the border areas of the United States.

(2) Such advertising would create considerable employment in the areas of the Graphic Arts industry, as form design, copy layout, offset photography and other graphic arts preparatory areas."

The third point he makes is that he feels "the present restrictions in Manitoba are contrary to our unwritten British heritage of free speech and freedom of choice, and in the final analysis people do what they desire anyway, and it is not in the best interests of our society to create by adverse legislation, thousands of our citizens who are quietly, and with no moral compunction to do otherwise, breaking the law. In other words, he's talking about they break the law if this is the wish of the individual, and the Honourable Member from Wellington so aptly pointed out this; and I might say that any time I want a drink I never have any trouble finding it whether hours were involved or they were not involved, and it really didn't matter whether it was advertised or it wasn't advertised. But I am suggesting, and this points out very clearly the grave economic injustice, and as I listened to honourable members opposite I thought it only fair that I should put on the record the views of organized labour in this particular area.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Honourable Minister a question? First of all, I presume you're reading this letter with the First Minister's approval; and secondly, I dare say for every one the First Minister received like this he probably received a half a dozen the other way. Would you know whether that's right or wrong?

MR. BAIZLEY: Well, I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, from the representations that have been made to honourable members in committee and in this House, and as the Member from Seven Oaks or Kildonan has suggested, we have had considerable representation opposed to it. This is why I felt that it would be in the interest of this Committee to know what the views of the organized labour body was in this particular area.

MR. FOX: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would answer a question. Could he tell me what proportion was for and what proportion was against, in the mail that he received?

MR. BAIZLEY: I can - in my personal mail, I can tell you. Mine was ...because I suppose being one of the reprobates of this Committee there weren't too many people felt that it would be of any benefit to write me and tell me they were opposed to it. I had two letters opposing advertising and I've had more letters suggesting that I should support it.

MR. FOX: ...he read of the First Minister's mail. Could he tell us what kind of response the government has had in this respect?

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): I stand before you as a reprobate and a backslider. I don't intend to support this resolution and the reason why I'm not going to support this resolution is not because I'm going to raise the argument of discrimination, but when I was elected to this House I didn't come to this House as a delegate to represent any particular views. I came here to express my own views, my own opinions, according to the dictates of my own conscience, and that is the basis upon which I am going to vote on this resolution. I, too, have had letters, numerous letters from individuals in my constituency and organizations in my constituency asking me to oppose the advertising section of this bill. I have written these people. But, Mr. Chairman, if I am going to be honest with these people, first of all I must be honest with myself, and I cannot be honest with myself if I support this resolution. As I say, I do not approach this problem on the basis of discrimination. I approach this problem on a much wider view.

Our children are brought into this world not to live in a vacuum but to live in the world as they find it. Our children today can walk into a drugstore; they can sit down and look at the funnies and look at the other periodicals and books they have there. Have you ever gone into a drugstore and seen the sexy books that are alongside of these funnies? Now, I don't think that's had any deleterious effect on our children because they don't pay the slightest bit of attention to it. But, as I say, if you are going to bring children up you've got to bring them up in this world; it's not a vacuum; and the only way that you can build character is to teach children what is right and what is wrong, and try and get them, through the strength of their own character and your teachings, to resist temptation. Now they're going to be faced with the same temptation whether we repeal this section or whether we don't because these ads are coming in from the outside, and the worst type of advertising we have, as far as liquor is concerned, is not advertising at all. It's in the form of the moving pictures and other performances shown on TV where drink seems to be now part of our social fabric. That is the worst type that we have to get and we can't do anything to stop that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wish to become involved in the debate specifically because I'm going to be voting against the amendment that was put forward by the Honourable the Leader of this Party, and in doing so I find that nobody has yet sort of expressed my views on the subject, and therefore I don't want to be associated with some of the arguments that have been presented in favour of the bill which would make the advertiser less inhibited than he is now. Particularly I wouldn't want to become associated with the stupid argument, or an argument which was described as stupid by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that others are doing it and therefore that we should do it too. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it's within the power of the government undoubtedly to inhibit advertising in Manitoba by other means, some of which have been suggested, and I don't think that it's correct to say that if other journals are covering this thing that we should do it as well.

I also, Mr. Chairman, find myself unable to support the suggestion that organized labour is in favour of advertising or that we should permit advertising because it would create jobs and bring growth into the province. I find that to be a completely unacceptable argument if one is opposed to advertising, to the supposed effects that this advertising would have. And yet, Mr. Speaker, I find that I am opposed to the resolution that is put forward and I'm opposed to it I think on reasons which differ from any that have yet been advanced, although the Honourable Member for Selkirk was somewhat in line with my thinking in the suggestion that was made in Mr. Raines' letter that was read by the Honourable the Minister of Labour. The third suggestion with regard to the right to freedom of speech, is to some extent related to my thinking on the subject.

Now, first of all, Mr. Chairman, let me explain my opinion thusly. I don't agree with a great deal of advertising. Much of the advertising that we have now can have the same type of effects as is suggested will this liquor advertising have. Any child who goes to the movies has liquor advertised to them by the debonaire detective offering the beautiful girl a drink when she comes up to his apartment. But that's just one form of advertising. --(Interjection)--They're not drinking liquor there. You want to know where that picture is? At the Garrick. But,

(MR. GREEN cont'd)...Mr. Chairman, all of the advertising that's done in favour of the soft drinks - and I'm not going to add to their advertising by mentioning the names of them - the soap companies, the other products that we are deluged with on television, have a flavour to them, and I suggest to you that that flavour is usually one of providing sex appeal associated with the product. And yet, Mr. Chairman, it would be --(Interjection)--The Honourable Mr. Miller says, "What's wrong with it?" I am merely indicating that this is not a productive form of advertising in terms that it brings wealth to the province.

So I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that any of this advertising does any good. Like some of the members have said, "Well, will this advertising do any good?" I don't think that it will do any good, and yet I won't legislate against it because I don't think -- I think that legislating against the advertising is more harmful than the advertising itself. Once we get into the area of starting to, by legislation, decide which things can be sold to the public and which things cannot be sold to the public, we will, as surely as night follows day, enter the area of saying which ideas can be sold to the public and which ideas cannot be sold to the public, and, Mr. Speaker, I say that on principle that it is wrong to move into this area with legislation. I say that it is an infringement of free speech, unless it could be demonstrated that the item which is advertised is intrinsically evil; and I think that the people who are against liquor advertising are against it because they believe that alcoholic beverages are intrinsically evil, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they are not intrinsically evil. I can't find sin in the person who has a drink. I can't find that this is something which is illegal for him to do by the standard of our penal laws, and therefore I have to assume that people will govern themselves with regard to this product as they do with regard to all other products, that they will have temperance. And if some don't, I can't blame the advertisers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make one more point, and that is that the enactment of legislation prohibiting liquor advertising is itself a great advertisement for liquor. It's one of the biggest advertisements that can be made, because then people have an attitude towards liquor which subjectively regards this product as being different than anything else which is sold, and that in itself -- (Interjection) -- Well, I don't think it is. I don't. And if you think it is then of course you have a legitimate reason for voting against this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is no advertising for marijuana but I suggest to you that everybody knows what this is and everybody who wants it can go ahead and find it, and the reason that they know what it is, is that it is an item which is prohibited. It's, so to speak, a forbidden fruit and immediately it becomes an item for the curiosity of not only the young but older people, and this is more of an advertisement than anything that can be published on either television, radio or any of the other media. And I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that what the Honourable Member for Selkirk said was correct, that society has to mature in an atmosphere where they can regard this area of our society, where they can normalize it, so to speak. The sales of liquor could double or treble. I put it to you, Mr. Chairman, that if there was one bottle of whisky per month in every home in Manitoba, this would probably be a much increased sale of whisky, and yet it would result in less alcoholic problems than they have today because there is such a thing as the normal use of alcoholic beverages, and what makes it abnormal is partly this attitude that society has towards its sale and its use. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, anything which I feel will normalize our attitude towards these drinks is not going to cause harm; it's going to cause good. I'm not in favour of advertising but I'm not in favour of legislating against it.

MR. MOLGAT: ...permit a question? In view of his statements regarding forbidden fruit and the attitude that the control creates the demand, would the honourable member recommend that drugs be openly sold; that there be no restriction; that there be open advertising on drugs?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the advertising that has taken place with regard to heroin, marijuana, LSD and the other drugs, has resulted from the restriction on advertising. I don't want to see these drugs sold in quantities which would cause trouble. I'm suggesting that the restriction on advertising of these drugs does not achieve the result that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition obviously wants.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, but the member has not answered my question. My question, Mr. Speaker, is, in the light of his statement, following through his logic in the words that he said, is he recommending that drugs be openly sold and that there be advertising of drugs? A simple question: yes or no.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I am dealing with the resolution before us. If the Honourable Member the Leader of the Opposition wishes to put a resolution to that effect I'll consider it when it comes forward.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the member isn't answering my question. He made a statement; he built up a case and he used in that case the analogy of the drugs. So I asked him: Is he in favour of the advertising of drugs and the free sale of drugs.

MR. GREEN: And I repeat, that when a resolution comes forward to the House which maybe the Leader of the Opposition will put, then I'll consider it in the same light that I've considered this resolution.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Chairman, listening to the debate and considering the amendment that's requested at this time, I rise to say that I cannot support an amendment of this type and it takes a little courage to get up and say it in view of the fact of the approach that is being made to us through our Committee. But I seriously question whether those that spoke to it are speaking for as great a number of people as they would let on that they are, because I am sure that those people that made representation at Committee were doing it because they felt themselves that this was the attitude and they let it be known that they were either a minister in charge of a church, or people that were in charge of other organizations; and we know that in many cases these people do not speak for all their congregation; they speak for themselves. And I think that this should be something that is carefully considered. If it is the executive that do not want these things, then I don't think they have any right to impose it on other people.

But in considering advertising, we do find that people move away from the very point that we're trying to get across and this is brand advertising. For instance, the Member for Wellington said that we do not need advertising to tell us where to go to get this drink - and we don't; but the advertising that we're talking about does not intend to tell a person where to go to get this drink. The consumption that they're trying to put across is consumption of their own product rather than somebody else's, and we must keep in mind this is brand advertising.

The Leader of the Opposition said that we should get together to try and form some type of national code or even international code, and I don't think that we can by sitting back doing nothing. I would suggest, on the other hand, that perhaps we'd be a leader and go out and provide the laws that govern advertising as we feel it should be. Let us be a leader, for a change, in Manitoba and show other people what type of advertising should be allowed, because I for one, in standing and voting against this, do so with the assurance in my own mind that we're not going to let this advertising get away from us and become the advertising that entices young people to smoke to show them how to overcome many of the problems of life that they have accepted. I do not like that type of advertising, Mr. Chairman, and I would certainly vote for this if I thought that it would ever get to that stage, but I feel that there's enough resistance to it that it will control and probably give the better type of advertising that we are looking for.

I think that it should be restrained advertising, and I think that if we vote against this, if we withdraw it completely, then we are certainly hurting the newspaper business, particularly the weeklies, the publication of nationals, and I think it's important that these national magazines, as they tell us, are going out of the province to get their publication just because they can't advertise in Manitoba or publish it in Manitoba. This is rather ridiculous, because we get the same number of magazines regardless of whether they are published in Manitoba or not, and I would have hoped that we can look upon this as constructive legislation. I would rather look toward the Honourable Member for Lakeside's amendment where he chose to limit the advertising on radio and TV, I believe it was to be from 10:00 at night till 7:00 in the morning. This I can't particularly agree with altogether, but I think it's a more realistic approach than to wipe out all advertising altogether in the province because, after all, our children will leave Manitoba some day during their life and they'll be subjected to it and I think, as the Member for Inkster pointed out, that really in today's age I don't think all drinking is bad. There's a place for it as there's a place for many things. We don't say, "Let's cut out all the cars because there's a lot of accidents; there's a lot of deaths." If you did cut out the cars then certainly I don't think there'd be anybody killed because somebody got drunk and ran down the middle of the street and ran over somebody. He has to be in the car so the car is part of the problem, and with a growing population certainly there'll be more alcoholics, but the percentage is not growing, and with the number of people that are drinking today I'm certain that if it's well enough advertised, if the people can gain - and probably profitably - in the fact that the public will learn to drink properly through watching others that are drinking properly, then I

(MR. BEARD cont'd)....believe that this is some place where we'll profit, rather than by hiding our heads in the sand and saying, "Well, if we don't read it in our own province then maybe there'll be one less person that will get drunk."

MR. SHOEMAKER: ...a question, Mr. Chairman. You said the percentage is not growing. What percentage is not growing?

MR. BEARD: In proportion to the population.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the percentage is not growing in proportion to the population - what is the story? The percentage of what is not growing in proportion to what population? I don't know what he's talking about.

MR. BEARD: Alcoholics.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I rise in support of this amendment. On the previous occasion when this was introduced I expressed my feelings and at that time I said if it was possible I would ban the sale of liquor completely. I know it's not possible and I'm not advocating this at the present time. And in answer to the Honourable Member for Selkirk when he just spoke, he said he governs himself according to the dictates of his conscience. I would like to say that most of us do likewise, and although I received some 400 or more letters, most of them were against liberalizing the liquor laws, I will have to say that I was not influenced by these letters because I got these letters after I had spoken. It did not change my conviction; in fact it strengthened the conviction; so I am going to vote on this according to the way I feel that we should vote.

I'm happy to note that several periodicals, the dailies and the weeklies in the Province of Manitoba, have indicated that their policy will be that they will not advertise even if this bill is accepted as legislation. I give them a lot of credit for that because although some people argue here that we are being bombarded by periodicals, magazines and so forth from other provinces and other countries, that we are receiving advertising in the Province of Manitoba anyway, but there is a difference. We all know that our dailies and our weeklies have the greatest circulation in the Province of Manitoba. Practically in every house in the Province of Manitoba you will find a daily or a weekly paper, and we do encourage our children to read these dailies and these weeklies and the schools do encourage our youngsters to read them for current events and so on. Therefore, they form a habit of looking through these papers and reading the papers, which is not so with these magazines coming from outside the Province of Manitoba. And that's where my greatest concern is, that it's our children that will be, if this bill goes through the way it is, free advertising of wine and liquor, that they will be bombarded by these advertisements, and I do not think that it is desirable at the present time at all.

Now as we come to the speech we listened to delivered by the Honourable Member for Inkster, I completely disagree with him. I give him a lot of credit for being a strong advocate of free speech, but I would like to say that there is quite a bit of difference here. If I accepted his argument that there should be free speech - and I agree to a certain extent that there should be free speech - I could stand up here and call him a liar, I can call him a thief. What will he do? He will turn around and sue me for that and probably I'll land in jail or pay a fine for doing --(Interjection)--Not where I am but outside of this House, or if I write a letter to, say to the editor and I call him a thief and call him a crook or whatever it may be, dishonest, he can still sue me, and I'm sure that he'd change his mind about free speech. And again I'll say, if I advertise it and I keep repeating it day after day calling him those names, I'm sure that even in his own constituency I could convince quite a few people that I am right, and this could apply to advertising. Our children -- although he says it's free speech, advertising is tantamount to free speech, but this is what I am concerned about, that you keep on in the dailies and in the weeklies advertising and it will have its effect on that.

Again, the Honourable Member from Churchill seems to think that this is grand advertising, and again I'll repeat that you have to resort to grand advertising when the market is saturated; then there's competition to steal the business from another party - that is, when the market is saturated. But I would not like to believe that as far as liquor is concerned in the Province of Manitoba we are boozing so much that we are saturated, and there's only this difference that we try to take away business from another brand. I'm sure that everybody knows that advertising pays and the idea behind it is to increase the sales of liquor because it does pay.

Now I'll go back to the letter read by the Honourable Minister of Labour, written to the Premier - I think it's from some union. They expressed their belief that we should have advertising because it's an economical gain. Now I would like to ask the members what our

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)...priority is here. Is it always that big dollar sign, economical gain? I'm sure that most of the members will agree that our priority should be the concern of our people, their health and their welfare, and not only their economic gains because our economic gains will mean nothing if our people turn to be weak and not healthy, and I cannot see any other way for the members of this Legislature but to oppose or to support this amendment before us at this time. I'm sure that we have enough advertising and much more than we need at the present time. I cannot see who should be in favour of advertising except some of those people who stand to gain economically, but if you go through the country most of the people are like ourselves, they don't give a hoot about advertising. They don't need this advertising that some people are trying to hoist on us in the Province of Manitoba. Nobody needs it. Nobody cares for it except a few individuals who stand to gain economically.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, as one listens to the debate that has developed and which is very interesting, at which I have been looking forward to for some time, one realizes that no matter which side he takes in his vote he will find that he has strange bedfellows with him as far as the motivation of each one of us in making our decision, and because of the fact that I will necessarily be voting with people with what I think have some peculiar ideas, I thought I should express my point of view in this and my motivation in voting as I intend to vote. I must say, in listening to the Honourable Member for Inkster describe the insidious type of advertising that takes place when a detective apparently offers a drink to a young lady in his apartment, that it occurred to me that liquor is not the motivation that one receives, and one starts to wonder whether it's not only a means to an end, and we could then develop into a discussion as to whether the means justifies the end or the end justifies the means.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): ...imputing motive to the Member for Inkster?

MR. CHERNIACK: I am only indicating that motivation comes from various sources, one of which is advertising, which is the matter before us today.

There was a time, Mr. Chairman, when I found that all matters were either black or white and all principles were so sound that one could only vote one way regardless of any other issues and side issues. I've reached the stage now where it's no longer black or white in all respects. There are certain principles for which each one of us will fight regardless of other people's points of view and certainly regardless of what his constituent might -- or what he thinks his constituents might wish. There are other principles which conflict with these and which are not as rigid. I would say that when it comes to the principle of the freedom of being able to consume alcoholic beverages, making available to people the opportunity to consume, that I think that that is important. I don't think that one should suppress it because I don't think that we can consider that the mere consumption of alcohol is in itself a great danger. It is the over-use of it which has to be watched, but certainly it is a consumable commodity which adds a great deal to our way of life and which is not harmful if taken in moderation.

The principle that one has a right to promote the consumption is another one, and that is one which I find that I can differ with and still accept my own ideas that liquor should be available at all times without restriction to people who have learned to handle it. Now there have been arguments made in favour of advertising, one of which is that we have it anyway from all other places that send in their advertising to Manitoba; the other is, the corollary is that our local advertising media are losing revenue. Well the fact is they are losing something they never had before, and what they are losing is the opportunity to make more money out of liquor advertising, not that it's being taken away from them. So I can't get too excited about that.

There's no doubt that the purpose of advertising is to increase the consumption of alcohol, and although I agree with my friend from Inkster that freedom of speech is an important principle, yet I take along with that the idea of truth in advertising which I think is equally important. There have been advertisements that I have seen by liquor companies, pointing out that you should be moderate in your consumption and even suggesting that people should not drink, but - then the ad goes on to say, "if you're going to drink anyway, do drink our particular spirit as being the one which would suit you or which you would find most attractive."

Well, I would feel that in this principle of truth in advertising there ought to be an indication at all times of what are the dangers of excessive use of alcohol, and I think that we must recognize that alcohol itself is not the cause of the problems of the alcoholic, it is merely a symptom, and that the cause involved in the problems of alcoholism is seldom related to the attraction of the taste or of the reaction that one gets from alcohol; rather it is something that one -- it is a refuge for many people for problems that they have due to the pressures of the

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . . economic and social whirl in which we live. If I felt that along with the advertising we would have an equal, equal time let us say, or an equal pressure on people to become aware of the importance of moderation or lack of excess; if I felt that there were proper educational advertising used that would warn people of excesses, then I would feel that the idea of freedom of speech along with truth and advertising could be taken care of, but I think that there is not that. I feel that the alcohol education which this province has been sponsoring in the schools and elsewhere, is not adequate to combat the advertising that would come from the private enterprises whose concern only is to promote the consumption of alcohol.

If I felt there was a balance created which would both give the opportunity to people to learn about the different types, makes of alcohol, and at the same time learn how to adapt to living in a society which has it, then I would not oppose the unlimited or even the limited use of alcohol advertising, but I feel that we are not doing enough on the question of education in regard to the consumption of alcohol to be able to combat this other side of the advertising practice, and for that reason I have come to the conclusion that I must no longer look at it as black and white but in those gray areas of balance and truth and proper education -- I would be compelled to support the motion that is before us.

And in saying so, I must make a distinction in my attitude regarding the amendment which I think was accepted, which says, "If you're going to have advertising, then don't have it between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 in the evening on television," and I think on radio. I am not a believer in the thought that advertising is going to attract the young people, as it has been said in committee, from ages two to twelve or fourteen, that would be exposed to this type of advertising during the day. I think that that is not a reasonable deduction. I don't think that alcoholism starts at that age at all. I think that it starts much later in the age of our children and actually starts in young adulthood, so I don't support the idea that you should suppress it during those hours, but I do support the idea that you should withhold granting the privilege until we have made sure that there is a comparable and effective form of education on alcoholism which I think is insufficient in today's society.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to mention the thing that I know you're thinking of, and that is that you have found, as I have, at this stage of the Session that no votes are made by long speeches, and so I'm going to do what you are going to suggest anyway and keep mine pretty brief.

I would like to comment, however, Mr. Chairman, that you can see from what has already happened here this morning that the Liberal Party is living up to its tradition of being truly liberal and having views that cover the whole area, and I'm glad to see that a little of that at least has rubbed off onto the New Democratic Party which is the party of control, controlled thinking, and that they are now emulating a principle of the Liberal Party and allowing some freedom of opinion in their discussion and even the free expression of it, and I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I find myself in a difficult position sitting right here between the Honourable the Leader of this Party and the distinguished and Honourable Member for Selkirk. Here I am, exposed to the sound logic and telling arguments of my Leader on the one side and the moving eloquence of my colleague from Selkirk on the other side, and I must make a decision between them, and all I can do, all I can do, Mr. Chairman, is to weigh the evidence to the extent that I'm able to, and come up with what to me seems better judgment under the circumstances. And to those who have said, and I agree, that the arguments that we've heard in favour of advertising have been namely economic, so they have. But on the other hand, the economics of that situation do not appeal to me because studies have shown, Mr. Chairman, in many states of the Union - not just a few, but many states of the Union - that as far as the economics of the situation are concerned they are all against advertising because advertising is intended and does in fact promote greater use of alcoholic beverages, and the greater use in turn adds to the cost for the government of the province in social services. So that even on the ground of economics, let alone those of morality and personal habits and successful careers and broken families and all the rest, even on the ground of economics, in my opinion the arguments are in favour of the control or elimination of advertising.

Now I recognize the fact that we have some advertising. I think too much already, that we can't get away from at the present time, but I certainly do most emphatically support the suggestion of the Leader of this Party that we should use every endeavour to secure not only a national but an international code regarding advertising.

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

GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment and I shall try to be brief in spelling out my reasoning. To begin with, on the matter of hours and what not in the bill, there can probably be many opinions as to what the right hours should be and there is certainly a lot of room for argument or judgment in that regard, but on the matter of advertising I think, in listening to the folks that spoke to us in Law Amendments Committee - I think there were about 40 delegations or individuals who spoke - they could be roughly divided into two groups. One group took the stand that by and large it was good for business or they were losing business - along these lines. There was no argument put up by these people about the social side of the problem. It was strictly the economic aspects of how it affected their business or their industry and so on. Then there was the other group who spoke, generally speaking, against the advertising clause of the bill, and these people by and large were speaking for groups of people or for themselves. So, as one who is not nailing his flag to the mast of abstinence or teetotalism but rather as a moderate who wants reasonable liquor laws that allow for anybody who wishes to have a drink in dignity and have reasonable hours and have access, I would put myself in this class.

I couldn't help but dig out a set of figures to try and answer the Member from Churchill when I understood him to say - and I don't know where he got his information from - but I understood him to say that there was not an increase in the percentage of alcoholics or alcoholism in the population. Did I understand that correctly? Is that what I thought he said? But I have here a set of statistics that are put out by the Alcohol Education Foundation and they say in their statistics that in Manitoba from 1956 to 1963 the total number of alcoholics has risen from 8,370 to 12,210. Now this is with a pretty well static population; I don't think our population has increased by an appreciable percentage. And they say that the incidence of alcoholism in the same period of time has risen from 1,570 to 2,170, and percentage-wise they call this a 30.8 increase. Now I know this hasn't anything directly to do with the advertising, but the Member for Churchill tried to make the point that he didn't see any increase, so I quote him these figures and the source.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think we are all sincerely trying to decide what is in the public interest. So if we try to keep our discussion to what is in the public interest, I was asked some time during this debate by the Attorney-General to answer what one of the gentleman said in Law Amendments, and that is Mr. McCaskill, the head of an advertising firm who took issue with the Attorney-General's figures that 80 percent of Manitobans can now see and hear liquor ads over outside radio and television, and he produced statistics from Neilson ratings to show that 13 percent of the people in the province do in fact see and hear outside advertising in this regard. So I would like to have this...

MR. LYON: I can clear that up for him right in mid-sentence. If he reads my statement he will see that my comment was that 80 percent of the people could see and hear it; in other words, that they were within the beam of that station. What he was talking about was Neilson ratings, as to how many people actually listen to a particular program. I bow to his knowledge of Neilson ratings. All I say is that 80 percent of our population of Manitoba is within a belt where that signal can be picked up.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well I think, Mr. Speaker, that I did say when I quoted Mr. McCaskill, it was said that 80 percent of Manitobans can see and hear. I agree. But I think many of us have taken this opportunity to look at the Bracken report and I would just like to quote what the Bracken report says about liquor advertising. "The members felt that it is wholly inconsistent to recommend the expenditure of money on the rehabilitation of alcoholics, more law enforcement, the promotion of temperance education and the prevention of excessive drinking, and at the same time approve the stimulation of sales of alcoholic beverages which give rise to the necessity of these expenditures. It is quite one thing to allow what the majority of the people want; it is quite another thing to stimulate the sale of a commodity which puts on society the burden of correcting the various consequences."

So my stand, Mr. Chairman, is that to advertise a product which the main purpose of advertising is to increase sales and to find new consumers, and the product itself creates social problems, I don't think it's in the public interest for legislators to vote for it on the matter that it's good for business.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief like the speakers prior to myself, but I rise to say at this time that I propose to support the amendment, and a lot of members have said why they're voting so and so. If there's one single solitary man in the Province of Manitoba that has convinced me to vote the way that I intend to vote on this one, it was the

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . Mayor of Winnipeg, not only in his presentation here but in his presentation in Portage la Prairie. Because he tried to make two points. No. 1, that advertising did not pay in any way, shape or form, and that even if they did advertise that it wouldn't increase the consumption of alcoholic beverages. I disagree with him on both scores - completely. I maintain that the whole purpose of allowing free advertising is to increase the consumption and it's bad.

The Honourable Member for Churchill, as was pointed out by someone else, has said the consumption has not gone up, and I tried to pin him down on what he meant by the per capita consumption in Manitoba has not gone up. It certainly has gone up as was indicated by the Order for Return that I got about a month ago on this whole question of the relationship of the contributions by the Government of Manitoba, that is the receipts from the sale of liquor on the one hand to the government and their contribution to alcohol education on the other. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, the Order for Return, and my guess is that you haven't looked at it, and for that reason I think it might be helpful to some of the members of the committee to say what the government said - what the government said as to the increase in the consumption, the increase in revenues to the province from the sale of liquor.

Here's what the Order for Return says: In 1963-64 the province received in liquor revenues 16 million four hundred-odd. In 1967-68, exclusive of the 5 percent sales tax - exclusive of that - \$24,600,000. In how many years? In four years. An increase of well over 50 percent in four years. So all of this talk about there not being an increase in the consumption is all hogwash because here is the government's figures to support that there has been a substantial increase without advertising, or without advertising in the manner that the government propose to allow the breweries to advertise in the bill that is before us. And so I am, as I said, going to support the amendment.

As I recall the vote on this question when we were in committee, there were, of the Cabinet Ministers that were present there, one voted against advertising and all the other ones that were present in committee voted for it, and the greatest shock that I got, Mr. Chairman, was the fact that the Minister of Welfare voted for it, and here is the Minister of Welfare that I guess really believes that it is in the best interests of the province to allow advertising of alcoholic beverages. And so, Mr. Chairman, I suppose that I have now indicated that I intend to vote for the amendment that is before us, because I think it would be bad -- we've gone far enough in this whole field of encouraging more consumption of alcoholic beverages.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, could we have a little more order so we can hear ourselves. Mr. Chairman, I definitely will support the amendment that is before us and I want to thank the honourable member that presented the amendment. I felt that we had excellent presentations made in Law Amendments Committee by the various organizations and societies who did appear and I think that special thanks should go out to them for appearing, taking the time and trouble, and also I think informing the members of that committee to a large extent on many aspects of it.

To those who feel that advertising doesn't pay, I just don't believe it because otherwise why would we have the section in the bill before us if this was the case. And then, too, the demonstrations that we saw in committee I think convinces more than ever that advertising of this type, on TV especially, would have an effect in that we would have more drinking and I think more of it by the younger people.

Mention was made here this morning that this section applies only to beer and wine because of the BBG regulations. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this need not be the case because those regulations might be changed at some time and then it would have the effect on liquor as well, other liquor. So that when we discuss this section, perhaps we should not just discuss it in the terms of beer and wine.

I would like to know from the government how many people or how many organizations were asking for this legislation before it was ever brought in. How many were there originally and who were these parties that were requesting this type of legislation? Was there really a public demand for this type of legislation that would provide for advertising of this type? After all, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the government is responsible because they are responsible for bringing this legislation in, even though it's a free vote. They must be held responsible for the consequences of this bill when it's adopted - or implemented - and why should they bring it forward? I don't think they had the consideration of the future generations really at heart in drafting this particular section of the bill.

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) .....

We know that from time to time in the representations that were made, some people referred to this as a disease and once people become addicted to drinking that it may well be termed a disease. Surely enough I would be the last one to want to encourage drinking of this type and that our people should become sick and then later on spend lots of money in trying to correct the ills that we have created. Is this why Medicare is being brought in? Is this just a coincidence that Medicare is being brought in at the same time? Certainly the passing of this section would be harmful and I don't think there's any doubt in any of the members' minds on this, because we know that drinking can cause irreparable harm. We've seen it happen on too many occasions, the heartache that has been caused, families driven apart, youth who have fallen for it and got trapped and then later on they become alcoholics. Certainly we cannot stop all this but certainly we can do something about it, and not encouraging it through legislation of this type where we would be allowing advertising.

So, Mr. Chairman, I definitely will be supporting the amendment before us. When the government brought in this legislation, was it because also they intended it or thought that they would be having greater revenues come in as a result and that this was back in their minds in bringing forward this bill? Sometimes I even wonder whether we as legislators are doing the right thing in taxing liquor as highly as we do, whether this is not discrimination on a section of the people in Manitoba that are already in the poor position in that many of them are addicted and they just seem to have to drink.

I noticed the telegrams that came in that were quite interesting, and I was even alarmed at some of the papers of whom we have a record here did come out for liquor advertising as they did. This was quite a surprise to me. I won't go into detail on these telegrams because there's quite a list of them and it might embarrass some people.

But, Mr. Chairman, drinking in my opinion is evil; the consequences of drinking are evil. We find this to be the case all over, that even today many of our high school students are going in for drinking and this definitely affects their studies. I think this would just be encouraging a situation of that kind, so I definitely will vote for the amendment.

..... continued on next page

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside referred to the controlled thinking in the ranks of the New Democratic Party but I think really what he meant to say was that there was disciplined thinking in contrast to undisciplined, erratic or illogical thoughts so I thank him for that commendation.

Mr. Speaker, I, like many others, I think, are going to support longer hours of drinking and yet oppose advertising and I think that this is done largely on the following point that longer hours permit a person to drink or not to drink and to a certain extent this is an element of choice, but advertising in a sense, compels people or attempts to compel people to drink and it's for this reason that I oppose that, I think this position is similar to that expressed by some of the members of the clergy who took the position that longer hours were all right but advertising which went after people to encourage them to drink more was not right.

The Attorney-General put across the argument at one point that he made his decisions rationally, or he believed that he made all his decisions rationally or at a conscious level so I think anyone who has done any reading about advertising or about consumption comes to the conclusion very rapidly that not all decisions are made at the conscious level. The classic example I suppose is the book called "The Hidden Persuaders" by Vance Packard who talked about how all the decisions were made often irrationally or without the full conscious knowledge of the consumer. Then of course there's also Thorstein Zebelin who talked about conspicuous consumption and so on. I do not believe, as some seem to, that by allowing brand advertising all you'll do is direct people's attention from brand A to brand B and that the result will not be a total increase in sales. I think that by advertising a particular brand, you encourage people to, first of all, drink more of that type of product and secondly to simply drink more in general; so that I think that although allowing a particular brewer to advertise will increase his sales, I think it also helps to increase the sales of all brewers.

Now it's been said many times in this Legislature and I suppose this is a philosophical debate of whether or not we legislate morality. Some argue of course that we cannot legislate morality in a sense of make people moral, and that is true; but I think that really what we are doing in this particular debate, and in many others, is attempting to draw guidelines of behaviour and of course when we make civil laws as we do here, this is in effect what we are trying to do - we are using our own conscience and our own moral standards and trying to relate them to the social mores and behaviour of our constituents and the public at large.

I don't think that advertising is evil in itself and I similarly don't think that liquor is evil in itself but certainly liquor can lead to very harmful effects and I think that encouraging people to drink is unnecessary and may lead to harm. For example, I don't think people need to be encouraged or reminded to drink. They can see people drinking in public; they can go to movies and television and see outside publications concerning liquor; they can see brewery promotions in the paper by indirect means; they can see liquor stores and they can see brewery plants and signs on their premises. I think people who are concerned about this section are concerned about people who are going to drive their cars under the influence of alcohol, who will over-consume, who will become belligerent and in the extreme cases, who may become alcoholics. I think the argument is basically an economic one versus a moral one and I think the moral argument is more persuasive and should override the economic consideration.

There's two things that I would like to ask of the government here and that is one, that since there will undoubtedly be more drinking as a result of a liberalization of laws, first of all because I believe the hours will definitely be lengthened and the advertising may or may not go through, but I think there's a need for some tougher laws and for some stricter enforcement of the laws on driving and drinking. And secondly, in full agreement with my colleague from St. John's that more money should be spent on alcohol education and rehabilitation.

Mr. Chairman, it's been estimated that there are as much as one out of 15 people who drink are alcoholics, and if you project these figures into Manitoba and assume that there are 300,000 people who probably drink, or of the drinking age, or who do drink, that this means there could be upwards up to 20,000 alcoholics. And yet we have programs like Nassau House, which is an excellent start, which has a capacity of 12 men for rehabilitation; or River House which has a capacity for 15 women. We are now going to cut the budget of the Alcohol Education Service and I think that what is needed now, whether or not advertising goes through, is a greater increase in the expenditure spent on alcohol education, and the rehabilitation of alcoholics because I think we've just gone into this field and I think there's going to be greater need just to hold our own in the face of these changes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HANUSCHAK: In speaking on the Liquor Bill on second reading I have made brief reference to my - briefly commented my views on the matter of advertising liquor be it beer or wine. Now I do not look upon the matter of advertising liquor any differently than I do upon the advertising of any other commodity. I feel that the manufacturer or distributor of any commodity should have the right to make known to the public the type of commodity he sells and to publicize its features, qualities, whatever it is that he wishes to advertise to make known to the public about it.

However, having said that, Mr. Chairman, I wish to qualify my statement by saying this, that there's a danger in over-consumption of any commodity; over-consumption of liquor is not the only cause of disaster, tragedy, various social ills that we fear. Buying beyond one's means can also lead to tragedy and undesirable results. In other words, what I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that I feel that some consideration should be given to directing some funds towards an educational program in the moderate use of alcohol, and what I'm saying could apply to other commodities. I feel that the finance company in advertising the ease with which loans can be obtained from it should also direct some funds towards education programs to teach people the wise and proper budgeting of their expenditures. I feel that the automobile manufacturer should also look upon it as his duty to draw to the attention of the buying public that it is not desirable for each and every individual to have an automobile. The same could be said of the garment manufacturer - one could go down the line and list hundreds of commodities, the purchase or the over-purchase of which leads to undesirable results. And because I do not feel that the legislation governing the advertising of any one commodity should be discriminatory against it, I therefore must oppose this amendment, with the hope, Mr. Chairman, that if not this year then next year we will have an opportunity to consider legislation which would perhaps impose a tax on advertising earmarked for an education program or legislation which would impose some responsibility on the advertiser to spend a certain amount in education in some proportion to the money spent on advertising.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief, but having possibly all of us heard more than we actually thought was possible was known to all the members, I'm sure that any lengthy addition isn't going to be appreciated at this time. But being one of those that possibly received between three and 4,000 letters or signatures of various natures, and approximately 99 percent of these being against advertising and the drinking, extending the drinking hours, I think I should say a few words. I do not want to be influenced by just these letters. I hope that I am able to, while I respect these letters, respect what was said in them, I hope that I can make up my mind as one individual and form my own opinion on those bases that have been - many of them mentioned here today.

I think that the basic point was hit when the Honourable Member of Lakeside questioned the fact that are we doing all this for the sake of economics. Now it seems to me that the question is, are we encouraging advertising to encourage drinking for the sake of encouraging higher liquor revenues, either for the government or for the individual that is going to benefit from it. Now this may very well, and I think as the Honourable Member for St. John's mentioned, that there is no doubt in his mind and there's no doubt in my mind the object is to increase the purpose of drinking and this of course could help the economic situation, there's no doubt about that, but I think we're all sincere and hoping that we are not going to be governed, our minds are not going to be made up for the sake of being governed to the thought that economics, the dollar, the big dollar is going to make up our minds if we wish to encourage this advertising or not.

And I also wish to bring up another point. I am still convinced in my own mind that the money that will be spent by these large firms and companies, whether they be breweries or distilleries, the money that they're going to now, if this law is extended, that they're going to spend for advertising will not then be spent for donations as they have in the past, I think this is a practical view of the situation because these firms have done much for service clubs, much for sports clubs and I firmly believe that this money if this amendment is defeated will certainly increase or decrease and this money will be spent on advertising.

Well I said I would be short - I think, Mr. Chairman, that if the object is that we're really trying to establish more liquor advertising just for the sake of creating more business I don't think this is logical; I don't think that this is fair and as mentioned by several persons that we must take our next generation into consideration. I think that some of the legislation that has passed here today is going to affect our next generation and I only wish to say this - amongst these three or 4,000 letters and signatures many of them were from school boards that passed

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) . . . . resolutions hopefully that the advertising part especially would not come to a point where it would have the detrimental results that they feared it would and I must agree with them. We all know that the briefs that were presented - there was a slight intimation at times that maybe some of these Ministers were not possibly as serious. I think most of them were very serious, not only those that spoke against it; I think those that spoke for it were also serious. I think the matter has been laid very clearly before us and I hope that we will do our part.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Attorney-General would answer a question before the vote is put. In consideration of the fact that many members on both sides of the House have said that they thought that the four principles in the bill that is before us might be more acceptable if there was a relationship between the revenues received by the province from the sale of liquor on the one hand and their contributions to alcohol education, that the whole thing would have been more acceptable. Now, in the Order for Return that I talked about earlier, it suggests, the Order for Return on Question 4, the answer given - no, in 5, sorry - where I asked the question of the principle or the relationship, it was the relationship and it says, "No", and that it's assessed by the government.

Well, if the Attorney-General would get up and say that henceforth and from this day and forever more there will be a relationship, some percentage of the revenues received from the sale of liquor directed to alcohol education and the other very worthwhile organizations that make a sincere effort to control drinking, then some of the members might look on the whole bill in a different light; but until there is some relationship why I'm afraid they won't.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I'll be very brief. At the outset on the introduction of this bill I took a stand that I was not in favour of this legislation, particularly advertising.

I very intensely listened to all the various presentations made at Law Amendments and I was very disappointed and surprised that we didn't have any presentation from the No. 1 contributor who will be the customer in regards to advertising, made no presentation in regards to having the privilege of advertising his product and I can't find in my own thinking, I can't agree with the fact that the people that say that advertising it will not make any difference to consumption of liquor, that all it's going to do is change from one brand to another; because it's a known fact and can be documented if necessary that the only reason that advertising is used is to precipitate and make bigger sales of products.

Now there very definitely is a relationship between advertising in this bill to the fact that these sales organizations that will be soliciting, I assume, because we've no indication that the people that are the brewers or distillers have made any presentation to have this included, that it must be the people that are interested in selling advertising are requesting this and there has to be a relationship in my mind between advertising and consumption. And if this is a fact that it is in here to produce more revenue for the Liquor Commission then I would suggest that we must have a balance between the sale of liquor and the advertising and the contributions to alcoholic education. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. LYON: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit me just to interject that there's nothing in this bill to increase the profits of the Liquor Commission. If there is any increase it will be by the natural desires of the people of Manitoba but there's nothing intrinsically in the bill to cause the consumption of alcohol to go up - other than some amendments that were introduced at Law Amendments relative to Veterans' clubs.

MR. DOW: Mr. Chairman, my contention is that the liquor profits will increase with greater consumption and I reiterate the fact that advertising will create more profits to the Liquor Commission. And therefore I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in supporting the amendment of this morning to eliminate advertising, I would suggest as an alternate if you're going to allow advertising, then I would like to see inserted in there, "A percentage of the increase in profits go to alcohol education."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question before the House is that Section 5 be deleted.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Ayes and nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

The motion before the committee is that Section 5 of Bill 38 be deleted.

A STANDING COUNTED VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:  
Yeas, 19; Nays, 33.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move an amendment, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the Act further be amended by adding thereto immediately after Section 9 thereof the following section: "Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the Commission may make regulations regulating advertising with respect to licensed premises and liquor in magazines and periodicals printed in Manitoba if more than two-thirds of each issue of such magazines and periodicals are distributed to persons residing outside the Province of Manitoba."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think in view of the way that the motion has come to us from Law Amendments Committee that the motion should read: "that all the words after the word 'liquor' in the proposed Section 9A be deleted and the following substituted therefor: Only in magazines and periodicals printed in Manitoba if more than two-thirds of each issue of such magazines and periodicals are distributed to persons residing outside of the Province of Manitoba."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, is there going to be any explanation of this or not?

MR. McKELLAR: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is the motion that our Honourable Chairman made in Law Amendments Committee; this is the same motion. I think he explained it fully when he was dealing with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. WILLIAM HOMER HAMILTON (Dufferin): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that the proposed Section 9A of The Liquor Control Act as set out in Section 5 of Bill 38 be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof the words, "only by the exhibition, display, printing or publication in, by or of newspapers, magazines, books, signs, billboards, posters or other printed material."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, in view of the way that this Section 9A was amended in Law Amendments Committee I suggest that the proper motion is that all the words after the word "liquor" in the proposed Section 9A be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "only by the exhibition, display, printing or publication in, by or of newspapers, magazines, books, signs, billboards, posters and other printed material."

Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question on this one. This is an example of the type of amendments we had in committee the other day to which I referred when I spoke earlier this morning, that there is no sequence here. This amendment in part restricts and in another part expands substantially the advertising. By adding billboards and posters here we are in fact I think expanding beyond what is being done in other provinces and I frankly cannot support that part of it. There's no logic in my opinion in the amendment.

MR. LYON: Perhaps I could explain, Mr. ... -- (Interjection) -- Well perhaps I could help by explaining that -- all of the sections in any case are permissive and this would be still subject to regulations made by the Commission as to whether or not billboards, for example, I think that's the key point, would be permitted. I can't forecast accurately what the Commission would do but I merely point out that no other province in Canada permits billboard advertising and I would expect that this would be the case in Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be proper for me to state my position. I proposed the amendment for what I figured was total abolition or prohibition of advertising in the Province of Manitoba itself and now we have an amendment before us which in my opinion would create discrimination against local advertisers, and having lost the complete prohibition I can't feel that I would be justified in supporting an amendment of this nature which would only permit a little bit of sin in Manitoba. I'm agin it all. Or if we're going to have it, without discrimination between the various media of advertising.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, at the risk of displaying my ignorance, I can't understand why you say that all the words after the word "liquor" be struck out. Well there are no words after the word "liquor".

MR. CHAIRMAN: In Law Amendments Committee Section 9A as printed was amended to read as follows: "Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the Commission may make regulations regulating advertising with respect to licensed premises and liquor, but such regulations shall not permit broadcasting of advertising with respect to licensed premises and liquor between 7:00 o'clock in the morning and 10:00 o'clock in the evening." So that if this motion is passed, it would have the effect of limiting advertising to the printed material set out here: "Only by the exhibition, display, printing or publication in, by

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.) . . . . or of newspapers, magazines, books, signs, billboards, posters and other printed material."

MR. LYON: . . . billboards here is necessary in order to permit the kind of advertising that goes on at the present time, that is billboard advertising on brewery premises. If billboards were not in, even that would be cut out and that is presently permitted. I reiterate though that insofar as commercial billboard advertising is concerned that would remain still a discretionary matter and that so far as I'm aware no other province permits it on a commercial basis.

MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd be quite willing to delete the portion that reads: "Signs, billboards and posters" if it would so meet with the approval of the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Signs, billboards, posters and other printed material? The mover wishes to delete the words: "signs, billboards, posters and other printed material?"

MR. HAMILTON: No, I think if we were to eliminate the "signs, billboards and posters" but not other printed material. It's coming into the province in various forms in magazines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The mover is deleting the words: "signs, billboards, posters." So the motion will read that all the words after the word "liquor" in the proposed Section 9A be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "Only by the exhibition, display, printing or publication in, by, or of newspapers, magazines, books and other printed material."

Are you ready for the question?

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): No, for clarification, Mr. Chairman, I understood the Honourable the Attorney-General to tell us that this would take away from the breweries the right which they already have to put a billboard on their own premises and so why remove it when they already have this right? I can't understand the deletion. I was prepared to support the motion as it was but the deletion interferes with something that's already in existence and I don't think it makes coherent sense.

MR. LYON: That's the way I understand it from the statutes and from the advice that I've received that -- to boil it down, the effect of this motion if passed would be to prohibit radio and TV advertising in Manitoba.

MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Chairman, to clarify the situation I think possibly the motion should stand as originally drafted and handed to you.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a sub-amendment to this. The sub-amendment is that the amendment be further amended by deleting all the words after the word "liquor" in the third line of 9A. In other words I'm reinstating what is appearing in the original Bill 38.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have the sub-amendment from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that the amendment be further amended by deleting all the words after the word "liquor" in the third line of 9A. In other words he seeks to reinstate the original section as printed.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, no. This is amending this amendment. He's already amended that he is deleting all the words after 9A. He's putting it back to where it was, then he's adding something; isn't he?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Well how does his amendment read? Mr. Chairman, if I may, we had an amendment in Law Amendments Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think your purpose will be carried out if your motion will read: that the amendment be further amended -- that is the motion of the Honourable Member for Dufferin -- that the amendment be further amended by deleting all the words after the word "deleted". So that the original one would be reinstated as printed. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? The word "deleted" in the motion of the Honourable Member for Dufferin. It will have the effect of reinstating the 9A as originally printed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, was that the amendment that was carried in the Committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: With the restriction on TV?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. It will have the effect of reinstating Section 9A as printed, if the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface passes.

MR. LYON: . . . Mr. Chairman, for the sake of clarity on the point of order, if it might not be clearer for the Committee -- and I only make the suggestion with this motivation in mind -- if the amendment by the Member for Dufferin were dealt with separately and then my

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . . honourable friend were to come with a new amendment which would be more easily understood, I think. He can still achieve his purpose by a separate motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreeable to the Honourable Member of St. Boniface?

MR. LYON: I think it might be more easily understood if we did it that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface is withdrawing his motion for the minute so that we can vote on the motion of the Honourable Member for Dufferin which would have the effect of not allowing TV and radio advertising.

MR. PAULLEY: I was just going to say, Mr. Chairman, except for one thing -- that this amendment here would have the effect of removing the provision for TV and broadcasting and we already have within Section 9A a restriction on broadcasting, as to time, and I don't think that this amendment here would supersede the amendment that was carried in the Committee would it? This one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The way it's printed it would. It would. It would have the effect of no TV or radio advertising.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well that means that you have changed the wording from what we have in front of us. Have you not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Slightly, in order to fit in with the amendment that was made in the Law Amendments Committee. That's right.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then what you have done -- If you would read the amendment for us then we could understand what you're saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good.

MR. DESJARDINS: Why don't you read the clause the way it exists now as amended; and start from the start.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll be glad to do that. The way the clause stands now as amended in the Law Amendments Committee is as follows: "Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the Commission may make regulations regulating advertising with respect to licensed premises and liquor but such regulations shall not permit broadcasting of advertisements with respect to licensed premises and liquor between 7:00 o'clock in the morning and 10:00 o'clock in the evening." Now the amendment of the Honourable Member for Dufferin: That all the words after the word "liquor" in the proposed Section 9A be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "Only by the exhibition, display, printing or publication in, by or of newspapers, magazines, books, signs, billboards, posters and other printed material."

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . third line of the original 9B?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . moved the amendment before the amendment that was made in the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . after the word "liquor" in the third line. That makes it clear: after the word "liquor" in the third line.

MR. LYON: . . . as I understand it then, would wipe out the amendment moved by the Member for Lakeside, would accomplish what the Member from St. Boniface was trying to do partly, but would then substitute for it a more restrictive -- (Interjection) -- Yes. Completely wipe out all TV or radio advertising.

MR. PAULLEY: And radio broadcasting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. If the amendment of the Honourable Member for Dufferin passes, it would completely wipe out TV and radio broadcasting. Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move, an amendment to the amendment. I move that the amendment be amended by striking out the words: "signs, billboards, posters and other printed material" and adding the words "and billboards and signs on brewery premises."

Mr. Chairman, if I assess the situation correctly it will accomplish what the Honourable Member for Dufferin wanted plus what the Honourable Member for Brandon wanted, because it strikes out all of these things but then replaces the billboards and signs in this case on brewery premises. I suggest that this is a clarification, not a complication of the situation.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I want it definitely understood that when I vote for this motion that I'm not for advertising in any way, but at the same time I will support the amendment in order to have the lesser of the evils.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? -- (Interjection) -- Your first vote on the amendment to the amendment which has the effect of limiting advertising to printed advertising in newspapers, magazines, books and billboards and signs on brewery premises.

MR. LYON: I wonder if we could have a copy of that because there is one matter that arises. We're just having a new distillery built in Manitoba and I presume they may want to put a sign on top to indicate what they're doing. I don't believe that this sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for Lakeside would cover that eventuality.

What we're doing here in effect is this: under another section of the Act, under 175 (4) (a) which is being struck out, for the sake of clarification, there is a present provision in the Act that says: "Subject to regulations made by the Commission, a person who holds a licence of any of the kinds" and then they go on to mention the different kinds - "may publish, exhibit or display in or on an advertisement, notice or sign the fact that he holds such a licence in respect of his premises but the advertisement sign shall not contain any information concerning liquor" and so on. I believe that's the section that refers to signs on premises.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I think we're exactly back in the same position as we were in Law Amendments Committee the other day and we're going to end up by making amendments that may give us an impossible Act when we're all finished. I frankly question the procedure that we're following because I don't think we can at this stage by making minor amendments here and other amendments there and produce something that's going to be logical. If we can't agree, as we haven't obviously on deleting advertising altogether, I would respectfully suggest that the Attorney-General withdraw this section, withdraw it and have a committee study it during the course of the next year. It's not going to change anything in the course of one year but other than that we could well end up by passing something here which he is going to find is impossible to administer in any case and which may have no rhyme nor logic to it. It will be a series of compromises that'll satisfy nobody.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, there's no problem with the amendment that is before us by the Member for Dufferin; it's the sub-amendment, and I'm suggesting again that we try to avoid sub-amendments if we can. Let's pass amendments and then pass other motions and we'll keep ourselves clear. We're in no problem at all. We know exactly what has to be done to permit what is presently being done to be continued and it's certainly not worthwhile holding the whole matter over to clarify a few words like that. We're getting advice from the Legislative Counsel; I'm sure he won't let us go too far astray.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, there is something apparently objectionable from the point of view of a good many members of the committee to the Honourable Member for Dufferin's amendment because it strikes out a right that some of the people, breweries and perhaps other premises already have. -- (Interjection) -- It doesn't? Oh, well I - I thought that it incurred the displeasure of the Honourable Member for Brandon because it struck out a right that someone already had.

MR. LISSAMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, that was when he was going to delete those last categories.

MR. CAMPBELL: How does it read now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... of the Honourable Member for Dufferin reads: "that all the words after the word 'liquor' in the third line in the proposed Section 9A be deleted and the following substituted therefor: Only by the exhibition, display, printing or publication in, by or of newspapers, magazines, books, signs, billboards, posters and other printed material." Would you withdraw your amendment to the amendment?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this goes further than the present situation because if this were passed it would allow billboard advertising off premises as well. I don't think the supporters of what I will refer to as the temperance side, want that. I was prepared to leave the signs and billboards that I understood were already authorized but I certainly am not inclined to support a section that will allow the Commission to authorize billboard advertising in general. I don't think anybody in the House wants that.

MR. LYON: I read the wrong section. Here's the permissive section at the present time in The Liquor Control Act, it's presently in the Act, it will be struck out by a subsequent thing in the bill. It prohibits advertising except as permitted by the Act: "No person within the province shall exhibit or display signs, etc.," except the following things: except such signs on a brewery, distillery or winery. Now I think if the Member for Dufferin could incorporate those words into his amendment we could accomplish what the Honourable Member for Lakeside is attempting to do. That's what I think we all want to do.

MR. CAMPBELL: Dufferin, Brandon and I would all be in agreement and you could follow our advice with confidence.

MR. HAMILTON: Mr. Chairman, would you add those words to the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Legislative Counsel is drawing up the proposed change.

The motion of the Honourable Member for Dufferin will then read: "That all the words after the word 'liquor' in the third line in the proposed section 9A be deleted and the following substituted therefor: only by the exhibition, display, printing or publication in, by or of newspapers, magazines, and books, and by signs, billboards and posters on a brewery, distillery or winery."

Are you ready for the question?

MR. BEARD: Does that cut out all radio and TV advertising?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. This will cut out all radio and TV advertising, cut out billboards excepting on premises of the brewery.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. HAMILTON: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. Do you want the motion read? "That all the words after the word 'liquor' in the third line in the proposed section 9A be deleted and the following substituted therefor: Only by the exhibition, display, printing or publication in, by or of newspapers, magazines and books and by signs, billboards and posters on a brewery, distillery or winery."

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 27.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, ... my motion now? "All the words after the word 'liquor' be deleted."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that all the words after the word "liquor" in the third line be deleted. Are you ready for the question? This has the effect of reinstalling this section as it was originally printed in the bill.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chairman, in effect this does away with the amendment that Mr. Campbell passed in Law Amendments. If this what we're doing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. DESJARDINS: Ayes and Nays, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. The motion before the committee is "that all the words after the word 'liquor' in the third line of the proposed Section 9A be deleted."

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 18; Nays, 32.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost.

Section 9A as amended.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to this section. I would like to move that Section 9A of The Liquor Control Act as set out in Section 5 of Bill 38 be further amended by striking out the word "ten" in the seventh line thereof and substituting therefor the word "seven".

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, my purpose in making this amendment would then allow liquor advertising on radio and television for a 12-hour period out of every 24 hours and have 12 hours free of such advertising.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before the vote is put on this, I think this removes the logic behind the original amendment which was to remove those hours when youngsters, children were subject to the advertising. That was the reason for the 10 o'clock ... I frankly admit it's a compromise but it was one that would at least have some logic. There's no logic to the "seven" except total compromise, it's 12 hours one way and 12 hours the other; but apart from that, I don't think it achieves what some people are concerned with, is the influence on children.

A MEMBER: Why not make it "nine"?

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chairman, I would move an amendment to the proposed amendment "that the word "ten" be struck out and the word "twelve" inserted."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The word ...

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, that motion would be out of order because we're now dealing

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . . with the number - if this motion is dealt with then my honourable friend is free to move his motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. STEEN: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. Does anyone want the motion read? All those in favour of the Motion of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please stand.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 15; Nays, 35.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is lost.

Section 5, 9A as amended passed, 5--passed; 6--passed; 7--passed; 8. 58A--passed, 8--passed; 9 (a)--passed, (b)--passed, (c)--passed, (d)--passed, 9--passed; 10 passed; 11--passed; 12 (4)--passed, 12--passed; 13. 82 (1)--passed, (2)--passed, 82--passed; 13--passed, 14. 89 (1) (a)--passed, (b)--passed, (c)--passed, (d)--passed, (e)--passed, (f) (i)--passed, (ii)--passed, (f)--passed; (g)--passed; subsection (1) of 89--passed; subsection (2)--passed, 89--passed; 14--passed, 15 . . .

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that more and more there is an awareness and a deep concern about the falling apart of family life. This is a very sad situation and something that we as legislators should be thinking about very seriously because I believe the future possibilities of any great nation remaining a great nation in the future depends on the stability of the home life within that nation.

I am sure we cannot consider lightly the concern that our late beloved Governor General George Vanier and Madam Vanier expressed regarding that very important institution, the family; a concern which resulted from their personal observations of family life as they travelled through the various parts of Canada. It was owing to their urgent desire that something be done to preserve family life in this Canada of ours that the Vanier Institute of the Family was incorporated in 1965. Surely we cannot consider lightly the words of the late Governor General when on the day previous to his death he was in conversation with a friend and he made the statement that the time had come for Canadians to take action against this crisis that threatens the institution of the family.

I have been asked, Mr. Chairman, what will Bill 38 do to strengthen family ties. I have spoken on a previous occasion about the concern that was expressed to me regarding the children whose parents take them into the larger centres to enjoy recreation such as skating and hockey but when the children are ready to return home many of them have a very weary wait until it is time for the closing hour of the beer parlor or the beverage room. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, what is this legislation permitting beer parlors and beverage rooms to remain open another hour going to mean. It will simply mean that many of these children will have an additional hour to wait before returning home, not to say anything of the ability or the inability of the driver to get the family home safely.

I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to repeat the statements I made when I spoke on Bill 38 during the debate on second reading, but I will say again that in view of the broken homes, the many tragedies that arise from an over indulgence of alcoholic beverages, there are many people who simply cannot see any need to liberalize the liquor laws of our province, can see no need to give licensed premises another hour to remain open, thus giving people more time to consume more alcohol. This type of legislation will do nothing to improve the welfare or the social well being of our people, especially our young people; it will simply do the reverse. And so, Mr. Chairman, I move that Section 15 be deleted from the bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I rise to give support to the motion because I've already established with government figures that about 29 percent of all the automobile accidents in the province result from the consumption of liquor. We've established that fact. Now I know that this extra hour, the extension of one more hour of drinking time is at the option of the outlet - they're not compelled as I understand the Act to remain open for the other hour. Nevertheless, a lot of the towns in the province, that is a lot of the beer parlors in the province and outlets in the province will elect to take advantage of it - we'll say half of them close, half of them stay open. There will be a lot of traffic on the road because in those areas where they do not elect to remain open for the other hour, they'll say, "Well, we'll jump in the car and we'll drive down the road to the next town where they are open," and this kind of traffic at midnight and one o'clock is bad, it's bad at any time, and so I intend to support the motion that's put by the Honourable

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . . Member for Pembina.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the committee rise?

MR. LYON: . . . on that one motion and clear the motion off, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Honourable Member from St. Clements wish to speak? Beg pardon. . Birtle-Russell.

MR. CLEMENT: I think we should rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LYON: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. -- (Interjection) --

MR. LYON: We'll call that resolution first.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.

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