

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, June 25, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 12 Grade 5 and 6 students of the Kent Road School under the direction of Mrs. Duncan. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson. And 12 Grade 8 students of Edmund Partridge School. These students are under the direction of Miss Eleanor Murray. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. On behalf of the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here this afternoon.

STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a report to members of the House on matters concerning the sale of the Manitoba Centennial Bonds. Honourable Members will recall that the open sale of these bonds closed on June 10th but that a two week extension, that is up to the close of business yesterday was provided for holders of earlier issues of Manitoba Savings Bonds to convert them to the new Centennial series. We are still awaiting some returns from rural points in Manitoba but our next to final figures show that our bond issue has brought in the very encouraging amount of \$55,847,400.00. Of this figure \$3,612,200 came from conversion of earlier issues of Manitoba Savings Bonds, and there is still an outstanding balance of \$7,001,800 from the earlier issues. This amount together with the Centennial bond sales brings the total of Manitoba savings bonds outstanding to \$62,849,200.00.

Mr. Speaker, there are some significant features of the Manitoba Centennial Bond issue that I would like to draw to the attention of the House. First, the sale of over \$55.8 million was far larger than any of the previous six issues of the Manitoba Savings Bonds. By comparison the 1961 issue was \$40.8 million; followed by \$20.2 million in 1962; \$13.1 million in 1963; \$18 million in 1964; \$9.9 million in 1965, and \$6.2 million in 1966.

Secondly, the Centennial bond issue received widespread support from every element of the population. It was the biggest subscription by private citizens and similarly the biggest by corporations. Indeed a statistical sampling of sales indicated that corporations picked up a third of the entire issue, reflecting I contend a continuing faith of what I term "money-wise organizations" in the strength and potential of Manitoba. I note that our samplings indicate that municipalities - and this is contrary to press statements - only picked up between 4 and 5 percent of the issue, which means that private citizens and corporations acquired the vast bulk of the issue, 95 to 96 percent.

Third, in all there were 13,858 purchasers of bonds, bringing the average purchase per applicant to \$4,030, which is \$1,000 more than the previous best average recorded which was in 1964.

The money from the bond sale is primarily for four purposes. These are general capital uses for such things as roads and provincial institutions, plus funds to support the capital activities of the Manitoba Telephone System, the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and the Manitoba Development Fund.

Judging from previous experience of Manitoba Savings Bonds and with Government of Canada savings bonds, we can expect that there will be a reasonable cashing in of some bonds around December. One reason is that some corporations buy bonds for short-term investment, and some individuals use them to save for the Christmas season. As I have already noted, the total outstanding of Manitoba Savings Bonds is \$62,849,200. The previous high level of bonds outstanding was reached in 1965 after five issues had been sold in each of the five years from 1961 to 1965. That year the total outstanding reached approximately \$76,000,000.00. We have had no difficulty in redemption of those earlier issues and we are not anticipating difficulty with redemption of the current issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to observe once again how pleased I am with the result of the sale and to know that Manitobans from every part of the province are actively willing to invest in the future of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, if I might just speak briefly to the announcement made by the Minister, although I don't pretend to be a financial expert, I want to congratulate him for his very fine project in which he has raised an amount of money which exceeded under a similar program in any previous date, the amount by which he has indicated. I'm sure that the people of Manitoba by and large do have a great deal of faith in their province; if they have any concern it would be at the very large amounts of money which the provincial government is borrowing for their purposes in this day and age, but this doesn't draw back at all from the congratulations to be offered to the Minister in the promotion of the very fine campaign.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to congratulate the Minister of Finance. I would think though that some people of Mr. Campbell's ilk wouldn't be quite so gleeful about being so happy about borrowing such large sums of money that have to be repaid some day. But I would think that by and large people who bought the bonds not only had faith in the province but they probably bought the bonds at the highest rate of interest on sale in Canada, bonds of this nature, and they bought it as a good business investment at 8 1/2 percent. Had the percentage been less I would think that the sale might not have gone quite so well. But I congratulate the Minister in any case.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker. . . .

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): Does the honourable member have leave. -- (Interjection) -- Do you ask for leave?

MR. FROESE: I'll put it in the form of a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has a question?

MR. FROESE: If it irritates the House Leader so much when I get up to make some comments, I'll put it in the form of a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member may put his question.

MR. FROESE: The question is why didn't the Minister of Finance when he gave the amounts of each of the former bond sales, how much had been sold every year, why didn't he also give the interest rate each time that he mentioned those figures, because the interest figure is the big factor in selling the present bond issue.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member is going beyond the limit of a question.

MR. FROESE: The question was why didn't he give us the interest figure as well? And will he give it to us?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the direct reply to the Honourable Member for Rhineland is, one of the reasons is that I wasn't asked and I would have been glad to give it. If there is any suggestion on his part that I withheld information then it's completely unacceptable because had I been asked he would have received it. The reason I didn't give it is that it is only relevant in the context of what is the prevailing interest as at the time when the bond issue is issued; and therefore if I had said that Mr. Roblin's first issue was say 5 1/2 percent - or whatever it was, I'm not saying that it was - that it would be meaningless as it would be equally meaningless if I said that the first issue was 10 or 12 percent, which it wasn't, unless I described the interest rate in relation to what was then current on the market; then it would be meaningful.

On that point, and I'm still directing my answer to the question for the Honourable Member for Rhineland - who of course doesn't have the right to speak on statements without leave - to indicate to him that the interest rate at 8 1/2 percent was set at a fraction higher than the Canada Savings Bond interest rate. It would have been inconceivable to put it out at the same or lower than the Canada Savings Bond which is currently on sale, and no one questions, and Manitoba does not question, that the credit standing of the government of Canada is of the highest calibre and ahead of that of the Province of Manitoba and ahead of all other provinces, with the possible exception of Ontario which is usually very close to the Federal Government rate. So that the interest rate at which we put out this loan was one that was fractionally higher than the Canada Savings Bonds; it was one which was recommended by all persons who were consulted, which includes all the investment dealers, all the investors as well as the brokers who are there to protect the interests of the Province of Manitoba, as well as, in my judgment, based on information and advice given to me by those whom I could consult. So the interest rate was nothing abnormally high, but naturally it was a good investment, it was set at such a rate that would produce a fair return to the people of Manitoba who were the only ones who had

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.). . . . a right to make purchases of these bonds. So if there's any suggestion that they took them because it was good business, then by all means I accept full responsibility for making it possible for Manitobans to get a good return on their money when they invest in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, today is a very important occasion. It's the first anniversary of a very important event - June 25th. I thought that honourable members opposite might want to be reminded and that they may have the opportunity to celebrate sometime later on today.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): I have a question for the Minister of Labour. I wonder if he has any new information about the fees that are charged by Industrial Overload to people that they found jobs for?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I did undertake the other day to take a further check into the rates charged by Industrial Overload and also the rates of pay. If you recall, Mr. Speaker, at that time I indicated that Industrial Overload was not a normal type of an employment agency in that it actually is an employer of personnel and then allows its personnel to be hired out to others who require their services.

According to the information that I have Mr. Speaker, a general labour worker in the employ of Industrial Overload receives \$1.40 per hour. Of course this will be increased when the minimum wage goes to a \$1.50. The charge to the customer is approximately \$2.15. Specialized labour - and I'm sorry I haven't got a breakdown as to the definition of a specialized labourer - receives \$1.50, for which charges are made of \$2.20 to those who require the services. Skilled labour is paid \$1.85 and charge to the customer is \$2.85. Drivers receive from \$1.60 per hour to \$1.85, and the charges to customers \$2.35 to \$2.85 per hour. Female labour rates go from \$1.35 to \$1.65 and the charges to customers range from \$2.10 to \$2.45. In addition to the rates receivable by the employees of Industrial Overload, we must of course recognize that the employees receive four percent of their wages for vacation pay and they also receive a 10 percent premium on their rate for work done between midnight and 8:00 A.M.

I also would like to point out Mr. Speaker, and I'm not trying to justify or otherwise this information and the actions of Industrial Overload, but I would like to point out that most firms do charge to customers a greater amount for the service of their employees than the employees themselves receive. This is common practice, of course, in industry generally. But that is the information, Mr. Speaker, that I have received in respect of the particular service organizations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: I've a supplementary question. Are we to understand that roughly 40 to 55 percent of a person's wage accrues to that Industrial Overload as their fee? That's the way the figures seem to work out to me.

MR. PAULLEY: Well if that's the way it works - Mr. Speaker, I haven't precisely worked out percentages - but if my honourable friend the Member for Crescentwood has, then I would not dispute his figure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, I like the way the members opposite read off their prepared statements before the Orders of the Day. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of . . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm not sure just what the member -- on a matter of privilege -- just what is the member referring to? Is there any question about my right to read a statement before Orders of the Day?

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member wishes to present a question, I would appreciate if he would and limit his remarks to the question.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order and ask if you might not give some consideration to the type of answer that we just received from the Minister of Labour. My suggestion, Sir, is that that kind of an answer could more properly be given either during the course of a debate or as an Order for Return. It seems to me, Sir, that if the questioning is to be kept short in this House, the answers should be kept equally as short,

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.). . . . notwithstanding the necessity of giving out long answers. I maintain that that kind of a question should not have been asked on Orders of the Day and if it required an answer it should have been placed on the order paper as an Order for Return.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm just wondering whether the point of order still exists because the Honourable Member for Roblin indicated that he wished to put a question to the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education which he had prefaced with a remark which was not related to the question, for which I had admonished the honourable member just a moment ago. So I believe that if there was a point of order it no longer exists at this time. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I regret any remarks in the preface of my statement that were out of order. My question is to the Minister of Youth and Education. Due to the announcement of the First Minister last night in his speech with regards to compensation for those who are being removed from their position due to technological, can the Minister tell me now if this will include the school teachers who are being phased out of their positions?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): I wasn't aware that teachers are being phased out of their positions.

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

MR. MCKENZIE: A supplementary question. If the Honourable Minister would just refer back to my question the other day and his answer. I think in fact he did say that they were being phased out in some cases.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a supplementary question?

MR. MCKENZIE: I would ask him to verify his statement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I still say I'm not aware that teachers are being phased out of their positions.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, some time ago I directed a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development and it had to do with whether or not there was discrimination in pay scales between the male and female employees who are employed as custodial staff in the detention institutions of the province, and he said he would take it as notice. I wonder if it has slipped his mind. Is there discrimination in the pay scale between men and women employed in the detention institutions of the province?

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I have to agree that the question was taken as notice. I haven't got a firm reply on this; I hope to get it very shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege to correct the record of the proceedings of this House as contained in Hansard for Tuesday June 23rd, Page 3139. Mr. Speaker, I am completely responsible for the remarks given under my name on Page 3138 and at the top of Page 3139, but I think it would be modest of me to take the credit for the eloquent words that are contained in the middle of Page 3139 and I therefore would wish that the record be corrected. Apparently some other member has made these remarks and I have been given the credit for them.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fees that are being charged by Industrial Overload, would the Minister consider this to be a possible matter of investigation for his department as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

HON. AL. MACKLING, Q.C. (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, well, I'm getting lots of advice from the other side of the House and I appreciate that very much. I will look into the matter. I don't think at all, Mr. Speaker, that the jurisdiction of the Consumers Bureau relates to professional fees, but I'll make enquiry and advise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour. Can he advise whether in his opinion Industrial Overload provides a useful function in providing job opportunities for people?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member asking for an expression of opinion?

MR. CRAIK: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Orders of the Day?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if perhaps I can't get an answer from the Minister of Labour, could I direct a similar question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce with respect to industry in the province.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): . . . repeat your question.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could repeat the question as to whether the Minister of Industry and Commerce considers that the Industrial Overload provides a useful operation in light of industry's requirements in the province?

MR. EVANS: I'm sure there must be a service that is needed in the community by that organization otherwise it wouldn't be able to exist, and I'm sure it must be a profitable organization. But you are asking me for a matter of opinion. I'm not that familiar with the function of that particular company.

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable members again that this is hardly the time for questions of this type. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): . . . ask the Minister of Culture. I notice that there are some bandstands going up down the street, I wondered whether Mrs. Lennon was coming to town.

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs)(Wellington): Mr. Speaker, if that question was directed to me, I know nothing about it; not any more than I know about John Lennon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following bills: No. 3, No. 75 and No. 107.

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 Elmwood in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on Bill 75, An Act to Amend the Liquor Control Act. The proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, we were talking about an amendment and we've heard quite a bit on the subject already. And one of the things that struck me is the suggestion by many of the members that we were not proceeding the right way with Bill 75, with any reform or change to the liquor law. I say to them that we cannot have it both ways. The government either brings in a government bill and takes the responsibility, or if this can not be done, it's felt it should be left to the conscience of all the private members, the individual, then I say to the Attorney-General and others well you can't have it both ways. You're not going to veto the sections that you don't want or that you feel are some drastic change, because this if it's left to the individual might be that I feel that certain sections should not be in and the Attorney-General might disagree with me.

Now, I would be very much tempted when the motion is "that the bill be reported" to vote against this because I agree in general, I agree with what has been said that this is a poor way to bring in a bill. I think it's a poor way, because we're bringing in any kind of amendments and they might look right when we isolate them, when we look at one thing at a time, and then it might be something that will cause us much trouble later on. So I for one would be ready to accept a government bill, I think that this is the way it should be done; but I don't insist on this if it's felt that it's a question of conscience. But then what's the next step? If we bring in a private member's bill, the Attorney-General gets up once in a while and he says well not this thing, I don't think this should go through. In other words he wants a veto over certain sections and I say that's wrong. Now the only other way is - and I might say that I've been in this House for 11 years and this is always the way it's been done - that it's been a question of private members. The Attorney-General mind you - the former Attorney-General Mr. Lyon - sponsored a bill at one time but he made it quite clear, I thought it was odd, but he made it quite clear that it wasn't a government bill, although he was the man responsible and he was the Attorney-General at the time. Therefore if we are not, if it's felt that it's asking too much to have a

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.). . . . government-sponsored bill -- and I don't know - as I said, I'd be ready to accept this because I think it's the responsibility of the government -- but if this as I said is expecting too much, well then, there's only two different ways of doing it. By a private members' bill - and this is what was done when we talked about this law. Now it seems that God came on earth and said after 10:00 o'clock you can advertise, not before. Well it wasn't done like that at all. It was a private members' bill -- there was lots of discussion it's true and you might call it a compromise and we can let it go at that, maybe that's what it was -- but this motion passed at the time. And to say well this was settled forever at the time is wrong, and if this is the case the whole Bill 75 is out of order because the things are changing quite a bit.

So if we can't have a government-sponsored bill and if we don't feel that it should be done by a private member's bill, it only leaves one thing and this is probably what we should do. I can say at this time that if anybody brings in a motion that I would support, that is a motion of "not reporting the bill" because I think that we should at least have a -- and I agree that it's an important matter -- we should have a special committee of the House to look at all these things and to look at the former Act and to get the proper experts and so on in front of us. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? Well I'll vote for it. I'm glad that you will, because I think this is the way it should be done. But in the meantime, I have no alternative, if I believe that something is incorrect, if I think there should be some changes, I have no alternative but to make an amendment or suggest it here when it's a private member's bill. There's no other way I can do it. I'm not going to agree with the Attorney-General who says no, it's a private member's bill, and then who's going to get up and say but I want to veto this. He can't veto a darn thing. If he wants to take his responsibility, if he feels it's his responsibility, fine; if not, he's a private member same as anybody else in this House. And of course those that do not agree with me on this motion are free to express their thoughts the same as I am. There's no doubt about that.

Now I don't know if this has been suggested that there was any pressure because of this bill. Probably you can say about the whole bill there's been some kind of pressure or suggestion. Well I can say that nobody talked to me and asked me to try and get this clause in the former bill reinstated. And I don't intend to bring in, while we're in third reading or in Committee of the Whole, I don't intend to bring in . . . . motion that's been defeated, but I understand, unfortunately I wasn't there at the time in Committee, and I understand that it was very narrow, I think it was something like 14 to 10 or something like this. Now this is one of the reasons, and I don't intend to speak all afternoon on this, but I wanted to make this thing clear.

Now, it's funny you know, and I don't doubt because I'm like all the rest of the members, but it's funny when we have a certain hang-up where it becomes so important for us. We're talking about the liberty of the individual, the freedom of the individual to do right or do wrong, and we're sincere, I'm sure we are, because we all have those little hang-ups, but some of them, certain people feel that well in this case in liquor it's up to the State to decide. And I suppose that it's not quite right. As I say I don't doubt the sincerity of the people, but I think that the main thing in this is education. Is the education like was said by the members that either favour this resolution or that wish to reject it. The question is the education. I think that the Minister of Youth and Education touched on this, he said that you can't isolate. Now we were talking on the question of advertising and that's what it is. And if somebody is advertising the great thing, that a public compulsory monopolistic auto insurance plan is coming, well it's great if you favour this, it's great if you favour this; but whenever we talk about advertising it seems to be, we don't say it in so many words, but it seems to be practically wrong or a sin for somebody to be good at it and to advertise liquor. But if we want to protect the public in this -- I agree with a lot of the things that were said by the Honourable Member of Morris, but I certainly disagree with him when he said that it's exactly the same as tobacco. Because tobacco, we are told, and I think we all believe it, is harmful; and liquor is not harmful, it's the abuse of liquor. I know that there's a danger, I admit this, but liquor in itself, to say that liquor is all wrong and to make statements like some of the people that came in by delegation -- I received a note by one of the ladies there that there were one thousand so many priests that were alcoholics. Well what do I care about that? What do I care about that? I suppose because I'm supposed to be a Roman Catholic this is going to hit home; there's so many priests. Well maybe my friend is an alcoholic, I don't know. But -- (Interjection) -- I said maybe. Those who protest too soon and too loud - where there's smoke there is fire. No, I'm

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.). . . . just joking Mr. Chairman. But certain people have a hang-up on this. I don't know what it matters if there's so many priests in the United States that are alcoholics when we're changing the rules here. I'm darn sure they're not alcoholics because they're priests and those that are not -- well it's the same thing, it's not because they're priests that they're not drinking. This stays with the individual and that shows that you can have any kind of people that will drink.

Now as far as I'm concerned Mr. Speaker, I have no hang-up. I think I've been drunk once in my life. Mind you I've come pretty close when I've had to smell the breath of some of the members in this House. And it's no feather in my hat because it doesn't bother me. This is not my hang-up and my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition knows. I'm his fat friend and food bothers me, and I don't hear anybody say -- it's the abuse of food, this is my difficulty not liquor. But do you say well don't advertise these things. It's harmful to me; look at me, I have a hard time dragging myself around here. It is harmful to me; and it's the same thing - and you're talking about sex. -- (Interjection) -- And there's an abuse there too. What - sex? He says that sex looks good on me, I don't know what he means. I'm serious, you're laughing but I'm serious. It shows that it's the abuse that counts. You can drink - Jesus Christ himself, and he's supposed to be a pretty good man, I think that he didn't have enough wine and he changed water into wine, so it can't be all that bad. But it's the abuse; and it's the abuse in the food, and it's the abuse -- (Interjection) -- He didn't advertise? It's in the Bible and everybody reads the Bible, even you I think. I think it's pretty good advertising, Mr. Chairman. And, as I say, it's the abuse that counts. This is why education is so important in this thing.

We've talked about advertising and this is what we have to figure out. I would like to see - and it would be all in the system of education - is the right way to advertise, something that will not be abused. I think the Member from Portage said, Well, do we have to be in there with the TV and shut it off? Well, he's right. But it's not the advertising, I suggest, it's the type of advertising. He could carry this further, or is it that his hang-up or is the thing that he's most worried about is just liquor, I don't know. But there's crime, there's sex, there's all these things we know so you can go on billboards all over the city. I don't think that that's too good for the young children and for some of the older fellows like us also, Mr. Speaker. In fact I was reading just a couple of days ago that the police chief of I don't know what city, was stating that the mini-skirt was the cause of a rise -- a rise in the -- some of those fellows are pretty slow -- but in the crime rate that we're having here and it's possible. And all of a sudden I don't hear anybody say well everybody with the maxi until 10:00 o'clock at night, I never heard that.

I think that we have to educate the people and now in the advertising -- some of the members laughed when the Minister of Youth and Education said that advertising is to keep your product in front of the public and that is true. There is no doubt, there is no doubt that by advertising the odd time, somebody's -- you're coming in your car and they say this is going to be a hot weekend, get a case of beer in the fridge. You might say well that's a good idea and you might stop. You might drink the odd time or it might save you going to the bootlegger on Sunday, I don't know. But it is true that the main reason why they advertise -- and mind you one of my friends who objects to this said, well there wasn't one representation made by the owner of a brewery or any liquor at all. He said this. Then on the other hand he says -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): They don't have to.

MR. DESJARDINS: Why?

MR. BOYCE: Because you're doing the work for them.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh. Well then who are you doing the work for?

MR. BOYCE: I'll make my contribution when you're finished.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. All right we'll see for whom he's working and we'll see who pays the most. -- (Interjection) -- Well, there's the former Speaker who woke up again. You're the Rip Van Winkle -- he woke up and he was left behind well there's my old buddy over there. Mr. Chairman, I think we have to realize the most important thing is the education and in the advertising it is true, for instance if it was just to force you to use a little more and that is, I agree with the member that this is the point that maybe the sales will go up. But it's not necessarily the main thing and the only thing. For instance they're advertising toothpaste and they're advertising -- and I'm darn sure you're not going to take, because somebody's advertising toothpaste you're going to take two tubes of toothpaste and brush your teeth at the same time with two, you're going to change? You're going to try it? And this is what they want. Some of

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.). . . these breweries and some have very good programs of advertising. -- (Interjection) -- Yeah, but you don't feel a train. So you have some of these people that are talking about -- they'll say Red Cap beer or something and there is no picture of bottles, there is nothing at all that they are talking about sports or something like this. Some people think that it's bad to associate liquor with social events, and I think that this is exactly what it should be. You're going out to a ball game and they're advertising a cool beer and you're there with your children; they'll have ice cream or peanuts and you'll have a bottle of beer and it's not the end of the world, you're not going to beat your wife when you get home because you've had a bottle of beer, I don't think this.

Now I know that we're torturing -- there's comment which I heard -- (Interjection) -- Well that's right. That's why I said that, that's why I said that. Well, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend, the Minister of Health is really torturing himself. He got up and he said he wanted to be a Conservative, an NDP, a Social -- I was hurt, he didn't say a Liberal Democrat, that's the only thing he didn't say.

MR. TOUPIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I did not say I wanted to be a Conservative. I did not say that. I did not say I wanted to be a Conservative, Mr. Chairman, I said that I was caressing the idea. . .

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): On a point of order. There is nothing wrong with being a Conservative.

MR. DESJARDINS: He's talking about sex now, caressing ideas.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Chairman, I thank you for recognizing me because the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is taking me out of context. I never did say that I wanted to be a Conservative. I did say that I was wondering if my thoughts were being conservative and I was wondering if I should be progressive because of the legislation that was in front of us; that I had said that we couldn't be Conservative and progressive at the same time and that I was a Social Democrat.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm sorry. My honourable friend is right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): On a further point of order, Mr. Chairman. Might I suggest that the question of being a Conservative is not a point of order but a point of privilege.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Hear, hear.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to apologize to my honourable friend. He said that he wanted to be a Social Liberal with progressive conservative ideas. I think this is. . .

MR. TOUPIN: Now I'm up, Mr. Chairman, on the point of privilege. I did not say a Social Liberal but a Social Democrat, not a Social Liberal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we leave the matter as it is because we're all getting confused.

MR. DESJARDINS: I misunderstood him. He didn't want to be anything but he was having a hard time making up his mind. And I think this is the trouble here with us. Not all of us on the same hang-ups but all of us some time or other, there is a certain thing that is particularly dear to us or something that we're afraid of for some reason or other. Maybe we've had a sad experience related to it and then we try to be overprotective and we try to be everything to everybody and I think that this is wrong. I would certainly go along with all of the members here, I'm sure, in looking into the possibility of a good up-to-date education on alcohol, certainly. I think that maybe if we had that we would realize that it's the . . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Training centre.

MR. DESJARDINS: Training centre is all right if you want it. That's not the -- it's funny that you think it might be because actually when you want to go and dehydrate yourself, you've had too much, it becomes more or less a training centre because they give you less and less and less. Now maybe you're suggesting that we should go the other way around, I don't know. But, Mr. Chairman, I submit that it's not a question now, we're not talking against or for advertising, we're not debating the merits and the pitfalls of television or radio, we are trying to make laws and just laws. We can't prevent people from abusing things that they want to and they will find the way and I'm darn sure that there was just as much abuse before this law came in that you could not -- in this province as other provinces where you start maybe the ball game and they're talking about Molson's or one of these beers, even if you start at 3:00 o'clock. You know, I'm so fed up now because it's so limited, they start at 10:00 o'clock and every five minutes they're advertising liquor. I wish they'd start a little earlier and advertise other things at 10:00 o'clock.

MR. ENNS. Big balloons.

MR. DESJARDINS: Big balloons, small balloons, whatever you've got, everything as long as it's liquid. So, Mr. Speaker, if anybody wants to make a resolution -- I understand my friend from Rhineland says that he will -- I think that you're right. If it's felt by the members here that it could not be a government responsibility or a government bill then let's have a committee and let's look at this with the -- let's start from the Bracken Report, if you like and the existing laws and so on. This is fine but if not -- and apparently this is not going to be done -- my only way of trying to correct things that I feel is unfair, is not right, is by bringing amendments in a private member's bill like we have here. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: You know there's been some points brought into this argument, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabour the point or drag this out unnecessarily but it would seem ludicrous to me if I came before this Assembly and I purported to be an authority on embalming; because I don't know a darn thing about it, I'd probably proceed in the same manner in which you give a child an enema but I was really astounded in some of the remarks that have been made. There doesn't seem to be any effort -- I have to choose my words carefully because I, you know, one of the other members on the other side said that he had spent some time in his life standing in the gaps and holding back the bloody horse. You know I spent five years in the lower decks in the Navy and sometimes I get rather emotional. I have a tendency to revert to that type of conversation because I think it's very expressive and sometimes I have to be careful how I choose my words. But I think I would be remiss if I didn't take this opportunity to express my views relative to what we're talking about.

Now please, before I say what I'm going to say, don't think I'm talking down my nose at anybody or I'm lecturing somebody or -- please don't impute motives. But I want to just mention something about the ecological ramifications of something and I'll start by explaining the word. Now if you have a couple of situations such as you have situation (a) in conjunction with situation (b) will entail a certain result. We're talking about the relationships of (a) and (b) entailing some result. Now if I put in juxtaposition with (a) and (b) another element (c) it will not necessarily lead to the same result.

A MEMBER: Got it, Bud!

MR. BILTON: ... Bud, start over again. Start over again.

MR. BOYCE: Got it? Good. Hold on to it. Hold on to this. You know what I am ...

MR. SHERMAN: You've changed bills, you've changed bills!

MR. BOYCE: I'm astounded, I'm astounded at some of the members on this. In fact I was so tormented during the lunch hour by some of the remarks that were made that I thought perhaps the best way for me to serve my constituency was to sit as an Independent member in this House. Now -- (Interjection) -- Because I am a free man and I fought a tough battle to become a free man and I'm not going to stand up here and mea culpa, mea culpa and make a big confession about some of the errors I made in my past.

But I have addressed myself to one area and that is the area of human development. How in the hell did we get this way? And I intend to spend the rest of my life trying to find out the solutions for other people. I've found it for myself and I'm not trying to tell any individual in this House how they should behave, how they should act, how they should vote. Let me digress just for a moment. -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry; for the Member for Morris, I'm not.

MR. ENNS: You're telling him how to buy auto insurance.

MR. BOYCE: Let me digress just for a moment. If as a result of this legislative body looking at all of the evidence and you decide that you want to make booze free, after all the discussion, I'll go along with it. -- (Interjection) -- I beg to differ with you, it's not our bill, it's a private member's bill. Now -- they're getting at me again. Let me take one point. A fellow like Einstein said "Living is becoming." Some people develop the attitude that all education takes place in school. But yet when I spoke about a Task Force on Education, you know I just try to hit the highlights and I hope that people can fill in the gaps in between what I say. I haven't learned yet, I've only been here a year, how to speak on my feet and get continuity into my thoughts and persuasive arguments because I said originally in one of my speeches, I haven't got the ability of Anthony. But in learning theories -- let me talk to you about learning theories just for a moment. Now if I take this cottonpickin' ashtray and I let it go, well there's one thing that everybody in this room will agree will happen, the damn thing will fall. Now it will fall but there is a distinct possibility that it will also break. Right? Okay.

Now I can give you -- I can pile it this high, the empirical evidence, to support the contention of psychologically created needs in people. And what we're talking about is the

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.). . . . psychologically created needs in people. Albeit that the Minister of Education says that it doesn't increase the growth needs, I take exception to that because it does increase the needs of people. And there's many many areas in which this is manifest. Industry today, they sit down and their psychologists get together after some engineer, with all due respect to my friend from Riel, some engineer gets an idea. He builds something. Now how do they sell it? Is the engineer making it and putting it away on a shelf? No. They say here's a doodad, a froufrou. Look at the thingamajig eh? Everybody's seen the ad on thingamajig. Eh? How many people -- everybody raise your hand, I guess I'm back in the classroom for a moment. Sorry. But they got a doodad on television -- (Interjection) -- yeah, buy a thingamajig. This thingamajig you bought it for 79 cents at Eatons and it's very subtle, it's good advertising.

MR. ENNS: No, MacLeod's.

MR. BOYCE: Now it's available somewhere else. -- (Interjection) -- Yeah, you could even put your bottle in it. The Minister of Education accused me among others of hiding my head in the sand. Yeah I'm sorry, I guess -- well I'd rather have it there than somewhere else. But I'm sorry. I haven't got my head in the sand. In fact I've been talking about this darn need, in fact in my request for a Task Force I suggested that the press become involved and for them to assess their own position, their position and what contribution they make in people becoming what we are. In fact there's a Senate Committee, a committee of the Senate set up and they're supposed to be making a report soon on the effect of media in everywhere. Let me step aside just a second again. You know in a teaching situation in the Province of Manitoba, we're in direct conflict in many areas with the press. In schools, because of the ethics that we're expected to impart to the children, we say "don't". The press says "do". And I'm not criticizing the press for it.

MR. ENNS: They're fair game. You can always criticize the press.

MR. BOYCE: Well, I hope they don't just go out tomorrow and say Boyce -- it comes out in the paper to establish a house of prostitution or something. The press themselves could look at it. So all I'm saying relative to this particular amendment is: until we can come up with the answer let's not move on this one. Because the expansion of it -- until you can come to the decision if as a result of all the evidence, when the Senate committee's report is available and they say well you know this is the type of people that grow to a certain exposure. If you people say and the greatest number of you say, this is the way we're going to go, okay, fine, we'll go. Some people wonder, they say what are you going to Greece for? Well this is one of the reasons that I'm going to Greece. If you take a look around you and you talk about pollution, you talk about life in general, we hear many many things about the Manitoba Mosaic and every -- you know about human dignity and the human conditions, that's the word I'm searching for. What are you talking about, human condition? If you take a look at some of the sociological illnesses in our society that we are creating by such things as suddenly created psychological need -- where was I, where did I get to?

MR. ENNS: You were visiting Jackie Onassis in Greece.

MR. BOYCE: You're all going to be glad I'm leaving Saturday. But this human condition; it's a nice sounding word. Motherhood, sin -- against sin, you've got to be against sin. Heretofore you had to be against sin, now it's getting a little bit . . . for it in certain areas. But if you look around us, we're creating a type of society in which we are saying people have to live; urbanization, packing people into cities -- and what do we have to do with the cities? Somebody dropped a statistic here a little while ago -- 70 percent of the booze that's sold in Manitoba, 70 percent of the booze that was sold in Manitoba was sold in the Metro area. In my mind this means that we are creating conditions so damn bad we have to anaesthetize people before they can put up with it.

MR. DESJARDINS: The farmers come and get their supply here. Who are you trying to kid? The farmers come and get their supplies here half the time. Don't blame Winnipeg.

MR. BOYCE: Here again, if people say, okay this is the way they want to live, they want to live anaesthetized and it's a deliberate decision on their part, I say fine and dandy you do it deliberately, but realize what you are doing. If after -- I'm getting more notes, let me check first of all before I read this one. No that wasn't, let me see -- Wait until I come back I'll share it. Here we go again, one little beat of my drum, while I'm on my feet for the last time I hope. The Human Resource Research Council -- once again I mention it -- I'd even made another proposal. It didn't even get off the drafting board. The Human Development Corporation, I think I mentioned just a little bit about that. But until such time as somebody can come along and

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.). . . . look at psychologically created need and give me some basis for making a decision, I'm sorry I have to oppose any expansion of this. Now I could go for hours but I said when I started -- before I sit down though, I would agree that there is nothing the matter with being a Conservative; in fact of late they have called me the Conservative Socialist, we've got Conservative Socialists, we've got Liberal Democrats, we've got Social Democrats, we've got Social. . . . In some areas I don't think -- (Interjection) -- beg pardon? Well the only kind of Conservative, I'm sorry, I wouldn't like to be is that kind. That's all.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, I would like to direct the attention of members of the House to the gallery where we have some 80 students from Grade 5 from Neepawa who are under the direction of Mr. Bradley, Mrs. Murray and Mrs. Burns.

These students come from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. On behalf of the members of the Legislature we welcome you here this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I'm not going to speak at great length, but I was prompted to get involved in this debate because of the remarks just made by the Member for Winnipeg Centre. He reminds me of an individual that often encourages people to do certain things, while probably at the same time he does everything that he says other people shouldn't. I don't accept the philosophy or the attitude that he displays here in suggesting that because of a media in the living room of one's home or one's rumpus room, that there is going to be a form of indoctrination taking place which he, as the head of his household and any other members of the household will not be able to contend with.

It's remarkable to notice that a lot of the members that are speaking in opposition to the extension of advertising of liquor, beer, wine, so forth, are people that themselves very heavily indulge in the drinking of those products or the consumption of those products, and I'm wondering, I'm wondering - and I'm thinking of members on both sides of the House - I'm wondering whether the children that they are trying to protect from the environment are more subjected to that environment by watching what their parents do than they would be by watching a commercial on television or hearing one on radio or looking at an advertisement in a newspaper; and if it was at all possible to box yourself in, to prevent the environment from penetrating, what kind of a world would we have, Mr. Chairman? Can we really live in isolation of what is happening around us? Can we really say that we must keep these things from our children? I find that that has never worked; I find that the very thing that you are trying to prevent from becoming a known fact, happens to work its way into the minds of people. The very thing that you say must not be done is usually the very thing that is wanted to be done. You get an opposite reaction. When you tell a child don't do something, that child will insist that it must. There is some experiment involved, there is some mystery involved, and it's a natural instinct to uncover that particular mystery.

I think my friends have indeed buried their heads in the sand when they speak in opposition to the use of media in the advertisement of liquor, beer or wine. If it were true that it could be prevented their argument might stand up to some degree, but truthfully speaking, no matter where you go, in the urban areas, in the rural areas along the highway, you will see examples of consumption of alcoholic beverages, despite the fact that in many of these cases people are actually breaking the law, despite that fact.

I recall having a discussion with a chap that visited me sometime ago, about a year ago, who had immigrated to Canada, indeed to Manitoba, from Belgium, and he said to me one of his first experiences in this country was a unique one - it had to do with our laws respecting the consumption of alcohol. He was single at the time and he had picked up his girl friend, decided that they were going to visit a beverage room, found out that his girl friend couldn't sit with him in the beverage room because she wasn't 21. He was but she wasn't, so he said we were in really somewhat of a dilemma. He said I wasn't aware of the laws of Manitoba. Back home it's a family affair to go to a beverage room, the parents have a lot of discretion as to how the kids behave and that really because there is no mystery about alcohol it is used, shall we say with most discretion, that people are educated to use alcohol. He was amazed, he told me that in order that his girlfriend and himself could enjoy a drink of alcoholic beverage, whatever it was, they had to buy a case of beer and go down a country road, because after all you couldn't

(MR. USKIW cont'd.). . . . drink that beverage in the establishment where he purchased the case of beer, and he couldn't drink it in front of the people that were running the establishment because they would be subject to penalty according to the law.

So no one Mr. Chairman, can convince me that any laws that we want to pass respecting the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverage is really going to be effective, because people have ways and means of circumventing laws which try to control their morals or their behaviour, their way of life. This is something that is in my opinion, impossible to do, impossible to do. And in light of the fact that we have media beamed at Manitoba from all over, from the provinces to either side and the United States into Manitoba, unless we are prepared to go so far as to control that media, I think we are really kidding ourselves and members here that are speaking in opposition do have their heads in the sand. I don't believe that I will ever see the day where this government or any government in this province is going to take the position that they will restrict communications that come from other provinces or other countries, I just don't believe that that is going to happen. And unless it was going to happen I'd say there is no creditability to the argument put forward by members opposite to the motion on the part of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out to the honourable members that we are free to debate each section for as long as members feel is necessary, but I would remind members that we have spent some time on this bill and on this section in Law Amendments and in this morning's proceedings and again this afternoon. I would remind members that there are many sections of this bill that will entail considerable debate and I would ask them to attempt to keep their remarks pointed so that we can make some progress on the bill. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, when I want some advice on things pertaining to agriculture, I'll go to someone who knows more about agriculture than I do, albeit my basic degree is an Honours Degree in Agriculture, but I have spent considerable more time studying the behaviour patterns of people and learning theories and what causes people to become something than our Minister of Agriculture and I take great exception to his offhand dismissal of my opinion and perhaps he would be surprised what governments will do or will not do to stay in office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, we've sure had an awful lot of very, very complicated arguments over a fairly straightforward decision, and I want to agree with the remarks that you, Mr. Chairman, have just made regarding this resolution. What's before us is essentially to decide whether the Legislature or the Cabinet makes a decision as to whether or not television advertising will be allowed in the viewing hours when children normally watch television. That's the decision we are faced with. Most of the arguments we have heard have been very valuable from very many points of view, but I don't think basically that they are affecting anyone's thinking here; they are learning a lot but as far as most of us are concerned, I'm sure we are making a subjective decision as 57 people here as to whether or not we want children, during the normal hours when they are watching television, to be exposed to the advertising that they would be exposed to by the liquor and beer companies that are selling and that's the straightforward decision. Again I say that we all know how we feel on this. I happen to be one of the people that, I suppose by definition "across the way" have sand all over my shoulders, but I intend to keep it there, because I have three children that I do not want watching liquor advertising before 10 o'clock, and they very, very seldom see it after 10 o'clock, and if it's a problem we'll move it to twelve o'clock. But I don't intend to add any further to the debate and I hope that you have the opportunity to call the question very soon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILL URUSKI (St. George): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think sitting here all morning and part of the afternoon we have heard considerable debate on the subject and I would move that the question be put.

MR. FROESE: That's closure. That's not in order. On a point of order Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's proper to have a motion like this come forward in Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, I did not hear the Member for Rhineland, would he repeat his statement.

MR. FROESE: My point of order was that I don't think it's proper to have such a motion be put in Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Clerk advises me that it was more appropriate to call for the question rather than to make a motion in Committee of the Whole. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I want to make one point and then I'll sit down. We have been discussing Bill 56 now for days and days and repeatedly we have asked for regulations to that bill so that we would be clarified, the position would be clarified -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please direct . . . . . to Bill 75, or . . . .

MR. FROESE: I'm coming to Bill 75 because what we are actually doing by passing this amendment is to give the Cabinet the power again to bring in regulations on this and not have it in the Act, and this is the very thing that we have objected to in Bill 56. We wanted to see it in the Act and not in regulations. Now by passing this amendment we would be doing the very thing that we do not want to happen in Bill 56.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take too much time. I would like to say first of all that it's amazing how people are suddenly interested in calling the question after they have had an opportunity to speak and I think a little common courtesy should be shown to those that want to speak. We have wasted a lot of time in Law Amendments there is no question, some consider it was a waste of time but we sat and listened. Those of us who haven't spoke sat here all day listening and it seems to me that they'd have the courtesy to listen to someone else who wants to speak at least once. I would like to say a few words on this. I have taken a position on Law Amendments and I would like to take a position on it here. I think I've indicated how I'm going to vote.

It seems to me the question here is whether advertising should be allowed. The Member for Riel mentioned that this is what we should address ourselves to, so let's talk about that. Radio and television is in a field, by the very nature of the way they operate that there is discrimination, there's no question about it. People can pick up a paper and read it any time, they can see a billboard on a bus at any time. There is no way of controlling that and there is no way of controlling billboards in the city, and outside of the city of course you don't have that problem, because it is only in the city that you see this. Television and radio is another thing. In television, children watch it. How many children, say kids under ten read a newspaper? I don't think very many. But I would say that probably 100 percent, or very close to 100 percent of kids watch television, whether we like it or not, and they see the commercials and the Minister of Education mentioned, to buttress his argument that it won't work because they see drinking in the actual show itself, before 10:00 o'clock, that's true. You see drinking, you see cheating, lying, unfaithfulness, murder and everything else in a movie itself throughout the day, and I suppose if we use his argument and advance it a step further we would say that we should legalize all the rest of the things like prostitution and drinking and cheating and unfaithfulness, if we were to use that type of logic.

The fact of the matter is, a movie is one thing and an advertisement is another thing. It has a particular message it's beaming at a group of people and I think the Communists who are the best experts in twisting minds; they know when to get kids to think their way. They start on them when they're small and this is why they have for years taken the kids out of homes and put them into schools and brainwashed them into their godless and Communistic ways. They're very good experts, and I think what we're doing amounts to the same thing except we don't have such motives. All we want to do, or all our society wants to do is sell some more booze, but the result on that pliable mind is the same, and it's a very impressionable mind and it's affected by the liquor advertising and it's certainly affected by the violence and the cheating and the lies and all the rest that go on in the actual shows.

Another point has been mentioned here that we shouldn't set moral standards. The fact of the matter Mr. Speaker, is all those volumes on that table if you leaf through them you'll find that they have to do with morals, whether it's the fact that you're allowed only one wife in our society, that there's such a thing as statutory rates all the way down the line. All the laws deal with moral restraints and moral guidelines, and in fact if you want to go back further the whole system is really based on the Ten Commandments to start with, whether we like it or not. If you read the Ten Commandments and you look at our laws you'll find there's up to now there hasn't really been very much conflict; some of them are identical. So when we talk about we as legislators imposing our morals, the fact is this has been done; the function of Legislatures throughout the democratic world has been and still is and I hope to God it will continue to be, because that is why the people send us in here to make laws and those laws are based on something, on our beliefs.

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.)

I, as the Minister of Transportation, of course see the result of drinking, and we deal with these problems as does the Registrar, as do the courts and we know, no matter what we do in our department that slaughter and the tragedy on the highways continue. We know that, just as sure as the sun rises tomorrow. Does that mean that we should stop our safety program, we should stop taking licenses away and penalizing people? Till the last day that we're in here we should fight to keep down the accident toll, whichever way possible, and we'll continue to do it, knowing in advance that we will not succeed at best; if we can hold our own we will consider ourselves a success.

With liquor advertising as anything else we know that the system as it's presently continuing is for more and more liberalization of liquor, longer hours, and we've done that; we've given more liberalization than I think is required. We say you can drink, instead of 12:00, until 2:00 in the morning. We let them drink on Sundays, we let them drink in restaurants. You know, we've done these things but no one can say that we're dictators. The product is there, the facilities are there, the hours are there. Now what more do you want? What more does a person want? How could anybody say that we're dictators and we're trying to impose certain restrictions? The fact is the product is there and the place is there. All we are talking about is don't bring in the junk on the television screen where our kids watch it. Is that such a terrible thing to ask for? You know, most of the fellows here are married and they have kids; I'm sure that if they sit around and think about it long enough they'll realize that it's not us that we're talking about - although I'm sure advertising affects everybody, otherwise industry wouldn't spend the money they do - but we're concerned about kids.

This is what education is about and this is what the propoganda on television, although I am certain by saying what I said, I won't change one mind because if I've learned anything in the Legislature, I've learned that you can not argue religion and booze. We all have our mental blocks, everyone of us, and we're not going to change our mind. I would doubt if one person has changed his mind here today as a result of the speeches made, but we make them because we feel strongly enough about it and we say it and let it be recorded, maybe somebody reading it up in Pukatawagan will read it and will think, well maybe that's a good thing, maybe we'll change his mind and there's some value to that.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going - or Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to prolong the debate except to indicate that I'm going to vote against the resolution. I hope those that care enough about kids will vote against it also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, that last statement made me get up, because I care about kids.....

MR. BOROWSKI: I'm sorry. I withdraw it.

MR. CHERNIACK: You withdraw it? The last statement was withdrawn; I withdraw my right to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to add which hasn't been said before, but like the Minister of Transportation I feel that it is nevertheless important to register my opinion and say a few words.

I would say first that I'm going to vote against the amendment, not because I am convinced that by this act we will change the life styles of our times or our generation or our children, because I think the Minister of Education is right in saying that this is just one small influence on us as people and on our children.

Nevertheless I think that the advertising has some effect and it's not simply what he suggested that it's a matter of choosing between one label and another affecting taste between a label. I think it has a cumulative effect in changing our tastes. I think this has been proven by most studies in advertising, but I think there's another issue that's equally important here and that is by voting against the amendment I think we assert our rights. We register our right as the Legislative Chamber, being the collective voice of the people of Manitoba, to interfere with what I believe and I think what a lot of people believe is an insidious practice of merchants which is to manipulate the minds of young people before they have the ability to discriminate and I think that is an issue here. I think by voting against the amendment we do assert our right to interfere with this practice. Again I think it's not just a matter in my mind of liquor or cigarettes which I think all would agree can be medical hazards; I think it's a matter of social pollution which is brought about by the advertising industry in general. I think advertising, everybody

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) . . . . knows, doesn't teach us how to discriminate as well as warn consumers. The whole purpose it is to misinform, to - as the Member for Kildonan suggests - perhaps to train us at the earliest age to become super consumers, to become mindless consumers. I think that's the point of modern advertising.

I know that in watching my kids grow up, and I think they're average kids, they've become gluttons for things and they don't watch television or the media any more than most kids, and their life style is predetermined. It's all determined for them. They don't have much choice in the matter, and I think that the quality and content of the broadcasting industry, including the advertising, has had some impact and I think there's nothing wrong with this Chamber, being the elected representatives of the people of Manitoba, in attempting to interject themselves in this process to a degree, perhaps only as a matter of setting precedents.

In fact Mr. Chairman, I would recommend that we look into the question of advertising that is performed around children's programs in general. I would like to see an examination, investigation of banning advertising, advertising of programs that are geared to children, because I think whether they're talking about cereals, you know, or candy bars, or liquor, we're talking to impressionable minds, to minds that cannot discriminate and we're brainwashing them into becoming super consumers, and I think that I would make a general plea that, if not in this Legislature - perhaps it's not the appropriate one, perhaps it would have to be the one in Ottawa - would look into the whole question of banning advertising which affects the programming geared to children and make that a general policy. To sum up Mr. Chairman, I would say that I am definitely going to vote against the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . on the question on the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say two words on the subject because I had spoken on -- (Interjections) -- two of my words, Mr. Chairman, because I had spoken on it in second reading and participated in the vote the other night in Law Amendments Committee. I wish that I could agree and vote with the Minister of Transportation on the subject at issue because I really feel that he, in his remarks, brought great good sense to the assessment of the question, I respect the points that I think he made and made very effectively.

At the same time, Sir, I was impressed by what the Attorney-General had to say on this whole subject, and my colleague the Member for Morris, and I feel that this section, as I examine it, does not provide the opportunity for a wide-open exercise of all kinds of advertising privileges, and if it did so I would be emphatically opposed to it. I said on second reading that I was against extension and expansion to what I would consider to be an unreasonable degree of advertising because I think there is a keen differentiation between the use of alcohol and the promotion of the use of alcohol. I have nothing against the use of it. I do have some reservations against the widespread promotion of the use of it, but as I examine the section - and I was one of those in Law Amendments Committee the other night who voted against deletion of this section - as I examine it I come to the view that the responsibility requested in it is a responsibility that would repose with the chief law officer of the Province, the Attorney-General, and with the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the administration of the day, and I see nothing wrong with placing that responsibility in their hands in the wake and as a consequence of what the Attorney-General has already had to say on this subject.

I have the impression, unless I'm reading him wrongly, that he intends, should this section pass or should this bill pass unaltered or even altered, that he intends to address himself very assiduously to the whole question of advertising in the course of the next year, and I think at that time that the issue that we're debating in considering this section right now will be more relevantly available to examination and to the kind of expression of points of view that is occurring at this stage in the debate. I think at that time that I will probably stand with the Minister of Transportation and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in opposition to extension of advertising privileges, particularly in the broadcast media, but the section as it's contained at the moment, Sir, does not suggest to me that those privileges will be extended and I am putting my faith in the position that the Attorney-General has expressed that he will address himself to this question and that there will be no cavalier approach taken to this very important issue as long as he is in office and I would hope that any succeeding Attorney-General would bring the same conscience to the question as the present one professes to be doing. So if it may appear to some members, Sir, that my position is different from what it was on second reading, I would like to assure them that it really is not, Mr. Chairman, because on second reading I spoke against

(MR. SHERMAN, cont'd.) . . . widespread extension of advertising in the broadcast media but in Law Amendments I did not vote to delete the section; I voted for retention of the section. There is no inconsistency in that position, if I may say so, for the reasons that I've stated in the foregoing few moments. For that reason, Sir, I intend to support the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Yeas and nays, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Honourable Member have support for ayes and nays? (Agreed) Call in the members.

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

MR. CLERK: Ayes: 14; Nays: 36.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the proposed amendment lost.

Section 3. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I have a further amendment that I would like to propose at this time. I move that Section 10 of The Liquor Control Act be amended by deleting the words "10:00 o'clock" in this section and insert the words: "11:00 o'clock".

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that Section 10 be amended by deleting the words "10:00 o'clock" and insert the words "11:00 o'clock". Are you ready . . . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: A.M.?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 11:00 P.M. I . . . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, in speaking to the resolution there is nothing about "A.M." in the section. If the Honourable Finance Minister want it read out, I can read it out to him, but -- (Interjection) -- No, the reason is that I feel that we would have plenty enough of advertising without having the restriction or by not extending the restriction to 11:00 o'clock and I feel, as has been pointed out by a good number of other speakers, that I feel that this would be welcome to the people of this province and therefore I'm moving it.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the proposed amendment lost. (The balance of Section 3, and Section 4 of Bill 75 were read section by section and passed) Section 5(a) . . . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Section 5 of Bill 75 be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I see no need for extending the hours under this section. This would carry it into Sunday and I certainly don't go along with that.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 5 to 11 of Bill 75 were each read section by section and passed.) The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: I would like to amend Section 12. I think copies of an amendment have been distributed. I think however, the first few clauses of Section 12 can be called. I will have an amendment after clause 2 has been dealt with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Section 12 - 122.2 was read and passed) The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at the outset that, as most of the members know, in Law Amendments Committee I pointed out my great reservations in respect to the very substantive amendment which was embodied in the amendment proposed by my colleague, the Honourable Member from Rupertsland. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. -- (Interjection) -- All right. And the amendment which is shown as 12A has the effect of making it possible to sell hard liquor (that expression I think is commonly understood) in beverage rooms and I think the vote in the committee was very decisive. The overwhelming majority of the members in the Law Amendments Committee that had deliberated in those discussions were in favour of this change. I did indicate, however, Mr. Chairman, my grave reservations about the amendment itself introducing problems regarding implementation of this in areas that had not provided for the sale of hard liquor, had by vote opted only for the sale of beer or wine.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I indicated my reservation in respect to the change that it would have or the potential imbalance it would create in respect to the provision of the principles of the Act regarding the relationship of food and alcoholic beverage. However, the majority of the Law Amendments Committee did endorse the principle involved in the amendment and therefore I wish to make an amendment which would certainly make the amendment provide for the

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . implementation on a pragmatic basis and a workable basis by the Liquor Control Commission and which would have the effect of not introducing hard liquor in those areas which had not provided by vote for it.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, it would spell out that the provision of hard liquor in these beverage rooms would not enable the introduction of sophisticated drink because it was the argument of those who supported it that the nature of a simple drink of alcoholic beverage in the form of whisky or other alcoholic drink should be available at a very reasonable price without a sophisticated mix.

Accordingly, the amendment that I move provides that Section 12A, the new section that the Honourable Member from Rupertsland's amendment provided for be struck out and that a new subsection (4) be added. Those of you who have a copy before you -- perhaps I should read it into the record -- it would be entitled "Special authority for sale of liquor". Notwithstanding subsection (3) which provides for the sale of beer or wine in a beverage room. Notwithstanding subsection (3), the commission may, by written order subject to such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, authorize the licensee under a beverage room licence issued in respect of a beverage room in a portion of the province in which the commission may issue cocktail room licences, to sell for consumption in the beverage room under the licence wines of all kinds and other liquors either unmixed or mixed only with water or soft drinks; and, where the commission has authorized the licensee to do so under this subsection, the licensee may, subject to any terms and conditions set out in the order, sell for consumption in the beverage room wines of all kinds and other liquors either unmixed or mixed only with water or soft drinks.

Mr. Chairman, I think with those few brief remarks that I have made it will indicate my acceptance, with a measure of reluctance, of this substantial change in the Act which is embodied by this amendment, but with the amendment that I propose, will at least provide a measure of workability to this change that otherwise wouldn't be provided for and would not by the simple introduction of it fly in the face of the democratic votes that were taken in the areas that had opted only for liquors of the type provided by the vote.

Therefore, I move this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Chairman, some three days ago in Law Amendments when I introduced this amendment on hard liquor for the convenience of what I believe to be a large majority of Manitobans, I understood that my amendment would respect local options and involve straight liquor and mix so that the price would be moderate. I'm happy that the Attorney-General has introduced those refinements or specifications which protect in the Act, in writing, local option and assure simple drinks at a moderate price and also those specifications which protect the standards of beverage rooms.

I want to thank him also for clarifying the method of introduction through an application to the Liquor Board. I trust this will prove speedy and efficient to comply with the wishes of the House and for the convenience of Manitobans.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I really only want to ask a question of the Attorney-General. I have had one phone call myself from a restaurant operator and while he didn't go into great detail, he expressed to me the thought that this could be very harmful to the restaurant business. I still don't know quite what he was getting at because I was busy and I couldn't talk that long. But would this be harmful to the restaurants who had licences and they had an expensive cocktail bar set up and if someone across the street has the hard liquor in a beverage room and there's a price differential in the order that has been mentioned by the Member for Rupertsland, would this not have a harmful effect on the restaurant business? I really don't know. I'm rather vague on it.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's a speculative question but in the Law Amendments Committee, as the honourable member will recall, I expressed reservation about the impact of this change in respect to the degree of sophistication of restaurants in Manitoba. I think that there has been a very high standard of restaurants provided, and eating accommodation provided, as a result of deliberate policy carried out by The Liquor Control Commission, arising from the directive of the Bracken Inquiry Commission which laid down pretty stringent guidelines which were adopted by the government of the day in the provisions of the Act, and it has caused some difficulty for various people who felt that the requirements were too severe. Now this will mean a very substantial change. To what permanent effect, we can only speculate, but the

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . one thing that I am satisfied that the particularization provided in this amendment will do, is to ensure that the beverage room will not, initially at least, become a cocktail lounge by virtue of having a degree of sophistication in the drink that is provided.

I think the intent of the amendment that was made in Law Amendments Committee was to provide for a very simple drink, no sophistication, no elaborate preparation and so on, and if it's possible to maintain that system, then I don't think that the much more elaborate and sophisticated atmosphere, decor and so on of the cocktail lounge should be endangered too greatly. But to what degree it will be affected, I can only speculate. I'm hopeful that the principle that is involved in the amendment will be adhered to, and that was to provide, as I understand it, to many people who cannot afford an expensive, or don't want a very expensive elaborate drink but would prefer a drink of hard liquor rather than beer or wine, an opportunity to buy that simple drink at a moderate price, and I'm hopeful that the Commission will be able to lay down guidelines which will have the effect of maintaining that principle. I hope that that will come about because if it's allowed to be carried further, then the principle that's involved of providing a simple and moderately priced drink will be gradually eroded away. Maybe the people who will be faced with the guidelines that the Commission will lay down might think that they are a little stringent, but I'm hopeful that they will accept the fact that the principle behind this amendment, as I understand it, is to provide a simple drink of hard liquor at moderate prices.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A person who has a hotel with a cocktail lounge and a beverage room, he could close his cocktail lounge if he so wished and apply for the simple liquor license in his beverage room, thereby getting rid of some of his overhead by serving everyone in the one room. Is this not a fact?

MR. MACKLING: I think that's no doubt possible and might be the probable result where there is a marginal requirement of a cocktail lounge in a local community. I think there will be some change particularly where they have the two facilities side by side, but I think where there is a very high class restaurant and they have a dining room license and a cocktail lounge, I can't foresee any change there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, speaking to the amendment, the Honourable Attorney-General has used the word "the principle of the bill" many times and also in talking to the Honourable Member from Rupertsland earlier today, he explained his reasons for presenting this. We are coming into a situation here that is being done very hurriedly by this legislation.

I think the Liquor Board or Commission should study this very seriously, because the principle of the bill was to make sure that anybody that did have a cocktail lounge had to adhere to very stringent rules before it was received. The Legislature has enforced the ban to go into a very large investment in this case and all of a sudden - and I realize it will be the Liquor Board who will decide, they will decide whether this beverage room is such that it should be licensed to serve hard liquor or not - but we are gradually moving down the road, as far as I can see, in that not the beverage rooms, but the small restaurant that does not have the facilities that the other man has had imposed upon him by the Legislature, can very rightly so, come forth and say, I have the same type of restaurant, I have tables, I have all of these things and why can't I serve liquor too? I know, again I say the Attorney-General has said that it will be a licence granted only by permission but we are going down the road. I just mention a little case of a township in Ontario that I knew of that had a very strict or funny liquor law that said you can't bring liquor into the township but if you ever snuck it in there you could drink it in the middle of the street and this was basically what was happening. So really Mr. Chairman, I would say that before, in the period of three days, this has been sprung upon us, we are going - and there is no doubt about it - you are going to hurt men with very large investments which were imposed upon them by the Legislature that presently have a cocktail licence.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mine is merely a question of detail, in a sense. I am just wondering, where the Minister is suggesting as mix, water or soft drinks, would it not be better to word it instead in the terms of the product normally sold in there. For Example, fruit juices by this would be automatically excluded; I am just wondering if we couldn't simplify the wording, that's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I have to agree with the member's remarks from Sturgeon Creek. I know in my constituency there are two places that have just opened up, that have set up very elaborate places and they are very nice and in the country we only have so much of a population and this will practically force these two fellows out of business. I don't really know how they will be able to make it pay and I hope that if this does go through there can be some regulation that the hotels or the beverage rooms cannot sell exactly the same type of drinks, because if they do, and the people can get them cheaper there as well, while we must sympathize with them, we must realize that it will create a hardship to the other people and if every place has it, the places will become cheaper. It will be like what it is when you go across the line into some of these places where they have a poor type restaurant and every place has lots of liquor but you haven't got any decent places left. -- (Interjection) -- The Member from Assiniboia says next thing they will be wanting it in the grocery stores. But it really will hurt people in my constituency, a few of them, if this does go through.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a very few words on this amendment. I think the Attorney-General would have been well advised to study this and bring it in at the next session, amend this at the next session. I think he is going to create a lot of problems around the province and I can see people now with elaborate cocktail lounges, I can see people with a lot of elaborate dining places, they are going to be affected, because the restaurant trade with cheaper meals and a beverage room with cheaper liquor, can take over this trade.

Now I don't think these people in the Province of Manitoba, in fact I know the people in my area - and I want to say there are three cocktail lounges, Souris, Boissevain and Killarney, and I know I haven't contacted these people because I just got this amendment today, the amendment, and I think it's not really fair to these people with investments they have made, to go in with one stroke off the pen and say that their business is cut in half or more than cut in half, to the elaborate dining rooms that they have established in their operations, that these dining rooms are going to be affected, and I would say to the Attorney-General and to the Members of this Assembly that I think that if we are going to make a radical change like this, that we should take sufficient time and have the Liquor Commission approach all these licensees and get their opinion. I don't know, I just don't understand it myself, why we should be approaching this in such a hurry. I remember so well when The Liquor Act was debated before, I remember so well, there was no radical change in my twelve years in this House that would compare with this change because you are affecting every licensee in the province and I mean every licensee, and until they are informed and we get their opinion, I think that we would be well advised to vote against this amendment.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman before . . . I would like the opportunity of setting the record straight. The Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney in his remarks pretty well conveyed the message that the principle embodied in this amendment is the result of my agitation. I am sure that he recalls, or if he was at the Law Amendments Committee -- (Interjection) -- Well I just want to set out that the Law Amendments Committee in a very decisive manner by vote, indicated their endorsement of the amendment and I think that amendment is unworkable and impractical and that's the amendment that I now seek to strike out and provide for a workable arrangement and my views have been made pretty clear in my introduction of this amendment.

Now I would also, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, as you can understand this amendment has been prepared rather hastily, because of the need to come up with a solution for the problem that the amendment in Law Amendments Committee embodies, and the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose is quite right that it may well be that an individual would want to utilize a fruit juice rather than a soft drink, and the only way to really provide for this properly is to define or to eliminate the words "soft drinks" and provide something like this - well you could leave the words "soft drinks" and with leave of the House I would like to change this and if you would follow the amendment that I have before you, Legislative Counsel and I have discussed this and suggest that the wording should read: "Liquors, either unmixed or mixed" - this is 1, 2, 3, 4 the 5th line up from the bottom - Liquors, either unmixed or mixed only with water or soft drinks or simple mixes prescribed by the Commission," or simple mixes prescribed by the Commission, and then at the very conclusion where there is a repetition again of the type of mix, after the words "or soft drinks" "or simple mixes prescribed by the Commission" and with leave of the House I would like to make that change in the amendment that is suggested.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . Attorney-General have leave to make that change?

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you speaking on that point of order?

MR. BILTON: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has got up and put his position on the record, and it's really something that I had intended to do. The Member for Souris-Lansdowne implies that the Attorney-General is now bringing this forward as a radical change. The only reason the Attorney-General is bringing this amendment forward is that members of the House asked him to bring something which would protect the local option. He spoke against, as I recall, this radical change.

The other point that I want to make is on Monday night when this was first raised, there was some question as to whether people would be hurt and whether they would make representation so the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne can't say that he first found out about this today. I was very shocked on the day following, which was the next night, that there was nobody there, the item appeared in the papers in bold print that the beverage rooms were going to be able to serve liquor and not a single person came before Law Amendments to talk about the question, even though the notice had been given. Surely any member who was concerned could have told people to come in and speak, because this was being discussed. Not only was it listed in the paper at that time, but it was listed in the paper, oh at least two weeks earlier when there was a considerable story that the Member for Rupertsland would be putting this type of an amendment. So I was impressed by the fact, Mr. Chairman, that nobody appeared at Law Amendments Committee to say that this was a radical change. I do want to repeat because I think it bears repeating, that the Attorney-General brought this amendment forward as a result of a request; he did not propose this change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a comment on this amendment. In our particular area we have eight hotels and the one in Swan River with a cocktail lounge and the other six in communities quite a distance from Swan River. This amendment will afford the hotels in those small communities the opportunity of serving hard liquor so that therefore it seems to me it will be a service to those people rather than having to drive or what have you into Swan River to enjoy the facilities of a Cocktail Lounge. Particularly if it is their feelings that they would like to have a drink from time to time, it will probably eliminate them having to have a bottle from time to time and therefore may be a step in the right direction in those small communities and be well worthwhile.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, on this I think -- I'm sorry the Member for Pembina isn't here -- but I think they have strayed in their thinking if I understood the Member for Rupertsland right, he introduced this so that it would be a simple drink added in a beverage room which is certainly really no competition to anybody that is operating a cocktail bar and a restaurant.

You have had it defined by the Attorney-General today; it is a simple drink of rye or scotch or rum or whatever it may be, and there would be the addition of coke, and such on, but it isn't a mixed cocktail that you would go to a cocktail bar for. Now there is a difference. There is quite a bit of difference because if there are two or three people going to a place and particularly with ladies, in most cases, they want a more sophisticated drink and as far as putting people out of business, I just can't see this. I won't name the restaurants in town, but we know them in the cities here, ones that will charge \$7 or \$8 for steak and they are not concerned about the place down the road that sells steak for \$1.50 or \$2.00. Those \$1.50 or \$2.00 steak houses are not putting these sophisticated places out of business, nor is the simple drink in a beer parlour going to put a cocktail bar out of business. Under no condition can I see that there is any resemblance between the business that is undertaken in the cocktail bar and that which is in the beverage room. They are different in all respects and the Commission itself understands the difference and stipulates the difference, lays down the difference when they put out the Licences. I don't think that ever it was conceived that a cocktail lounge was given a monopoly on a certain type of drink and that is why they were allowed to build their cocktail lounge and their restaurant. If somebody is having a drink in a beer parlour or a beverage room, then when they are going to move to a restaurant to eat, they are going to make their decision as to whether they are going to go to the five or six or seven dollar steak house or restaurant where

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . they are going to have the other sophisticated drink; they go hand in hand, and to say that one would put the other out of business I can't see that. I think that the Honourable Member for Swan River brought up the best point, and that's the fact that it can now be served in small communities that cannot support a cocktail lounge and if you are talking about putting somebody out of business - which I am sure it will not do - you are in fact, on the other hand, giving an additional privilege to many hundreds of places in the community of Manitoba. In fact, it's the rural members that have spoken against it and they are the areas in which many of them that do not have the privilege of having cocktail lounges in their communities, so I think you've got to take a look at it and say again to yourself, what does this really do? Actually it just extends the privilege to those people that do not have that privilege at this time and it is hopefully brought in I'm sure by the Member of Rupertsland in that it will lower the cost, not increase the cost but lower it and I would presume that it'll lower it very considerably so that somebody can go in and have one, and it's not going to cost them that much extra to have a drink of hard liquor if they so desire.

But I don't foresee in any case where it would ever put a cocktail lounge or a sophisticated restaurant out of business or in fact cut their business because probably the people will end up in the restaurant anyway eventually and they're not going to this sophisticated restaurant to do their drinking. They're there to do their eating and they're going to have a couple of drinks but I don't think it'll hurt the restaurants and I don't think it'll hurt the cocktail bars. They're two different types of customers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm disturbed by -- that is my sense of order is disturbed here because as I understand it, we have proposed Section 12A which was accepted by Law Amendments Committee; it was moved by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland; it extended certain privileges to beverage rooms and it left certain doubts as to local option and as to the nature of the drink and as to whether or not it could be a danger to existing expensive facilities. Now we have an amendment presented by the Honourable the Attorney-General which limits, restricts and confines the 12A and I'm a little distressed in dealing with the amendment, as we should be, we are getting into the question of the section itself. It seems to me that the amendment should be acceptable to all those who approve and disapprove of 12A because as I read it the amendment should be an acceptable part of the permission to serve hard liquor in beverage rooms, and I think we should all accept that really because we should make sure, each of us, if we're opposed to 12A in its entirety we should at least make sure that this restriction is imposed. Then those of us -- and I don't include myself in that group -- who are opposed to the principle of the serving of liquor in beverage rooms should move that Section 12A, as amended by the Attorney-General, be deleted and then it would be the opportunity to debate the principle. I see you're shaking your head at me, do you want to interrupt me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I would only say that as I read this, that by adopting the amendment you are striking out Section 12A and in effect replacing it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and then, as I see it, we're replacing it with wording that's more clear and more restrictive. Then once that motion passes I think then there can be a motion that 12A or the new 12A be deleted because surely we're not in the position where we are faced with either 12A that came from Law Amendments or the amendment. Is that the way you interpret it, that that's our choice?

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is the problem. The Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Minnedosa): Mr. Chairman, I think we do have a problem because I was wondering about that myself, one of the difficulties that I see is the manner in which the amendment has been put forward. An ordinary amendment might have added some words or taken away some words, at which time you would vote on the motion as amended. If you accept this, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how you vote really on the -- once you've accepted the amendment you have really repealed it and I don't really know how you put a question on the motion as amended, and if we accept the theory of the Minister of Finance, one of the things that I would be afraid of is that if a member wanted to move the deletion, it's something that he would be prohibited from because of the fact that it's a matter that's already been decided by the committee that is here and that he might have that privilege taken away from him. So in my mind I settled back and decided that really all you could do was have the discussion probably once and maybe this was as good a place as any.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if I could pass an observation and ask for some guidance. As I understand it, if the proposed amendment is approved, then that is the section of the Act. If the proposed amendment is not carried then we vote on 12A and 12A may or may not carry. It seems to me the more traditional way of handling this would have been if the first sentence in the proposed amendment were eliminated because that section asks for 12A to be struck out. If that part of the amendment were eliminated, then we could vote on this as a section amended and then vote on the amendment and then on the section as amended. But the way it is now it simply replaces the section 12A which was instituted in Law Amendments.

MR. MACKLING: Well if I might assist, Mr. Chairman, I think your observations are right about perhaps the drafting of the amendment for which I will accept responsibility but I think that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has really stated the position which I think we are in and that there will be discussion in any event. Perhaps discussion can all take place now and maybe it is relatively over now, I don't know.

MR. WEIR: May I say I approve of this method rather than the other one because I think if you had it the other way we would have it twice, instead of just once.

. . . . Continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to confine my remarks to the question that was raised by the Minister of Finance dealing mainly with the local option that exists at the present time and will exist in the future and I want to ask a few questions that if this is accepted, do the conditions that would exist then possibly change the thinking of the people that maybe originally did vote on local option two or three years ago to establish a cocktail lounge and if this amendment is accepted, would their feelings in that matter still be the same? I raise this question, Mr. Chairman, because I think that there are conditions existing in certain areas where people voted for a cocktail lounge, realizing that there was a need for that type of service in that area who probably would not have voted for a cocktail lounge if they knew that there was going to be some other services added later; or the converse of that, having voted for a cocktail lounge they might not want any other services to be available at a later day realizing the economic situation that while there was a living to be made for one person, there probably would not be sufficient there for three offering the same services.

So I was wondering if the Attorney-General would entertain some thoughts regarding the local option whereby a petition signed by a certain number of people would require a new vote before the application of this amendment would come into force. I think it's a question that deserves some consideration and while I have not got the legal knowledge to draft such a thing I would ask the Attorney-General to consider this matter seriously. Now what percentage of people you would require to sign a petition to have a new vote I don't know but I would ask him to consider this matter seriously.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: I have one or two questions in regards to this amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I am concerned that this amendment will in some way affect the quality of meals that are being served around the province in the various motels and restaurants and I'm not that familiar with it. But the beer parlour, as I understand it today has X number of chairs and he can sell beer or wine and he doesn't have to abide by the food and liquor equalization factor that the Commission has established. Now if the beer parlour were to establish liquor and beer and wine, then does he immediately have to -- not qualify -- or does he have to abide by the standards that the Commission has established for those outlets that provide liquor with meals or wines? I'm wondering, are we going to lose that quality which we have today?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't hold myself out as an expert in respect to the provisions of the Act in the fool-alcoholic beverage relationship but the Act as it presently is provided, untouched by any amendments that are before us or that are contained in Bill 75, does provide for some food requirements in beverage rooms but it is not of the same high standard or calibre as is required for a dining room, for a dining room licence or a cocktail lounge. Now a cocktail lounge doesn't have food per se, but it must be adjacent to a dining room where there is proper food facilities. Now I think that the provisions of this amendment will ensure that the Liquor Control Commission will be able to insist upon some reasonable food standard to be maintained in the beverage rooms and I think that's desirable.

In respect to the question of the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell I would like to advise him again -- unfortunately he isn't listening -- that the question that he raises is a conjectural one. I don't know what the thinking of the people in the various areas who have taken votes restricted to one type of licence will likely wish to do, but there's no doubt in my mind that in some perhaps remote or rural areas it may have been the thinking behind the people who voted against a cocktail lounge licence in a given area that really it would be too expensive or wouldn't be the kind of thing they wanted but I'm satisfied that if the thinking would now be in such an area that they would go along with the provisions of simple liquor drinks in a beverage room, I don't think the mechanics of the vote would be that difficult. I'm confident that any community that wanted that change wouldn't have altogether that much difficulty because if the electorate would have been otherwise prepared to accept a cocktail lounge facility but didn't do so because of the economic factors, I don't think there'd be any difficulty.

I think that the basic principles were that cocktail lounges somehow were -- it wasn't an economic factor, it was a factor of well, being one step further into sin or something like that. I don't want to be jocular about it but it was a kind of an atmosphere that some communities didn't want to develop. They were prepared to accept the simple tavern or inn for the consumption of alcoholic beverage by men and there has been a change now to the acceptance of the principle that ladies can enjoy alcoholic beverage in company with men so the beverage

(Mr. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . room has come into being and has been accepted and I think that by and large this was the basis of the various classifications and not the economic one. So I don't think that in any given community where they would prefer to have or would have preferred to have a simple facility for the hard liquor facility, I don't think that would create any problem in the voting or the technique of voting for this under the Act.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, actually I don't think the Attorney-General understood me. The situation I was referring to was actually the reverse of what he stated where a community might be very willing to have the better class type of outlet such as the cocktail bar and the people might not be willing to have that cocktail bar operating in competition, shall we say, with hard liquor in a beer parlour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The proposed amendment of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, really I just want to ask the Attorney-General a question without intending to pour too much kerosene on the flames, I would be interested in why the Attorney-General came to the position where he formulated this kind of an amendment. He spoke with some conviction the other evening in Law Amendments about the difficulties that he envisaged in the acceptance of the amendment moved by the Member for Rupertsland and the subsequent section added to the legislation and he spoke, I think, with considerable impact and I would rather have expected that he would have brought in an amendment proposing deletion of the section which the committee accepted the other evening with the additional proviso that because of the legalistic and economic and technical difficulties resulting from that kind of an addition to the legislation, that he would examine the whole question in the months ahead and report more thoroughly at the next session of the Legislature and I'd be interested in why he chose this kind of an amendment rather than that kind.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, the reasons for my decision, the prime reason for my decision was the -- what I thought was a rather convincing vote in Law Amendments Committee and the strong support that the amendment of the Honourable Member, my honourable colleague from Rupertsland appeared to have had from, you know, right across the House the bipartisan strength of this view that this change should be made in spite of the very weighty arguments, I thought, that was involved in particularly in respect to attacking the decisions that have been made by people by their local option vote and I thought I'd made those arguments fairly strongly but I was amazed to see that the vote did go.

Now my views were made that evening and I won't repeat them. I do feel that, as I indicated, that this is a very substantial change and will of necessity create some variations in the whole standards in the Act and I have decided in my own mind, I had, even before the vote was taken the other night that regardless, it would be necessary for this government to ask the Commission to make a searching study of some sections of the Act, and I, as I've indicated, think that the whole question of advertising has to be looked at, and so I felt that rather than allow the amendment to go, if that's the amendment that obviously was going to be carried in this House, that I had to take steps to make sure that any change can be reasonably controlled by the Liquor Control Commission.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Chairman. In acknowledging the Attorney-General's answer, as I say, I felt that he spoke with some impact the other evening, not only with conviction but with impact, and he spoke from a position of knowledge and of acquaintanceship with the situation, and the problems that could result from that kind of amendment that was accepted. Now, what I'd like to know is, does the amendment that he has moved today, which seems to me to represent a pretty substantial compromise, does this indicate that he has changed his own position? Does this indicate an erosion or a watering down of the kinds of objections that he raised the other evening?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the other evening I thought I'd made it quite clear that I didn't have any, I didn't have any strong feelings against some -- if I can use the word "liberalization" or "variation" in the technique that was suggested -- but what I was concerned about was timing. I think that you don't make a change in an Act and then say well, we'll worry about the consequences later. I think that substantial changes in an Act have to be considered in relationship to all other sections of the Act and the principles that are embodied.

I indicated that frankly I'm sympathetic, I was sympathetic to the position and the principle that was embodied in the amendment that was suggested the other night, because I think that the principle is all right. I think it's very commendable that we should suggest that the

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . man who doesn't like, who doesn't like to drink beer or doesn't like to drink wine but preferred to have a simple drink of hard liquor, it's commendable that we should facilitate his taste by allowing him to buy a simple drink without having to spend a great deal of money in doing that, but I felt that that change ought to be made in relationship to all other aspects of the Act, and I thought that before that change was brought about the Commission should make sufficient study to make sure that that change would not greatly impinge on other aspects of the whole field of liquor control legislation. However, I'm not fervently opposed to the basic principle that is embodied in that amendment, so what I'm doing now is trying, I hope through this amendment, to provide some measure of control so that this can be phased in, can be brought in without wreaking great harm in the industry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Official Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I've just two brief questions. In a small hotel in a small town where this would be most beneficial I would assume, where they only have the one type of licence, would they be required to balance off food sales with the hard liquor sales if they were to sell this type of drink in what was formerly known as a beverage room? That's one question. The other is, would this also give restaurants who have a beverage license the right to do the same things as a beverage room in a hotel, and would they have to balance off food sales with hard liquor sales?

MR. MACKLING: . . . the first question, but the second one . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask honourable members to keep the conversational level down, please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would a restaurant have to balance off food sales with hard liquor sales if they had the same right, and do they have the same right, if this amendment carries, as a beverage room of a hotel?

MR. MACKLING: Well, dealing with the beverage room, there is a food requirement but it's a very simple one and there is not that relationship that is required, so that in a remote area it wouldn't mean that they would have to have a first class restaurant facility.

--(Interjection)-- No, they're not tied to a dollar liquor value relationship. In respect to a restaurant, if the restaurant has a beverage room - and most of them do not - if they had a beverage room then that would apply, only if they had a beverage room.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The proposed amendment of the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Section 12 A of Bill 75 be struck out and the following section substituted therefor.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 13 to 19 of Bill No. 75 were read and passed). Section 20 - 165.2 (a) -- The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Attorney-General here, in light of the changes that have been made respecting beverage rooms - and I'm bringing this up on fairly short notice - just looking at the rules respecting the cruising ships, whether or not some changes ought not to be made in this particular section that would allow their privileges which were similar to beverage rooms to be similar. Now the amendment which was introduced by the Attorney-General here refers specifically to beverage rooms, but under the section respecting cruising ships, or 165.2, there is no mention, you know, specifically made to beverage room, but I wonder if perhaps then appropriate consideration can be given here that would allow the cruising ships to qualify under the same changes that have been made respecting beverage rooms. That is, that they would be allowed to serve the simplistic drinks under the same provisions as the amendment which he has brought in.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'm under the impression that the cruise ships now can serve - under this amendment that they could serve liquor. They are a peculiar situation inasmuch as, you know, they are very confined, and because of the fact that the dining room is also partly lounge and so on, I think the provisions of 165 do provide for the sale of liquor. I might be wrong, but that's my understanding of 165.2.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to enquire if it wouldn't appear from the reading of it that the liquor would be confined to the dining room and beer and wine in other areas.

MR. MACKLING: My understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that the individual cruise ship could be licensed either for beer and wine or for dining room, whichever they apply for and whichever the Commission deems appropriate, and if they have a dining room license, then they will be able to sell hard liquor in the dining room with or without meals. They have a

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . confined area for dining and for lounge and, as I indicate, I think they coordinate both in the one area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 20 and 21 were read and passed.) Section 22 - 165.1 - The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I'd like to say a word or two about this particular section if I may. I spoke extensively at second reading and included the contents of this section in my remarks, and in Law Amendments it was quite an item of discussion and dissension and questioned in many ways. Mr. Chairman, at no time was I satisfied that there was a public demand for the serving of beverages in the senior citizens' homes, the Sanatorium and so on, and while I don't question the ability of certain premises, I did point out that I felt that this section was in there simply to serve institutions possibly in the city, and I'm fearful, Mr. Chairman - I don't want to go over everything I've said before - but I am fearful that licenses issued in this direction to establishments may have a demoralizing effect and would be a form of income to nursing homes and the like that I don't feel is warranted, and therefore I'd like to move that the contents of Section 65-1 in its entirety as included in Bill 75 be eliminated therefrom.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just on a point of procedure, I think it would be preferable - it's a point that I remember coming up before - I think it would be preferable for the Honourable Member for Swan River simply to vote against the section rather than to move its deletion in writing. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order, I want to raise a point of order here because this same matter has been brought forward when we have been moving that bills be not reported, because if the honourable member makes that motion to be deleted, he can later call for a vote, a recorded vote, which he otherwise -- it's not normally practiced anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He can call a vote on any section, and a recorded vote on this section as well. When I call the question, the honourable member can request a division.

MR. MACKLING: I think that that's exactly what he's doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think that in addressing the remarks he did, he's asking for a recorded vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 22 - assuming there are no other speakers - Section 22 - 165.1 The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: I'd like to say a little bit because I intend to support the position taken by the Member for Swan River, but I do so a little bit tongue in cheek because I think there are a few institutions that this privilege should be available for, but I think the section is so wide, and I haven't had an opportunity since getting into it to prepare an amendment that would fit the classification, but I feel - and I think of Lyons Manor and a few large places that I would think that maybe the privilege should be established for - and I support the position of the Member for Swan River on the strength of the fact that the Attorney-General has indicated in any event that there's going to be a far-reaching review and I think that that would be soon enough to deal with this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, now that there has been some argument advanced - this is a new meeting - I would like to reiterate very very briefly the position that I have taken in respect to this, and I think perhaps I echo the sentiments and the views of some who have accepted the principle contained in 165.1 as previously amended by the Law Amendments Committee. The principle contained is that persons who are living in homes for the senior citizens, places where they make their permanent home and do not have access normally to the same facilities because of either their ill health or their incapacity or by virtue of the fact that they are just not in a position to come and go as most other people, are being denied the opportunity to their own residence to have the type of institution whereby they can entertain a guest that comes to them. And what they have to do -- and they can in their own little room or their little suite have beverage.

But for most of us who have had occasion to visit some of the, particularly the older type senior citizens' residences, they're not all that gracious and particularly the small rooms. Some of the newer developments, some of the newer senior citizens homes have much better facilities. They have lounge areas, they have much better recreation areas, and some of the newer nursing homes are making provision for the type of dining and lounge facilities whereby they can under the present Act apply for and obtain the privileges to have a dining room license

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . and thus enable a senior citizen who resides there to be able to entertain any visitor that comes, to allow them to join him either with a meal, having a drink with a meal or just a drink casually.

This is not mandatory, it's permissive, the various individual nursing homes or senior citizens residences must apply and the same standards as would otherwise apply for any other licensee would have to be followed. This doesn't impose anything on anyone, but does provide that this flexibility that is otherwise denied to them, and although as I've indicated I am concerned to see a complete review of the Act, I don't think at this time expansion is to the extreme, I don't think it's doing anything wild, because it is possible now for these people to obtain and get this type of licence in some instances. But I think it will make it much more universal and much more equitable and that's why I was in favour of the amendment, the proposal in the Act.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if I might ask the Attorney-General a question? I am led to believe by the discussion that has gone on that a private operator, a private operator of a nursing home, would be entitled to apply for a licence if he so desired. Is this not true?

MR. MACKLING: That's right. But the amendment as my honourable friend knows will provide much more flexibility because the individual licensee under this amendment will be able to have a drink with or without a meal, which wouldn't be possible under the present arrangements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 22, 165.1 . . .

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to call for a recorded vote. I take it the word of my leader related to what the Attorney-General had promised to do in the oncoming months and I have that faith in him that he will do as has been outlined, but at the moment I'd like it recorded that I am against this section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 165.1 — passed — as amended. Section 22 —(Interjection)— Section 20? There was an amendment in Law Amendments to delete a portion of that section. If any member wishes to vote against this section and wishes to call for a division if he has support he may do so. The motion is that Section 165.1 pass, as amended. I'm saying if anyone wishes to oppose that and have a recorded division he may do so. Section 22 — passed. (Sections 23 to 32 of Bill No. 75 were read section by section and passed.)

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be not reported.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When I get there. (The remainder of Bill No. 75 was read and passed.) The Honourable Member for Rhineland moves that the bill not be reported.

MR. FROESE: Correct. Mr. Chairman, I feel that bills of this nature should receive far more study before their ever being brought to the House. I think the exhibition that we have displayed both here in committee today and in the Law Amendments, I think is a good indication that there should be more study given and that we should have a special committee dealing with a bill of this type if it should be brought forward to the House. — (Interjection) — Well in committee there would be, but at least I think there would be more coordination than there is and was in discussion of this bill. There was too many amendments that were brought in which — like the Attorney-General he wasn't sure whether they were proper in relation to other sections and I feel that there should be more study of bills of this nature before they're brought into this House. That's why I make the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion that the Bill be not reported lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 84.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I believe it will only take a minute or two. If honourable members think it will take more then we could leave it, but I'm not coming back and I just wanted to make one brief statement on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it in Committee of the Whole?

MR. CHERNIACK: Right on the Order Paper. Bill No. 84. Mr. Chairman, while it's being looked for — I do appreciate honourable members agreeing to see it. This is the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That bill has already been passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: No, I'm sorry, I'm sorry, the wrong number, 107, I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 107. An Act to amend The Motive Fuel Tax Act. The Honourable Minister of Finance. (Sections 1 to 2 (31) were read and passed.) The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make just the one explanation. I was

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . . asked whether the term "government" includes Crown corporations. I couldn't answer. But I am now able to say in the presence of Mr. Tallin that I'm informed that it is clear to him, and therefore to me, that the word "government" does not include Crown corporations in this context and therefore Crown corporations will not be in a position to purchase purple gas. That's the explanation I owed to the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Chairman, I know our caucus discussed this at length and I know of two or three of our members that want to speak on it, I being one. I don't feel that this is the appropriate time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, your Committee wishes to report progress and has passed Bill No. 75 with amendments.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Leader of the House could inform us as to where to go tonight.

MR. GREEN: We intend to go back into the Committee of the Whole House and then to bills. If we get out of the Committee of the Whole House we'll go to bills.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Thursday evening.