

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the **First Report of the Committee on Private Bills.**

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on Thursday, April 21, 1977, to consider matters referred. Your Committee has considered Bills:

(No. 31) — An Act to amend An Act respecting the Holding of Real Property in Manitoba by The Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Command and Branches of The Canadian Legion of British Empire Service League,

(No. 38) — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Winnipeg Bible Institute and College of Theology",

(No. 46) — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "The Community of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary",

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee recommends that the time for receiving Petitions for Private Bills by the House be extended to the 5th day of May, 1977, and that the time for receiving Private Bills by the House be extended to the 12th day of May, 1977.

Your Committee also recommends that the fees paid with respect to the following Bills be refunded less the costs of printing:

(No. 31) — An Act to amend An Act respecting the Holding of Real Property in Manitoba by The Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Command and Branches of The Canadian Legion of British Empire Service League,

(No. 38) — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Winnipeg Bible Institute and College of Theology",

(No. 46) — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "The Community of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary".

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the report of the Committee be received. **MOTION presented and carried.**

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli that the time for Receiving Petitions for Private Bills be extended to the 5th day of May, 1977 and that the time for receiving Private Bills by the House be extended to the 12th day of May, 1977.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the fees paid with respect to the following bills be refunded less the cost of printing: No. 31, No. 38 and No. 46.

MOTION presented and carried.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Corrections. I wonder if he can inform the House whether inmates of custodial institutions run by the province or run by the Federal Government are in receipt of Property Tax Credit Rebate Programs and Cost of Living Reduction Programs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

HONOURABLE J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): In some instances, Mr. Speaker, they are in both institutions, federal and provincial.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the Minister can indicate the justification for them receiving Property Tax Credit Programs.

MR. BOYCE: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the first part of your question.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate the justification for the receipt of Property Tax Credit Programs or Cost of Living Reduction Programs.

MR. BOYCE: That is a difficult question to answer, Mr. Speaker. I could best answer it, perhaps, in suggesting my recommendation is that we review the Income Tax Act to see if it is possible to exclude

them.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the Minister would confirm that discussions have taken place with the Federal Government to try and correct an abuse of the present system.

MR. BOYCE: Well, there's an assumption in the member's question that it is an abuse, Mr. Speaker. Really, this actually comes under the Income Tax Act and I would rather that the Minister of Finance or the First Minister answer it because there are many nuances to this question.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the Minister would confirm the fact that the Federal Government and the Provincial Government have discussed abuses in connection with the Property Tax and Cost of Living Tax Rebate Programs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that within recent months the Minister of Finance, of the Province of Manitoba, has been in communication with the Income Tax Administration of Canada with a view to ascertain the basis for any Property Tax Credit Rebate. I believe that he has communicated to them the proposition that there is not a basis for it. However, he does not have, at least did not have as of several days ago, a definitive indication of intent, and it may require legislation here to change that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable the First Minister. It relates to the announcement he made last night regarding the gas tax to pay for Autopac. I wonder if he has met with the trucking industry in the province regarding such a tax.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there will be ample opportunity to do just that because what I indicated yesterday was not in the nature of an announcement but rather an indication of future probable intent. It is a matter which certainly deserves the attention of all those citizens who want to think about ways and means of making more rational provisions in the future to pay for services and in a way that is more compatible with the energy conservation ethic.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, then, would the First Minister advise the House if he is prepared to study the problem of the rural residents of this province who must drive many extra miles to carry out their normal duties and responsibilities of every day livelihood.

MR. SCHREYER: Well precisely, Mr. Speaker, and that is why this is not being done immediately or overnight. There are powerful rational arguments and factors which certainly favour that approach. There are, however, certain realities which might, in that context, be anomalous and that is why I am inviting consideration and future discussion on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. Will the First Minister be taking up with the federal authorities, at the resumed energy talks that are going to be taking place shortly, the question of providing for Manitoba homeowners the same kind of a federal support program *vis-a-vis* insulation, as is being currently offered to the Atlantic provinces?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that has been done. In fact, the initiative has already been taken. There has been some communication at the officials' level. There has been communication as between the Minister, the Manitoba Energy Council and his counterpart. The Minister of Finance will have some message in that regard tomorrow and I think my honourable friend should look forward to that part of the budget with anticipation.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the First Minister entertain the thought of putting this case forward to the federal authorities, adding to it the suggestion contained in a resolution currently being debated in this Chamber, namely that of taking off the sales tax on insulation materials?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend really could better ask that question on Monday or Tuesday next I would think.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister reporting for the Manitoba Telephone System. Can the Minister inform the House whether he has authorized the Manitoba Telephone System to conduct a search for illegal electronic devices following the recent burglary at 656 Broadway?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Co-operatives.

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): No, I haven't, Mr. Speaker. I haven't been requested to do so. If the request is made we'll look at it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: I direct my question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— No. Is it true that Jack Horner is so frustrated, disgusted and fed-up with the power-hungry, unethical, politically immoral Conservatives, he has crossed the floor to join Otto Lang on that side of the House?

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON: I rise on a point of order. Surely, Sir, I don't have to remind you but it seems that I almost always have to, that a question like that which does not relate to any jurisdiction insofar as this Legislature is concerned, is out of order. The honourable member should have been called out of order before he even half-repeated that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on the same Point of Order.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Point of Order raised by the Honourable Member for Morris I believe is correct. Nothing that has happened in the last twenty-four hours with respect to Mr. Horner comes within the administrative purview of this government. But I can't help but say, Sir, in concluding on this Point of Order, that what the Honourable Member for Flin Flon has asked me, the thought has occurred to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we get away from the Point of Order, the Chair is prepared to rule that if it is going to be over-shouted by the members of the Assembly, then there is no point in the Chair participating in calling for order.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Minister of Finance. I wonder if he can indicate whether it's the government's position that the property tax rebate given to those who are in jails and other institutions of the province, are paid for or considered as part of a notional rent that the resident pays to the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, if the question relates to inmates and penal institutions, no. They pay no rent, and therefore, there is no property tax credit.

MR. SPIVAK: Again, I'm sorry the Minister of Finance was not present at the first questioning. I believe it is acknowledged that there has been some discussion. . . — (Interjection) —

MR. MILLER: I'll repeat my answer. I said there is no property tax credit payable to anyone in a penal institution.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if the Minister of Finance will confirm the fact that the Federal Government has had discussions with the Provincial Government with respect to the whole question of property tax rebates and cost-of-living rebate programs being paid to inmates of penitentiaries and jails.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, let us separate the two matters. There are two tax credit schemes. One is the property tax credit, which is a reflection of the rents paid, if any. — (Interjection) — Rent or taxes. In the case of someone who is incarcerated in a penal institution, if he has paid rent or property taxes prior to, or in that fiscal year, he may be entitled to the portion, as any other citizen. For the months or weeks that he is incarcerated, then of course there would be no tax credit at all. That's point one.

The other is the cost-of-living tax credit, and I think that's really what the member is talking about. This is being discussed with the Federal Government, and the problem is not just for Manitoba. Ontario is also facing the same problem. And whether or not any resolution can be found for this is not clear because it is not a simple matter. It requires a great deal of investigation by the federal people to see whether an answer can be found.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, then, I wonder if the Minister can confirm that some inmates of penal institutions in Manitoba are receiving cost-of-living credit even though they spent the full year in the penal institution.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, that may well be. And as I indicated, this is a matter which is being discussed with the Federal Government, but it's not something that just applies to Manitoba. It applies to all provinces where they have tax credit schemes of which there are a number. It's very, very difficult to control because the address given could be any address outside. It could be a family, where the tax credit is applied for on behalf of the wife or the children. So it isn't all that simple. It also could be somebody who is not be in for a full year, but for a partial year. These are just some of the numerous technical problems that the Federal Government said had to be resolved before they can ever hope to cope with separating this kind of application from an income tax form.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable the Highways Minister. I wonder can the Minister provide the members of the House with a copy of the legislation or the regulations which he and the government have assumed now, the right to erect metric highway signs across the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HONOURABLE PETER BURTONIAK (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I am not sure whether I got the gist of the question. Perhaps the honourable member should repeat it again so I can follow it.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister if he could provide the members of the House or

the opposition with copies of the legislation or the regulations which have given the Minister the right to erect metric highway signs across the province.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I think I understand what the question is now. I think it is a little different than what the honourable member said the first time, but nevertheless, I believe — not I believe, I know — and I think the honourable member knows that sometime ago there was an agreement signed pretty well, or agreed to, maybe it wasn't signed, a verbal agreement or whatever it was, that all provinces in Canada, along with the Federal Government, will go into metrication at some given time. Now that does not only apply to Highways, it applies to all departments, to all people in all walks of life, so that as far as the Highways Department is concerned, it is no different than any other department.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, am I to assume that the Minister will provide the Opposition with a copy of the legislation or the regulations under which these signs have been erected?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANKSY: Mr. Speaker, my question is not going to be what the Opposition wanted me to ask . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. SHAFRANKSY: . . . Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture, to the Acting Minister of Agriculture and this follows along the line of the questions asked by the Honourable Member for Souris in regard to who contacted the people in Texas for the Hydro auction sale. Could the Minister tell the House who contacted the foreigners who bought the farm from the Honourable Member for Morris?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition state his point of order.

MR. STERLING LYON (Souris-Killarney): On a point of order. I believe that the honourable member in question is referring to the Honourable Member for Morris. He is trying to be funny, which he is, without trying, and really that kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, should be called out of order immediately. The point of order is, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of nonsense that the Chair seems to permit of the Honourable Member for Radisson is not permitted for any other members and I think it is time it stopped. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, and as a member of this Assembly, I suggest that you take into consideration the propriety of the inference raised by the Leader of the Opposition that you are not conducting yourself in accordance with the Rules of this House and giving privileges to some and not to others. Surely my honourable friend . . .

A MEMBER: Read the record.

MR. PAULLEY: Read the record. I have read your record over this short time here . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . and you won't be here for a hell of a lot longer. Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I am glad my honourable friend added the word "too," inferring that he is a disgrace. I reject it, but, Mr. Speaker, it is historic in this House that all members have privileges, and among those privileges is not one to listen to the utterances of the Leader of the Opposition directed to the one we chose to be the Leader of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, the Acting Minister of Agriculture replying to the question, I would simply say that I am not aware, in fact I am confident, that there is nothing untoward insofar as the sale of any land, by any honourable member to anyone, does not violate any of the laws of the land and I don't quite see the connection.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question I would like to direct to the Attorney-General. I would like to ask the Attorney-General if the recommendations by the Solicitor General of Canada in the bill dealing with wire-tapping and the increased use of wire-tapping in Canada meet with the approval of the Attorney-General of this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity yet to review the draft bill. I've not received it from the Solicitor-General. I expect to be receiving some draft of the bill shortly, so that at this time it is premature for me to comment on it.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question then for the Minister of Consumer Affairs, Communications Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone. In the investigation he is carrying out on the recent break-in to 656 Broadway, can he indicate how many bugging devices have been missing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Co-operative and Consumer Affairs.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, as usual the honourable member wasn't listening. I indicated that I had not received a request and if I did, we'd look into the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. I want to ask the First Minister if the recent action on the part of the Liberal Prime Minister of this country, a person that the First Minister has often expressed a considerable amount of admiration for, has in any way changed in the manner in which the Prime Minister lured and hoodwinked a country boy and fellow rancher like Jack Horner, by devious and underhanded and sneaky and totally unfair and manipulative way that sparks and smacks of all kinds of unprincipled and underhanded ways. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member get to the question?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm just getting into my question. I'm just getting into my question. I now want to ask the First Minister whether his opinion of his great colleague the First Minister of this country has in any way changed.

A MEMBER: Would you mind repeating the question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's. . . — (Interjection)—

A MEMBER: I agree. I agree.

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

GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I believe it's the custom of this House, when the Speaker allows a question, that the courtesy be given for an answer to that question.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was not insisting on the right to reply, but since the Honourable Member for Portage has intervened it affords me an opportunity to say simply this, that it's a free country. The Member for Crowfoot, Jack Horner, has made his decision. I cannot pretend to know the details. I do not really have anything to say on the matter except that it is my personal opinion, Sir, that perhaps it is a little surprising in the light of Mr. Horner's previous political views, but that I regard his change as being at least to some degree, some improvement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. The question is, when will Series 5 be approved, or if they are to be approved, or announced? Because there are many communities wanting to plan now and they are asking daily, the question, is there going to be this series available to those communities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Continuing Education.

HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK: The Series 5 Capital Grants, Mr. Speaker, for construction of recreation facilities is under consideration by my department and it's my hope to bring a recommendation to Cabinet shortly for its consideration, and I would hope that a decision would be made within the next week or two.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary to the question of the Honourable Member for Virden. Would it be in order for the municipalities that are anticipating one of these projects to have their applications prepared and submitted for Series 5?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, this is based on submissions already received.

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

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I have a serious question. My question is for the Minister of Finance. I would like to ask him if the Minister intends to introduce a provincial tax on canned drinks such as the Province of Ontario has introduced that would tax Manitobans travelling to Ontario, if they consumed and took canned drinks with them and also that they would be charged with a fine in Ontario.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if I was to answer at all it would be an indication of what may or may not be in the Budget and therefore I will not answer at all.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. A few moments ago in opening my mail I received an invitation to the official opening of the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute in Portage, and if I'm allowed to preface my question, Mr. Speaker, the Ministers of Agriculture of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta will be in attendance. I wonder if the Minister, and I say also by way of explanation, the invitation came from some source in Portage La Prairie, I presume it's the people involved in the Institute. So my question to the Minister is: would he publicize and also invite all the members of this House to attend the opening of this historic occasion?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, it's obviously open to anyone

who wishes to attend the opening ceremonies. I'm not sure whether it conflicts with the sitting of the House, but if it does I would presume that would present some problem, but it is an open invitation. I'm advised that other members have received those invitations, Mr. Speaker, but I have no hesitation in inviting honourable members opposite. If they find it convenient to attend I invite them to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask a similar question on that invitation, and to thank the Minister for his consideration in providing such an opportune time as 2:30 of April 28th. My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the First Minister. Can he indicate if he has received any apology from the Leader of the Official Opposition, namely his charges that Manitoba Hydro has wasted some \$605 million of the taxpayers' money?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to proceed with the Resolution standing at the top of Page 3 of the Order Paper in the name of the First Minister.

RESOLUTION — SILVER JUBILEE OF HER MAJESTY QUEEN ELIZABETH II

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that an Humble Address in the following words be presented to Her Majesty on the occasion of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of Her Majesty's Reign.

To Her Most Gracious Sovereign:

We, the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, beg to offer our heartfelt congratulations on the happy completion of the twenty-fifth of the transforming years of Your Majesty's illustrious reign.

Having had the great pleasure and honour of several visits from Your Majesty, from the Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, as well as from other members of the Royal Family during the period of your reign, we call to mind that Your Majesty has visited many parts of this great province, and has had opportunity to meet a broad and representative number of our people. We have happy memories of You and Your family being among us, and especially of the ease and grace in which you have made the Monarchy, Your Royal Person and Your Family well and affectionately known to us all.

Because of this living knowledge and also because we are deeply aware of the Crown as the centre of loyalty and of unity for our province and for our country we wish to assure you of our abiding loyalty and affection. You may be confident of the prayers of us all for the welfare of Your Majesty and of the Members of the Royal Family now and for the coming years, in which we pray you may very long reign over us in peace, serenity and gracious service to all Your peoples.

MOTION presented. .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SHCREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution embodies the essence of the thought which I am sure we would all want to express on this occasion, nevertheless, it behooves me to take some few extra moments of the time of this Assembly to elaborate on the said subject matter.

It would be indeed true, Sir, to say that the reign of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, could be described as long, peaceful, serene, gracious and excellent. During her incumbency as Reigning Monarch, the world has changed a great deal; the Commonwealth has changed a great deal and it may be that in our own minds we may think that the particular contemporary circumstances are rather difficult and problematic inasmuch as we have been buffeted by inflation and by rising expectations and, if one were to glean all one's impressions only from the media, one would think that we lived in perilous times indeed. And in a way, we do.

But, in retrospect, Sir, the last twenty-five years of recent history have been among the more peaceful in this century and for a long time. The scientific and technological advances working for the benefit of mankind have been as impressive — indeed, more so — than in periods prior to this. Material living standards have improved greatly and we have had peace. Not a perfect peace, but a peace which has been of greater stability than in almost any other time in modern history. Therefore, it is certainly appropriate that we take time from an otherwise hectic and busy schedule in this House dealing with all manner of current specific matters to look back for a quarter century in retrospect and attempt to gain some perspective in our minds of where we are at.

Insofar as Her Majesty herself is concerned, she indeed has been a force for stability in the modern democratic state in the Commonwealth. That is not to say that some parts of the Commonwealth have not broken off and are in turmoil but, insofar as the older daughters of the

Commonwealth are concerned, of which Canada is one, the period of the last twenty-five years have been one in which I think increasing — not decreasing — but increasing numbers of people acknowledge that there is more than mere symbolism; that there is more than mere appearance attached to the Crown and to the Monarchy; that indeed any substitute human institution to replace the Monarchy would, Sir, be equally expensive — at least as expensive — and it would not have any more, indeed, Sir, I would suggest less of a basis for attracting the loyalty and devotion of the citizens of that State than does our present constitutional Monarchy arrangement. It has served us well. I know that with those who are more — or who like to think that they are more *avant-garde* in terms of political institutions and political economy, political science, that there is some more modern and more democratic form of Head of State, but I would suggest that the experience of history demonstrates that, indeed, our arrangement is as good as any that has yet been devised and is so meritorious that it deserves to be enduring and worthy of our continued devotion and support.

In order then that we attempt to give more pervasive specific concrete attention to the fact that this is, indeed, the Silver Jubilee, the Reign of Her Majesty, Elizabeth II, the Province of Manitoba, through the Government of Manitoba, on behalf — I hope I can say of all of us — is pleased to announce the establishment of a series of senior secondary student scholarships or awards. The Government of Manitoba is deeply aware of the Crown as the centre of loyalty and unity for our province and we feel it is entirely appropriate to announce today, The Queen Elizabeth II Silver Jubilee Students Award.

It is again, we hope, Sir, a little more than symbolism because we are announcing 60 such awards of \$1,000 each to relate to each of the school divisions that exist in our province. The award will be given to students who have maintained above average records in their studies and who have shown exceptional merit in academic or vocational studies or in physical education. They are being announced, therefore, in conjunction with the passage by the Chamber of a message of loyalty and affection to Her Majesty The Queen. The bases for selection are a matter of detail which I would be pleased to go into but I do not think it is necessary or appropriate just now.

By and large, they relate to students in senior high schools enrolled in academic and also in vocational studies and we hope that it will work out approximately on the basis of one award per 1,000 senior secondary students. The selection process will involve those in the school divisions, superintendents, principals, and notices of this are being sent to these people and to the private schools of the province.

I hope there will be — I am sure there will be — concrete recognition and recollection then of the Silver Jubilee on the part of all of us, certainly on the part of those 60 or so young people who will benefit and we hope continue to carry forward, in the years ahead, attachment to democratic institutions, to constitutional Monarchy and devotion to the The Queen and her successors.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING R. LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to associate myself and the members of my party with the solicitous words that have been used to draw this message to Her Majesty The Queen and to second the Motion proposed just now by the First Minister.

May I say at the outset that we join with him in acknowledging the propriety and the desirability of the scholarship program which the First Minister has just announced to mark this signal occasion in the life of The Queen and indeed in the life of our country. We share, with him, the hope that the recipients of the scholarships will carry in their hearts and in their minds loyal affection to Her Majesty and we know as well, of course, that it is precisely this kind of indicator that Her Majesty The Queen much prefers to carry hope and to carry assistance to young people throughout the Commonwealth. It is the continuation of a kind of program that has been utilized before on occasion of Royal visits to signify the loyalty and the affection of Her Majesty's Subjects in Manitoba, and I think it is altogether appropriate and proper that the Premier has made the announcement now and we share with him in support for that program.

This too, Sir, is one of those happy although rare occasions when the whole House may unite, with partisan differences put to one side, to acknowledge and to rejoice in the common fealty to the Head of State in the person of our beloved Queen Elizabeth II. I think it is worthy of note that Her Majesty The Queen is only the third Reigning Monarch since 1837 who has achieved the Silver Jubilee whilst upon the Throne. There are even some of us in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, who, as youngsters, can remember the Silver Jubilee of her distinguished Grandfather, King George V, back in 1936. What a festive occasion it was at that time when small medallions were passed around and a day of holiday was given to all the students throughout Manitoba — a recommendation and a suggestion which I hope will fall upon favourable ears with the Minister of Education — and it was a matter of provincial and national celebration that we should have enjoyed the benefit of the reign of her Grandfather for twenty-five years; and that even more so now, Sir, that we have had the benefit of the serenity and the kind and the wise advice and guidance that The Queen of Canada, Elizabeth II, has so freely given to her people over the past twenty-five years.

I suppose all of us would wish for her that she would have a reign of the length of that of Queen

Thursday, April 21, 1977

Victoria who was Queen when Canada came into being and who remained the Queen of this country for some thirty or more years afterwards until her death.

So, our Monarchs present to us on these Silver Jubilees, the kinds of occasions when we can all join together and pay the kind of tribute which, while always I know in our hearts and in our minds, is probably not as often articulated as it should be. So my first words would be to join with the First Minister in words of tribute to Her Majesty and the Royal Family for the example which they set for all of us; for the dedication; for the extremely hard work; and for the commitment to the very arduous task of Monarchy which she has given without attempting in any way to save herself from arduous tours throughout the Commonwealth, and many, many weeks away from her home and from her family, all in her capacity as Head of State of the various countries throughout our Commonwealth. She, without making invidious comparisons, Sir, can be said I think, to be one of the most distinguished monarchs that this Commonwealth and this country has had in a very distinguished line of royal predecessors. And they are not only, Sir, a royal family. They are a real family, a human family to whom we can relate in very personal terms. While taking pride in the singular position which Her Majesty holds as the Head of our Government, we also take very personal pride in her role as a mother, as a wife, and as the mother of the successor in due course, His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales. They are our royal family. I think it is appropriate that we do have that proprietary sense in which we regard the Queen and His Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh, and all the members of the family. It's a true manifestation, I would say, Sir, of the love and affection that we feel for them in a personal sense.

This is also an occasion, Sir, when we can reflect with, I think, some joy, and we can reflect with some pride upon the unique role of the Monarchy, to which the First Minister has referred, as the Head of our State. She is above and beyond the partisan, the day-to-day turmoil of government; she stands above it very serenely, and she is the continuum of order within our society. Governments come and governments go, First Ministers and Cabinets and leaders of the opposition and members of Parliament and members of Legislative Assemblies come and go, but the Monarchy and the Head of State remains intact, firm, and always there to provide that continuum that is so necessary in a stable democracy. But I know, as the First Minister has said, that this institution, particularly to an outsider or to a person who lives in a republic, in this day and age is considered I suppose, to be somewhat of an anachronism. Here we are in very turbulent times in the last quarter of the Twentieth Century, and yet the Queen provides that kind of stability as a living representative of an institution, the origins of which go back beyond the mists of history to the pre-Norman days, and that the constitutional monarchy Constitutional Monarchy has evolved down through the centuries to its present completely compatible role with parliamentary democracy is indeed no accident of history. It is precisely because of this evolutionary process through trial and error that we have been blessed with the kind of representative democracy that we have in this country, which is the envy of most nations around the world. And let it be said and let it be repeated, and repeated again and again, that the Monarchy is an integral part of that parliamentary democracy which we enjoy in this country.

Fathers of Confederation back in Queen Victoria's time thought about the Monarchy, as whether or not this institution could be transplanted and carried on in our country. And if one reads the excellent dissertation that has been prepared by Dr. Frank McKinnon, *The Crown in Canada*, the story that is told in there about the evolution of the Monarchy in relation to our country is a fascinating one indeed. I take the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, to read only one brief paragraph wherein he describes what was motivating Sir John A. Macdonald at the time of Confederation. I quote from Page 30 where he says: "The Fathers of Confederation examined carefully the Crown, and decided that it would continue to work in Canada." (And in parenthesis, I say, "What a wise decision that was!") "I believe," declared Sir John A. Macdonald on the monarchical principle, "that it is of the utmost importance to have that principle recognized so that we shall have a sovereign who is placed above the region of party, to whom all parties look up, who is not elevated by the action of one party nor depressed by the action of another, and who is the common head and sovereign of all." And his co-Confederationist, the great French-Canadian statesman, Sir Georges Etienne Cartier, said that, "In this country, we should have a distinct form of government, the characteristic of which would be to possess the monarchical element." And I think his following words are particularly appropriate for this day when we're concerned about matters in Canada relating to national unity. Here's what Georges Cartier said at the time of Confederation. "Respecting French-speaking Canadians," he asserted, "if they have their institutions, their language and their religion intact today, it was precisely because of their adherence to the British Crown." Words that carry wisdom, I suggest today, as we consider a situation in Canada arising from decisions and from the documents and from bills that were passed at the Confederation time.

Well, the Monarchy, as the First Minister has said, from that decision in 1867, it has worked and it has worked well and it will continue to work. And governments, as I have said, will continue to come and go; and crises will be faced and overcome; and the faces and the manners and the parties will disappear and will have their points of glory and their points of depression and so on; but the Head of

State, the Monarchy, remains undisturbed, rising serenely over all.

Under the constitutional umbrella of the Crown, we have here something that is unique for the rest of Canada, an emotional and a psychological symbol which sustains and gives vitality to the peace, the order and the democratic institutions of this country. It is, as Frank McKinnon has said, "a practical, working institution." It would satisfy all of the tests that any pragmatist would wish to attach to it. It is effective and, Mr. Speaker, it does meet the ultimate test: the Monarchy works. And that is why we have it, in addition to the love and the affection that we have for the person who is our Head of State. The Crown is the symbol of government. It remains throughout any difficulties that we have as a country, and it is in tune with human nature. It is a constant reminder to us — and particularly to us who are involved in active politics — that politics is really only only a part of life, and that sometimes, not a very important part of life; that the whole spectrum of life is much more important than just the political activities that go on in the country. And the Queen and her person, and by the example that she sets to the members of her family make us constantly aware of that fact, that politics is not all-important. And it prevents us, may I say, Sir, from time to time, from taking ourselves too seriously. I know it always encourages the voters of a democracy such as Canada to make sure that the politicians don't take themselves too seriously because there is much more to life than just what goes on in the political sphere. The pageantry of the Monarchy, the mystic that is attached to it — all of these are necessary palliatives, necessary things that are totally in tune with human nature. And they're good. We need them. And we hope that they will be continued, as the First Minister said, for as long as any of us care to look into the future.

The Monarchy as well gives us a sense of community. It's not any more a colonial institution, if ever it was that. The Monarchy really gives us a sense of community within the Commonwealth, a sense of community within a province such as our own, which has diverse peoples from all parts of the world. It gives us a common centre around which we can unite and feel that national sense of community that we must feel if we are to be a nation. Our people have many backgrounds in this Province of Manitoba where no one group is a majority. Our people of many backgrounds have come here under the monarchical institution and have adopted that institution, have adopted the loyalty to the Queen as part of their being and part of their way of life in Manitoba.

To the Crown, to the Queen, as our Head of State, we owe much. So today we do have many feelings of heart and mind as we join in paying tribute to a noble, and to an endearing Monarch, a Queen in the highest sense of that word. We wish her many more years of a long and serene reign with satisfaction in her role as Queen of Canada, and all of us, I know, join fully in the prayer, "May God bless Queen Elizabeth."

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with the Premier and the Leader of the Official Opposition in associating the Liberal Party of Manitoba with the resolution presented.

It may be said, I suppose, that in some periods in the past there was not that great an affection for the Monarchy, and I think now that the situation that came about through the Boston Tea Party in the United States, where that great country decided to break away. But I think that in recent years, and this is where our present Queen has played a great part, that there has been a modernizing and an opening up of the Monarchy as we know it today as compared to what it was some years ago.

I think that we can take great pride in the fact that people such as the Canadians who are fortunate to have played a role in, first of all the British Empire and then the Commonwealth, that the transition to a completely free country, from a colonial status, was able to take place in the peaceful and mostly harmonious manner in which it was accomplished, so that free men and women in all parts of the world, if they so wish, can remain a part of the Commonwealth as free men and women and as equal partners without any discrimination of race, colour or creed. And I think we owe something to the modern Monarchy which is represented by our gracious Queen and we should remind our younger people, as they come up and take part in this great process of parliamentary democracy, that it was able to happen in the manner that it did, in the way that other countries, mostly who have become completely free from the colonial system, have mostly patterned their democratic process on the British parliamentary system. And I say again, Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Party of Manitoba take pride and are very happy to join in putting this motion forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANKSY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to participate in this debate in offering congratulations to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, and I, too, agree with all the sentiments that have been expressed by the Leader of the Opposition and my leader, the First Minister, but I wish to register my one point of disapproval on a matter of principle, as a Social Democrat, the congratulations which are being extended to her husband, the Duke of Edinburgh, who took it upon himself to become political. I wish to register my position on this, that I disapprove of any congratulatory remarks being expressed to the Duke of Edinburgh, namely because of his stand in recent months in which he decided to get into the political arena. I have had admiration for Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, her family, and for the

Duke until recent months when he chose to become political. I wish to, at this time, register my disapproval of him. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat hard to follow the powerful words that have been said this afternoon in respect to Her Majesty. I feel, however, that the message that the First Minister put forward is a fitting message, Mr. Speaker, going forward, as it will go forward, on her 51st birthday, and on the occasion of her 25th anniversary of her ascension to the Throne.

I join wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker, with the First Minister and with my Leader, and I believe that the 50 or 60 student awards, named for Her Majesty, is a very, very gracious act and will be received with pleasure and certainly commemorate this occasion.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue for a moment or two, the Humble Address, Mr. Speaker, makes mention of the interest of Her Majesty and members of the Royal Family, and the people of our beloved province, and certainly of our nation. Well do I remember, Mr. Speaker, the visit of Her Majesty, Prince Philip, Prince Charles and Princess Anne to Swan River during the celebration of our province's 100th anniversary of the entry into Confederation. The Royal Family, Mr. Speaker, paused on that occasion to visit the senior citizens' residence where many pioneers of the valley now call home. Many of those people, Mr. Speaker, including war veterans, left Britain during the latter part of the last century. The affection and the loyalty that was shown on both sides was an experience and a memory treasured by us all. This example, Mr. Speaker, was repeated in all corners of the province, including amongst our Indian and Eskimo brethren and communities.

Mr. Speaker, I have lived through the reigns of five Monarchs, Edward VII, George V, Edward VIII, George VI and of course our present Queen. Mr. Speaker, much has happened in those years, the two World Wars, the world depression and now inflation. Science has brought forward that horrible weapon, Mr. Speaker, the atomic bomb that threatens the whole world. Mr. Speaker, famines, wars and rumour of wars are daily news. Through it all Her Majesty and members of her immediate family are a beacon of hope and an example to us all in family togetherness.

It should be mentioned, too, as it already has, Mr. Speaker, that during that period of conversion the British Empire has become the Commonwealth of 34 nations, which in themselves are supreme to this day, with the Crown Her Majesty wears symbolic of our universal unity.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Britain are renowned throughout the world for their devotion to the Monarchy and the historic pageantry, that must, of necessity be displayed on occasion, is something to behold. This, Mr. Speaker, I believe maintains their respect for the past and incorporates the efforts of the British people, in all walks of life, who over the centuries have left their shores to make their respective contributions toward the stability and well-being of mankind in all lands throughout the world.

Who will argue, Mr. Speaker, that the absence of the strong voice of Britain's statesmen are sorely missed at the diplomatic conference tables throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is good that once a year Her Majesty at Christmastime, through the miracle of television and radio speaks to 800 million people throughout the world, continuing the effort commenced by her grandfather, George V, over 40 years ago. May Her Majesty continue, Mr. Speaker, to defend the faith, and by her example spearhead world harmony so necessary for the well-being of mankind regardless of language, colour, creed or national background.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude with adding to the words of my Leader when he said, "God save the Queen." I say, may Her Majesty long reign over us. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my Leader, the Prime Minister of the Province of Manitoba, when he paid tribute to Her Majesty, the Queen, and to her family. And I want to compliment him for what he said because it was touching to me, who happens to be of British ancestry. I also listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and I want to congratulate him too, as he went through the historical background of a tradition that most of us hold dear. I compliment the Member for Portage la Prairie for the remarks that he made on behalf of the Liberal Party of Manitoba. But I felt, Mr. Speaker, that as the Dean of this Assembly and one who has announced that he will soon be leaving this august Assembly, that it only would be fitting and proper for me, on this auspicious occasion, to say a word or two.

I really don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether I am the only member of this Assembly who is the proud possessor of the Queen's Coronation Medal. It could well be. I want to say, Sir, to you and to the members of this Assembly there is no piece of metal coloured with, I believe, a red and black ribbon, that I honour more than the medal that was presented to me as the Mayor of my community back in 1952 when Her Royal Highness was crowned Queen of this great nation of ours.

During my life, Mr. Speaker, as a public representative, as Mayor, and as a representative of this Assembly, I have had many an occasion to pay tribute to Her Majesty and to her Consort for the job that they are doing on behalf of the democratic process which seems, on occasion, in fact being

eradicated in this universe of ours. I've been proud of those moments.

I'm proud as a member of the Anglican faith, to know that here we have the Defender of the Faith, a person who is truly cognizant of her responsibilities. How proud I was, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure every other member who had the opportunity during the centennial celebrations we held in 1970, that we, as Manitobans, of all political faiths, of all creeds and all religions were able to embrace these people from across the pond, the Queen of Canada, and Prince Philip.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was proud of the fact that my Premier and friend asked me if I would accompany Her Majesty to the horse races at Assiniboia Downs. If I have any fault to find with the Queen of Canada, she gave me a bum steer as to what horse race I should put my two dollars on and the next time I go to Westminster I am going to try and collect that two dollars. I wouldn't have really minded, Mr. Speaker, if it had come second or third — I bet on the nose — but it came about the second from the last, out of a twelve-horse race.

However, just prior to that, Mr. Speaker, prior to going to Assiniboia Downs, how proud I was to accompany her son and heir, Prince Charles, in Deer Lodge Hospital to see the affection that the old-timers, the veterans of our World Wars, how proud they were of their connection with our Royal Family.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting for me, as the Dean of this House, to just say these few words in passing. I note with a great deal of interest, as an old grandpa — I'm called many other old things as well from time to time — but I note, Mr. Speaker, with great interest that our beloved Queen will become, soon, a grandma and I would not attribute to her the same phraseology of an old grandma as attributed to me as an old grandpa. But I am sure, Sir, that all would join with me in wishing to her and to Princess Anne, as well, Godspeed as they develop their family as this great nation of Canada has developed.

Mr. Speaker, we can be truly proud of the heritage that is ours and we can be truly proud of the contribution that Her Majesty and Her Family have made to the well-being of this great nation of Canada.

MOTION presented and carried. (*GOD SAVE THE QUEEN*)

ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to now proceed with the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Bill No. 5 adjourned reading. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GHAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 14, the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 28, the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: We're prepared to let this bill go to committee, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 39, the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 56, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL (NO. 57) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE MANITOBA TELEPHONE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 57, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some comments on Bill 57 at this time and I wish to say, Sir, that I want to work from notes. They are my own notes compiled in consultation with a number of persons interested in the legislation and compiled from my own reading of the bill itself. But I do want to work from notes rather than just extemporaneously, Sir, because I think you'll agree the legislation covers a highly technical subject and a highly technical topic and if I attempt to deal with it in an extemporaneous fashion I am afraid that some of the technical aspects would not be properly conveyed or described.

Sir, there are disturbing aspects and ramifications to this legislation although I don't share quite the hysteria toward it that was expressed in this House earlier this week by the Member for Fort Rouge.

The fundamental principle of the bill put forward to the House by the Minister during his introduction of the bill last week for second reading, is the provision of orderly development of interconnection of telecommunication terminal equipment to the public switch network of the Manitoba Telephone System, a system that is owned by the people of this province.

The principle embodies the necessity of taking into account the wants and needs of consumers

and, at the same time, the necessity of protecting the technical and financial integrity of the Telephone System and its subscribers.

Well, that's an honourable objective, Mr. Speaker, an honourable principle, and it's one which stated in those terms commands support rather than opposition. The trouble is, Sir, it's a motherhood principle, like the principle embodied, for example, in the Workplace Safety and Health Act, and in so much of the legislation introduced by this government. You get beyond the principle and you run into some pretty specific trouble, trouble that nobody wants and that all too often this government either fails to anticipate or else attempts to bury under a mound of rhetoric. The result is that we wind up with poor unfair, and often unworkable legislation. Motherhood, after all, Mr. Speaker, is a beautiful thing provided it is not the result of forcible rape, provided it does not result in the death of the mother in the process of childbirth and provided that the progeny are not unwelcome. I don't suggest there's anything in this bill ordering either, on forcible rape or on death, but, Sir, there are certainly aspects of it that are very very 'unwelcome' in fact more than 'unwelcome, unacceptable.

So I merely point out that although the principle of this proposed legislation is admirable in the abstract, Sir, that doesn't necessarily make it a good bill. As a matter of fact, notwithstanding the very impressive statement of the Minister on April 13th in introducing the measure for second reading, Bill 57 is a bad bill. The Minister's speech was good. The bill is bad. Even at cursory examination, it's a shoddy and a dangerous piece of work. It is poorly thought out. It is poorly drafted. It is shot full of intentions that are potentially very dangerous to civil liberties and it raises many more questions than it answers.

If we give it second reading on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and we will, it will be only because we are in favour of motherhood in the abstract. And, I want to put the Minister on warning, beyond any doubt in his own mind right now, that it won't get third reading support from us unless it is substantially amended during Committee stage, and until we're satisfied that the motherhood being proposed here is not to be achieved crudely and forcibly.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is bad legislation that requires crucial amendment before it can be fully acceptable to Manitobans because it goes too far. While purporting according to the Minister's opening statement, to safeguard the wants and needs of consumers and protect the financial integrity of MTS subscribers, it rides roughshod, Sir, over many rights and it opens the door to individual inequities that can be simply intolerable in a free society.

Has the Minister considered, for example, that under this legislation a supplier of telecommunication devices, properly authorized, who keeps those devices near a telephone shall be conclusively deemed, in the words of the bill, to have connected those devices to the telecommunication equipment of MTS and shall, therefore, be guilty of an offence?

Has the Minister considered, that where under the existing legislation, the present Manitoba Telephone Act, a judge could draw certain conclusions, in the absence of any other explanations, the proposed legislation before us instructs him that he must in future draw a preordained conclusion, even if there are other explanations or possibilities relative to the placing and location of telecommunication devices. Has the Minister considered that under this legislation a purchaser of a properly authorized telecommunication device could find himself punished by the telephone company and have his telephone service cut off, possibly for good, when in fact he is innocent of any offence against the act? This could happen in certain circumstances, Mr. Speaker. It could happen to a purchaser of a device, which had once been used, unknown to him, in a manner that was in contravention of the legislation. That's right in here in Bill 57. Has the Minister considered the runaway power that this legislation would place in the hands of the Manitoba Telephone System?

He told us in his introductory remarks, Sir, that the Manitoba Public Utilities Board will be "an impartial interface between the Telephone System and the consumer," that the Board will protect the technical interest of the publicly-owned switch network while protecting the consumer against investing in substandard merchandise; that the Board, not the Telephone System, will rule on a consumer's right to connect up equipment not offered by the Telephone System; that the Board will guarantee Manitobans "an independent mode of arbitration."

Well, that seems pretty fair, Sir. It would be fair if, in fact, that were the way things would be. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, the Public Utilities Board won't have any clout at all. The show in the telecommunications field right across Manitoba will be run by the Manitoba Telephone System and that doesn't mean the people of Manitoba who own the system, and it doesn't mean the middle-management employees of the system who, according to current widespread reports, are considerably demoralized at the present time, and in a number of individual cases somewhat nervous in the service. I cite, among other evidence, a recent CBC Winnipeg morning news commentary, to support that contention.

MTS does not mean, in this case as I've said, Mr. Speaker, either the people of Manitoba, or middle-management personnel. MTS in this instance, in Bill 57, means the top echelon management of the system who run their own show their own way these days, who answer to no one, not the Legislature, not to Telecommunications Branch of the Department of Consumer and Corporate

Affairs, not even the Minister himself. The Legislation says, Sir, that the equipment that we are talking about here, telecommunications equipment, devices or contrivances, in the words of the Bill, capable of transmitting or receiving messages, and recording messages, must be authorized by being included in the Manitoba Telephone System's tariff, as approved by the Public Utilities Board.

Well, that may appear a harmless and even a desirable condition, Mr. Speaker, but there are some traps in it' traps which support what I said a moment ago about the Public Utilities Board's role being mere window-dressing in this exercise, and the Manitoba Telephone System's having all the clout and holding all the cards. MTS can prevent the use of some sorts of equipment very easily and the Public Utilities Board won't have even as much as a whisper of a say in the matter. All MTS has to do is simply refrain from putting those types of equipment in its tariff, thus the top echelon decision-makers at MTS have absolute iron-clad power over what telecommunication equipment will be permitted to operate in the Province of Manitoba and what will be prevented from operating.

Well, Sir, this is the Manitoba version of the old principle of divine right of Kings, refined and perfected in the executive suite on Empress Street. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted an aside, the Plantagenets and Tudors would gasp in admiration. Consider it a very important fact that telecommunication equipment does not just mean telephone equipment, or even answer-record devices. It includes cable television equipment, computers, data processors facsimile units and many more items of that nature and kind. Now, the telephone system doesn't supply equipment in these sophisticated areas of electronics and communication, nor should it. It doesn't even supply anything in the area of answer-record devices that have advanced much beyond the Rube Goldberg stage. It is suppliers in the private sector who deliver the modern products of contemporary technology in these product categories, and that means that consumers of these products, users of them, have to have authorization under Bill 57 before they can interconnect to the Telecommunications equipment of the Manitoba Telephone System, and the authorization of these products, these devices, comes through their inclusion in the Telephone System's tariff, as approved by the Public Utilities Board. But, the Telephone System doesn't have to go before the Public Utilities Board on matters related to anything other than specific telephone subscriber service. The Board has no power to regulate or adjudicate in competitive fields, only in those fields where there is no competition in rates.

Thus, under this proposed legislation, Mr. Speaker, the Telephone System will be free to charge cable television operators, computer firms, data processors, and many other telecommunications equipment users, anything it wishes to charge them, subject to no review or, if it wishes, in fact to shut them out of Manitoba altogether. I suggest this is too much absolute and arbitrary power, too dangerous a weapon to be vested in the bureaucrats of the Telephone System.

And I recognize what the Minister is saying about revenue being lost to the utility today through the use of unauthorized equipment interconnected to the public switch network, but this is a greater evil that is being proposed here, Sir. There are other ways to defend ourselves against the loss of that revenue.

We have no quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with the Minister's desire to get a handle on that unauthorized equipment to which he has referred, to protect the public switch network from the technical damage that can result from the use of some such equipment, to ensure the greatest protection of legitimate sources of revenue for MTS and take whatever steps are reasonable to ensure against a syphoning off of potential revenues for the system that can help keep telephone subscriber rates at their current reasonable level.

We certainly support the Minister's objective of ensuring that all telecommunication devices interconnected to the public network shall meet a rigid certification standard before being authorized for use, but to pursue those objectives, Sir, by taking some of the steps he proposes in this bill is to demean the objectives themselves. It is going much, much too far. The Minister is proposing to do all these things for us, to protect us from evil, by giving us a special kind of a palace guard in the telecommunications field and that guard will be in the persons of the senior decisionmakers at MTS. Well, I ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, who protects us against the palace guard? Palace guards have a way of usurping and taking onto themselves too much power and authority and becoming a threat to the very things they're supposed to be guarding. We don't need the Manitoba Telephone System running the telecommunications industry in this province. Let them run the telephone business. Where do they get these delusions of grandeur about running the telecommunications industry for all Manitobans and running half the people in the industry out of the province?

The Minister could take a positive step, Mr. Speaker, and remove this threat of an all-powerful telephone system, or at least reduce it somewhat, if he were to structure his legislation in such a way as to enable a regulatory body, such as the Public Utilities Board, to order MTS to quote a tariff for the connection of any type of equipment. That way the person wishing to connect the equipment would at least be guaranteed a hearing and MTS would have to justify its position to someone other than itself. The way the Bill reads, there's no such right for the user, there's no such requirement imposed upon the Manitoba Telephone System.

The Minister says he wants to ensure that persons attaching telecommunication devices to the MTS network should not be allowed to freeload, but should pay their fair share of the costs of supplying and maintaining that network. That again is perfectly fair and we concur with that position, Sir. But the question is this, who determines what is a fair share? As I've attempted to point out, for many users of many types of equipment, the sole arbiter on that question will be MTS itself, and a fair share levied will be just as fair, or just as unfair, as MTS wishes to make it. That sort of unregulated power is unacceptable to us, Sir, both from the point of view of individual rights, and the point of view of business and industry that has to compete for survival on a competitive North American continent.

In the case of connection of equipment operated by computer services, or data processors, for example, MTS will strike a tariff, but it will simply file that tariff with the Public Utilities Board and that will be the end of the matter. There will be no evaluation of the tariff, no review. MTS won't have to answer for it to anybody, to any higher authority, because here we're in the competitive area that I referred to a moment ago where the Board has no mandate to review. Many companies in those fields, in fact, have a strong case, I think, Sir, for challenging the legality and the constitutionality of the legislation. And many suppliers of a wide range of less sophisticated equipment, such as telephone answering and recording devices have a similar case. The as you know, Sir, calls on suppliers and distributors of such equipment, not supplied by the Telephone System itself, to notify MTS within ten days after delivery of such equipment, of the nature of the equipment and the name and address of the person who acquired it.

Well, I have a natural repugnancy toward that kind of snoopers law' and my colleagues do too. But quite apart from that, Sir, there is the very practical question of its constitutionality. Consider the fact that many of the suppliers and distributors we're talking about here, particularly in the computer and data processing fields, are not residents of Manitoba at all but live in other parts of Canada and North America. How does this Minister think he can impose such authority and regulation on them? This sort of control and regulation is not permissible and not being attempted by any government anywhere in North America that I know of. That last question, however, Sir, is not my primary concern with respect to Bill 57. It's a very important one and it again reflects the faulty drafting, the sloppiness and shoddiness and the dangers of this Bill, but it's not my primary concern. authority in the field of telecommunications in this province, a highly sensitive field, Mr. Speaker, need I point out. When it comes to the connection of equipment, other than equipment supplied by MTS itself, its officers, that is the Manitoba Telephone System's officers will say what the Tariff shall be, and even whether the equipment shall be considered for inclusion in a tariff. When it comes to disconnection of equipment on alleged grounds of contravention of the legislation, MTS or the Public Utilities Board may order that disconnection, — not MTS and the Public Utilities Board, MTS or the Public Utilities Board, — so that effectively means MTS. The Public Utilities Board will find itself emasculated in this whole area, Mr. Speaker, as impotent as the legendary royal eunuch

Under this legislation the Board is effectively going to be window dressing for the real action, and the real action is going to take place in the back room, and there in the back room the Manitoba Telephone System will make the rules of the game, use its own deck of cards and be the dealer, and there's no appeal under the legislation if you're in the game and you lose. — (Interjection) — Yes, my colleague, the Member for Morris suggests, Mr. Speaker, we've played in those games before and we don't like them, and we don't believe that the people of Manitoba like them. And, we don't believe that the Minister is aware that this is the kind of thing that's been put into this legislation by those in the top echelon of the Manitoba Telephone System, and other senior bureaucrats who not only are advising him, and in fact may not even be advising him, but who are misadvising him and misdirecting him.

The content of the bill before us, the ramifications of it, are at wide variance, Sir, with that bland innocence of the representations made by those top echelon MTS representatives in recent months, and I refer to representations made by them before the Manitoba Public Utilities Board and the Public Utilities Committee of this Legislature. I think it is not too strong to suggest, Sir, that MTS fooled everybody in those representations, misled would I think not be too strong a term. In those representations, the System's officers assured the public that they weren't asking for anything out of the ordinary in the way of new legislation. All they wanted was a harmless little bill that would help to bring orderliness to the growing practice of attachment of "foreign" telephones to the MTS network — and I use the term "foreign" in quotation marks to refer to anything in the nature of telephones that is not bought through the Telephone System itself. Well, that was the soothing impression their quiet words were calculated to convey, Mr. Speaker, but they deceived us — as I might say, some of us but not sufficient of us, suspected at the time. Some harmless little bill. It is about as harmless as armed holdup. It underscores the very serious need for action now under this Minister to define the limits of authority of the Manitoba Telephone System and to tell the Manitoba Telephone System what those areas are in which it is to be accountable to the people of Manitoba.

There are two final considerations, Sir, which I think deserve mention at this point just before I conclude my remarks. The Minister's position in this subject has been represented in a way that I feel has been harmful to some reputable suppliers in the private sector. It has raised the spectre of a huge

shadowy army of some kind of users of interconnected telecommunications devices out there in the province generally who are ripping-off the Manitoba Telephone System of a million dollars in revenue through the unauthorized installation of devices that are also unauthorized and that, in many cases, are technically sub-standard and, in most cases if not all cases, uncertified. This vast, shapeless army is soon going to feel the weight of the law — users and suppliers alike.

Well, in fact, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the greatest diversion or siphoning-off of potential revenues that the Minister talks about accrues from the relatively widespread practice in one area and that is the use of "foreign" telephones, telephones that are purchased and installed by Manitobans other than through the Manitoba Telephone System. The Minister's position — or at least the way it has been represented — has cast a shadow over, and I think done a disservice to those private sector suppliers of such items as telephone answering devices who demand certification of their products, who have always operated rigidly within the requirements of the present Manitoba Telephone Act and who, in fact, from my personal knowledge, maintain very close liaison with MTS officials. Unfortunately, there has been a broad net cast out in the field of telecommunications equipment and services in connection with the presentation of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and it has caught many persons in it in terms of impression at the level of the general public who do not deserve to be caught in it. As I suggest, some of those persons are private sector suppliers who, for years, have worked diligently and conscientiously as taxpayers and supporting citizens of this society dealing in first-class, highly certified equipment and working at all times in close concert with the Manitoba Telephone System and within the ambit of the Telephone Act.

There is an area where there is a great amount of revenue being siphoned off and that is that area of foreign telephone attachments. But to get at that, the Minister has taken a posture and that posture has been represented widely that reflects upon these entrepreneurs and suppliers in the private sector to whom I have referred who have always operated diligently and conscientiously within the law and in the service of their customers. So, I think that is an unfortunate spill-over from the legislation and the manner in which it has been presented up to this point. I think that distinction should be made for the record, Mr. Speaker.

My concluding comment at this juncture, Sir, would simply be to draw your attention and that of the House to the question of the ethics that are involved here as the Manitoba Telephone System seems to pursue deeper and deeper incursions into wider and wider areas of activity.

MTS is hungry for additional sources of revenue. It wants to pay for its huge capital programs and its experiments in the field of telecommunication exotics. At the same time, it wants to keep its home subscriber rates low in the field of pure telephone service. So it hopes to pay for those exotic programs, not by going to the average home telephone subscriber which would be politically unwise to say the least, but by moving into positions where it can demand big revenues from other sources, from the business and industrial sector, large and small, from the cable television field, from the computer and data processing field and it is going to that sector, large and small, and I include the small shop suppliers of telephone answering services and devices, it is going to that sector to meet its own capital requirements. It is deciding upon its own spending program and then demanding that persons in that sector to which I have referred stand up and subsidize the MTS program. And MTS doesn't have to answer to anybody while doing it.

Well, Sir, that is a nice deal. That is a nice poker game. That is a nice hand to hold but it is not acceptable to members of this party and I suggest it is not acceptable to the people of Manitoba.

The Manitoba Telephone System, Sir, is a public utility and a common carrier. It is responsible for providing its basic service at the lowest viable rate and one must question the ethics — I can't question the legality but I do seriously question the ethics — of operating at a non-viable rate and moving arbitrarily into other activities in order to pick up the difference. If the home subscriber rate is non-viable with MTS getting into trouble, going into debt, can't support its capital expansion, capital growth and exotic equipment programs, then it should be looking at that particular area of activity and it should be looking at its home subscriber rate and should either be cutting back on those expansive and expensive experiments or it should be doing something about the subscriber rate. I don't want subscriber rates to go up; I appreciate the political position; I can assure you that my position, were I in the role that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is in, would be the same with respect to subscriber rates. Nobody wants to take the unpopular step of raising those rates but MTS as a common carrier and a public utility has got the responsibility I have referred to to make sure that it is delivering that service at a viable rate and if the activities that it is involved in cannot be supported on a revenue-generating basis where the utility is operating in the black ink rather than the red ink, then it has to have a look at both sides of its operation. It has to have a look at what it is doing in expending in that exotic area and what it is charging in the home subscriber service area. If it doesn't want to increase home subscriber rates, then cut back in the money it is pouring into exotic capital programs and adjust its difficulties that way. If it wants to get into the field of supplying telephone answering devices and installing all that equipment in every home, store or business office that wants any such, let it get into an area of technology that is at least competitive with the kinds of

products that are coming out of the private sector today.

The reason most people go to private suppliers for telephone answering devices and in fact the reason many of them go to private suppliers for individualized telephones is because the equipment, the product equipment coming out of the Telephone System is in no way competitive, either in style or performance. Certainly in the field of telephone answering devices there is simply no comparison, Sir. As I said a few moments ago, the Telephone System is at the Rube Goldberg stage of development in that field. If they want to find new sources of revenue, then let them upgrade themselves in that kind of area of the market and let them offer services in that area of the market. Let them not invade those sectors that are rightfully supportive of the economy of this province and impose regulations and impose tariffs and impose authority for which they have to answer to no one and to which Manitobans generally, and businesses in a competitive situation in this province have to kneel and pay obeisance or get out.

Sir, I leave those comments and those criticisms with you, Sir, and with members of this Chamber and with the Minister at this stage of assessment and examination of Bill No. 57.

As I said earlier in my remarks, it is a motherhood principle that one is hard put to oppose. Unfortunately, we cannot take the position easily and I have not recommended to my colleagues that we oppose the bill at this stage because, on the basis of the principle the Minister spelled out and on the basis of the principle I articulated in the initial stages of my remarks, one has to offer support at this stage of debate. But it is a poor, a shabby, and a dangerous piece of legislation. It will need complete revamping and review and thorough going amendment before we will consider offering support at the final stage of the legislative process in this Chamber.

The essential thing we want to leave on the record for the Minister to address himself to is this highly unacceptable, highly dangerous tendency of the bill, and of many other measures that are being considered by this government at the present time, to give the Manitoba Telephone System free wheel and free rein to run this province in terms of telecommunications in any way it likes. We're not going to sit still for that, Sir, and we will demonstrate that in Committee and on third reading.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Flin Flon, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be hardly useful to go into two committees at this stage since it takes at least a half an hour for honourable gentlemen opposite to get two members in the House in order to form a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish the honourable member had left it with the observation that we should stay in one committee and I won't debate the other.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

ESTIMATES — CONTINUING EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): I would refer honourable members to Page 16 of their Estimates Book. Resolution 41(f) New Programs (1) Salaries \$81,700.00. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes that are available to the committee, I would like to refer to the information that was given to us at the last sitting of the committee by the Minister listing some of the new courses that were under consideration, the new programs which fell under this item. One of them mentioned was Adult Corrections. I think, Mr. Chairman, the committee would be interested in knowing something of the nature of the planning in this particular program. I can appreciate that there will be a growing demand for personnel in the corrections field.

There are a number of institutions that are in the planning stage, some we have heard about in recent days, the Federal Penitentiary, and also some corrections facilities in the Westman area that have been announced as imminent for a number of years. I gather, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this program would be to provide in the community colleges, a form of training that would equip personnel to serve on the staff of correctional institutions in Manitoba and elsewhere, I presume. Does the planning include courses for inmates of correctional institutions? Has the Minister made some decision as to the location of these courses? Will they be offered by all of the community colleges or is it the intention to centralize this type of program in one of the colleges? These are a few of the thoughts and the questions that occur to us in respect to the adult corrections program which the Minister has mentioned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, this will not include a training program for inmates of correctional institutions. It will be designed primarily for the training of adult correctional officers, that is adult corrections staff, and it would be a certificate pre-employment course to prepare individuals to work with adults in a correctional environment. The course will be structured in a manner to facilitate participation in specific sections by persons already employed in the field.

The objectives of the course will be to provide preparatory training for persons who wish to enter this career field and to provide upgrading training for persons already employed in this field but who lack some phases of formal training.

Last year there was a report prepared by the Ministry of Corrective and Rehabilitative Services which identified a need for pre-employment training in this field. Forty to fifty percent of the staff employed in adult corrections are expected to retire within the next five years and trained replacements will be needed. At present there is no training in Manitoba which meets this need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Could we just have a little bit less noise and babble because it is very hard for the Chair to hear what the Honourable Minister is saying. The Honourable Minister of Continuing Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sorry. I wasn't certain, Mr. Chairman, to whom the verb "babble" referred to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wasn't referring to the Honourable Minister.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Training in this field will offer fresh employment opportunities for disadvantaged and minority groups. The hope is that the ultimate beneficiaries of this course will be society due to improved rehabilitative services for persons under corrective custody and the persons receiving these services. The immediate beneficiaries will be members of disadvantaged and minority groups who represent a promising source of trainees for such a program, and other individuals interested in employment in this field. And this program, it is being planned that it will operate out of Assiniboine Community College.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, is it contemplated that universities will participate, in any way, in this program? Is there any sharing of instructional personnel or any type of support in the teaching area that is going to come from the universities, in this training?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Chairman, I think we will be able to draw upon the resources already existing within our community colleges, and particularly Assiniboine Community College, to provide the type of training program that is envisaged, is necessary, for this particular purpose.

MR. MCGILL: A final question. Is there a start-up date now, in mind? What is the projection for the starting up of this program for adult corrections?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Mr. Chairman, as I had indicated yesterday during our Estimates debate, that the appropriation for this item is to do the necessary exploratory work and preliminary work for the design of these programs and at this point in time there has not been a start-up date established for this program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 41(f) New Programs: Salaries \$81,700—pass; (f)(2) Other

Expenditures—pass; Resolution 41(g) Training Improvement Program: (1) Salaries \$96,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$60,400—pass; Resolution 41 resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$26,706,100—pass.

Resolution 42 Universities Grants Commission . Resolution 42 — \$94,433,600. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I recall, during the discussion of the Estimates last year, that we asked a number of questions and made the suggestion that this item, this single line item of \$94 million, would be much more intelligible to us if it were broken down into the grants provided to the various universities. That generated a debate on the position of the department in respect to the total amount of money that was provided to the Universities Grants Commission and the complete authority of the Grants Commission then to disperse the grants to the universities and to St. Boniface College.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that that information now is public knowledge. I believe that it became public early in February; the amounts that had been granted by the commission to each of the universities and St. Boniface College.

Again, I wonder why it was not possible to provide this detail for the information of the Committee to enable us to see at a glance what percentage of this total budget has been proportioned to the University of Manitoba, to the University of Winnipeg, and to the University of Brandon, and St. Boniface College.

I have no doubt the Minister will again reply that there is an area here that is totally the responsibility of the Grants Commission and that he chooses not to present any of the decisions and the dispersals that are made by that commission.

We did however, last year, after repeated requests, get some breakdown of this figure. I think the Minister gave us an amount for the administrative cost of the Universities Grants Commission, and then an additional amount covering the total grants. That, at least, was available and, again, it might have been shown this year under this amount.

But, Mr. Chairman, I know the Minister will respond again to our request to have some more detail on this figure. And if he has those figures available now, since they were publicly presented early in February, perhaps they can be put on the record for the use of this Committee and for Hansard.

In considering this appropriation it would be a time that the Minister might again define the duties of the Universities Grants Commission to enable us to understand whether there has been any change in the role of the Grants Commission over the past several years. One gathers that the Grants Commission now speaks more directly on behalf of the government to the universities than perhaps was formerly done. That change in the role, subtle as it may be, probably resulted from the problems that arose during the past four or five years at the University of Manitoba, perhaps in their budget problems, at Brandon University ' possibly during their periods of difficulty attempting to operate under the established grants formula.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to be the impression, from examining what is going on at the universities and noting the comments that are made from time to time about the relationship between the university, the commission, and the government, it seems to be a somewhat three-cornered arrangement here and it is never completely clear whether the Minister and the department, in certain areas, would deal directly with a university or if they would take the position that all matters relating to the universities and the college would be represented and spoken for by the Grants Commission.

I am thinking of such things that have come up recently as the public discussion of admission requirements at the university. Some statements have been made by the President of the University of Manitoba that they might, indeed, have to look at the admission requirements and possibly institute some form of evaluation. I'm wondering if a matter of that type would be dealt with directly by the President, or the Board of Governors of the University of Manitoba, and the Minister of Continuing Education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 4:30 Private Members' Hour in accordance with our House Rule 19(2) I'm interrupting it for Private Members' Hour and shall return to the Chair at 8 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The first item Private Members' Hour, Public Bills, Bill No. 9, the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 17, the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 41, the Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Stand.

BILL (NO. 49) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 49, the Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I did want to make some comments on this bill and they will be fairly brief and they'll be perhaps even briefer than I had intended if I am unable to find my notes. I'm sure I have the number correctly; it's Bill 49.

MR. SPEAKER: The Liquor Control Act.

MR. MCGILL: Yes, it would have made it even easier for me if they had numbered it Bill 19, that would seem to be more appropriate.

The Member from La Verendrye, who presented this bill, I think had in mind not attempting to provide a total answer to a very difficult and complex problem, he was presenting an amendment to a restriction which now exists in the statutes, to provide a minimum age at which people in our society can legally purchase alcoholic spirits and can legally buy alcohol at a distributor or in a restaurant or another licensed premise.

I was really moved to respond in this debate by the comments made by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews the other day who expressed his objection to any kind of restriction to the morals of people. And he said that he would prefer that there be no age limit; that drinking would be a matter of personal decision and that we should just eliminate it altogether, and that anyone who suggests that there should be a minimum, or some age at which this is permissible, is simply supporting a kind of prohibition that the ultimate objective would be to have a complete withdrawal and a complete prohibition to the use of alcohol.

And then a little later in his remarks the Honourable Member for St. Matthews mentioned that if he ever had a student who came to his class and was drunk he would toss him out and he would never come back to that class.

This is a rather curious contradiction, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for St. Matthews makes. He suggests, on the one hand, that there should be no restrictions and, on the other hand, he is prepared to turf out any youngster who came along and who had made a mistake, and perhaps for the first time had consumed something that he didn't really understand and his actions were then objectionable to the teacher.

I suppose under a no-restriction rule that the Honourable Member for St. Matthews would propose; it conjures up rather an unusual sort of scene with the honourable member at the door of his classroom in the morning with his breathalyzer and checking the toddlers through into the classroom. I'm sure that the Honourable Member for St. Matthews would be too honest a person and too fair to make a summary decision as to whether one of his students was drunk or not, and to eject him for the classroom. But again the fact that he wouldn't have him in the classroom really, I think, exposes his argument as being somewhat porous, the fact that he treats the consumption of alcohol in our society as a matter entirely of personal morals. It doesn't happen to me a matter entirely for the individual to decide because it happens to be one of the areas in which there is an effect upon society at large. Alcohol, like other drugs, changes behavioural patterns in most people that consume them, and their pattern of behaviour is likely to become difficult for other members of society to adjust to, as the amount of alcohol consumed is increased.

And so what we are trying to do, and what society has tried to do up to this point, is to determine some minimum age at which we can expect some reasonable judgment to be exercised by the young person who is consuming alcohol.

If it were simply a matter of censorship, as the member suggests, then there would be some validity in his argument that it would be a matter of personal preference, but in those areas where a decision to do or not to do can have an effect upon the well-being, and even the safety of other members of society, then it is important to have statutes and restrictions. And we have demonstrated this in many other areas of our social life. I assume the Member for St. Matthews would be satisfied that there should be a minimum age for obtaining a driver's licence, because if there is no minimum

age then the society at large is placed in a difficult position and the safety of many people would be affected.

Nevertheless, we have chosen, arbitrarily perhaps, a minimum age of 16 and some would argue that it should be higher, but in the case of a higher age limit, it would mean that there might be some economic loss to people who needed to have the ability to drive a car in order to pursue their livelihood. So perhaps we have, by trial and error, and perhaps cutting it as closely as we can, chosen an age of 16 at which a person in society, having passed the tests, will be licensed. But it again, is an age chosen with some regard for society at large.

In the field of aviation, pilot licences are issued to people who reach the age of 17, and I assume the Member for St. Matthews thinks that restriction is reasonable, he would probably not want to be a passenger in an airplane flown by a person of more tender years, in view of perhaps he would consider his lack of maturity and his lack of judgment at that younger age.

So there are a series of restrictions in our society that are imposed because of a need to protect, not the individual himself so much, but the people with whom he interacts in his everyday life. And that's why I think it is rather important to have some minimum age at which young people may be permitted to legally purchase and consume alcohol. I agree entirely that the member is adopting the proper kind of education for his family when he introduces them to the complexities of alcohol in his own home. I suggest that that kind of education is the kind that will have the most lasting effect upon the young people. But unfortunately, not all homes would provide that kind of training, and unfortunately, many of our young people don't have the advantage of having an orderly home life in which they could have this kind of instruction. But really, if the member rejects the amending of the age limit to go from 18 to 19, he is then really turning and shutting off the effective control and education which he is using in his home when the young person in his family is still probably in the school. And in a sense, then, he is transferring that responsibility from his own domestic scene to the classroom where the teacher now has to . . . because the young man in grade 11 or grade 12 can, on his own, and without any consent or guidance from his parents, make his own purchases and consume alcohol on his own decisions. That, then becomes the difficulty in the school system.

Again, we say that we're not going to, by any means, meet the problem here or succeed in solving it completely. What we are going to do is extend, perhaps, the educational program that the Member for St. Matthews and others have in their own homes, and give them another year in which they will be under the guidance of their home. And then presumably, when they leave secondary school, if they are on schedule, they will then face a new world of decisions in post-secondary or wherever they go in the world of business, and assume this new authority at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it does provide, at least, an improvement upon the present regulation. We are searching again. Many people who have been contacted and who have discussed this matter think it should go back to age 21. Well, perhaps they're right. Perhaps we need to try an amendment of the Act as it is now being presented by the Member for La Verendrye, and see if there isn't some improvement in the present problems that are arising every day in the effort of young people to adjust to a very difficult kind of drug, one that has provided probably more problems than good in the world up to this point. But people are continuing to try to find a solution that will enable people to use alcohol at their own choice, and at the same time, to give enough protection and guidance to young people to bring them in their lives to a stage of maturity that enables them to make reasonable decisions. No one, I think, can argue that a person is not more mature at age 19 than at age 18.

The Member for St. Matthews frequently quotes from philosophers. I think he used Aristotle which the Hansard reports as a big "C" Conservative. I am sure the Member for St. Matthews had him a small "c" conservative. He usually, in his arguments, manages to quote from one of the philosophers. I would commend to him Plutarch who had something to say about the teaching of young people. He suggested that we should be ruled by time, the wisest counselor of all. Now if for no other reason, then the passage of time and the maturity and knowledge and growth that it brings, this bill I think is worthy of serious consideration.

There are other areas of legislation that might have to be considered, Mr. Speaker. One area in which some progress could be made would be in the area of identification. It has brought to my attention that in California and I presume in other jurisdictions, a driver's licence with a picture on the driver's licence is a very useful document in which to provide identification. It seems unfair under the present law that the operators of liquor dispensing establishments should be responsible when people, by improper means, manage to gain access to the establishment and to the consumption of alcohol and have misrepresented their age. If they do, indeed by whatever means, manage to misrepresent themselves and obtain service, then under our present laws, the holder of the liquor licence is responsible. If that kind of law is to persist, it would do much to improve their ability to not serve people who are not eligible under the law, by having a form of identification that could be easily produced.

Mr. Speaker, these are a few of the thoughts I have. I regard the bill as not an answer, in a major way, to a very serious and major problem in our society. But an answer which provides an

amendment which goes in my view in the right direction, because while it increases the minimum age, it doesn't do any economic damage to the life of the person or the people concerned. We can argue about other age limits that by placing them too high, we may prevent certain economic benefits from occurring. I see no loss of any economic benefits to any one in society by raising the minimum age at which alcohol may be purchased or consumed. I commend the people who say that training should begin in the home. I suggest that if this bill is passed, that training might be extended by one year. I feel that the school system itself would benefit from having the 18-year-olds considered as too young under the law to purchase and consume alcohol during the period when many of them are still in the school system. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that although we are not really arguing about very much, the "wets" being those who are for drinking at 18, and the "drys" being those who are for 19, I have to ally myself with the "wets" in this particular debate. I say that, Mr. Speaker, as one who is himself a very moderate drinker and does not favour the widespread or the heavy use of alcohol or any other drugs. I am one of those who, from the moment I entered this Legislature, supported the notion of voting at 18. And my central argument in that regard is as follows: That I believe that a person is capable of making a rational decision at age 18. That is the very basis— (Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOERN: . . . the very basis of my argument for voting, and it is the very basis for of my argument in favour of drinking at 18.

Some of us seem to think that higher is better, that they could go for 20 or 21 or 31 or 41 or 51, so that by going for 19 they are moderates. My colleague quotes Aristotle, like some of the philosophers on this side. There are three in a row right here— the Minister of Corrections, myself, and the Member for St. Matthews are all professional, or at least semi-professional philosophers. And Aristotle talked about the golden mean. And some people think that if you take an extreme position, then you move a little to the left or a little to the right, that therefore you are moderate; that instead of going to 21 or 31, by going to 19, that's a compromising position, it's an intermediate position. It isn't an intermediate position because nobody is talking about lowering the voting age or the drinking age. No one is saying the logic that they should. The Member for La Verendrye should be pushing for raising the voting age. He shouldn't just be pushing for raising the drinking age. He should be demanding that the voting age be increased as well. Because obviously, if people are not capable on his account of making a decision on drinking, they surely, Mr. Speaker, aren't capable of casting an intelligent ballot. So I say that we're dealing here with parts or fragments of a broader picture. If we are not talking about lowering, we're either talking about staying or raising. Those are the only two positions. And I say that this gentle increase of a year looks to be reasonable, but in effect, has some serious ramifications that have to be explored.

Mr. Speaker, I say that I would share with probably all members here a concern for drinking, in the sense of a concern about young people drinking, the same as a concern for anybody drinking. But the solution is not to just change the age at which one is eligible for a drink. The solution is in education, No. 1, and in enforcement of our present laws, No. 2. Raising the age really accomplishes very little. One of the disadvantages we all have in speaking in a debate is that the debate goes on and on and on. Some of our arguments are picked up by colleagues, and therefore it seems that one is simply repeating what has been said before. But I understand that my colleague, the Member for St. Matthews, talked about prohibition. And that is the logic. If it's better to go to 19, it's even better to go to 20. And if it's better at 20, it is even better at 21. And ultimately, what we should do is to have complete prohibition and nobody will drink any more. That's the logic. We all know that it just doesn't work. As the Member for River Heights used to say, it doesn't hold water. Or it won't wash. Those are his words.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the member chose 18 as opposed to 18 and a half' or 19.1. He could just as well have picked those particular numbers. Mr. Speaker, all of us I think, in this debate, have to draw on our own experience. I would like to relate some of mine as a high school student growing up in the north end of Winnipeg around Mountain Avenue, in that particular area around Mountain and McGregor in the early Fifties. It will come as a shock to some of the members here that there was a lot of people in those days, 25 years ago, who drank, and they were under age; that it was very common, Mr. Speaker, for high school students in the Fifties — and I only quote from my experiences — to drink at age 15 and 16. It was quite common for people to drink on weekends or to drink at parties, or to drink at home or to drink at weddings. It was very common. And the legal age was 21. So these people were drinking at five and six years under the legal age. And even worse, you couldn't even go into a night club or so in those days because there was no such thing as drinking in night clubs. Of course we all know that what happened was people brought bottles in, bought the mix, poured a drink under the table and drank it. And eventually people said this was ridiculous and they decided to update or change the liquor laws.

The Member for Fort Rouge and I once participated in a debate at Miles Mac, and I got quite a kick out of his comments at that time because I related stories about some of the tougher people in my area who would buy a bottle of wine for 90 cents and then three or four or five young teenagers would drink this bottle and they'll all get high. The Member for Fort Rouge, who is also a northerner — I don't know if that's north River Heights or what — but he said that he used to drink too when he was in the north end. He used to knock around some pretty tough areas and they used to drink gin. He didn't explain whether it was gin and tonic or gin fizz. I never did understand what they used for mixes. But it was obviously pretty high class drinking. — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'm having some trouble here because I was trying to shed some light on the issue. So I simply say this from my experience, and I think that the honourable members, if they go back to their own, will recall that from the time of anyone in this Chamber, there has been drinking in Manitoba illegally, if you like, at age 15 and 16 from their experience on. And if the drinking age is 18 or 21, it won't matter, Mr. Speaker. There will still be people who will drink at that age because it seems that it is common for young people to first become interested in liquor at that particular age. I have spoken to many young people and asked their opinions on this particular issue and asked them about habits; asked them about how many students were staggering into the beer parlour at noon hour, and staggering into school and staggering into their classes. The answer is that in effect, there is very little of this. So I can only report to you what I am told. Now, maybe you are getting different information, but I can tell you that I deduce that this alcohol problem raised by the Member for La Verendrye, supported by other people and so on, is in fact highly exaggerated. I, myself and about eight or nine other colleagues on this side of the House taught school, and I think most of us can draw on our experience in terms of what went on in our times as teachers, etc. And I have to emphasize that we have heard a lot of quotes in this Chamber and in the press about the fact that the school trustees voted for raising the drinking age. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is true, but the teachers — I say if anyone is close to the students after the parents, and sometimes on some issues the teachers are closer to the students than their own parents, because they happen have to know what is going on, sometimes more so. Sometimes students are very successful at pulling the wool over their parents eyes and less successful in regard to the teachers who work with them day in and day out at the school. The teachers, at their convention, at the annual MTS convention, I am quoting from March 30th in the Free Press. I hope my colleagues won't reject my source on this occasion. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOERN: "The teachers diverged," the quote says, "from the trustees on raising the Manitoba drinking age to 20, from 18, rejecting a proposal about 2 to 1." And they went on —(Interjection)— Well, I think that is sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, I would not fault anyone in this Chamber for supporting a raise to 19 because I think that their intentions are good. I think that their concern is well placed. They are concerned about people drinking underage who are going to do damage to themselves, and that is a legitimate concern. But I say that the solution is wrong, that the solution of raising a drinking age is not the right solution. The solution is first of all in education about drug and alcohol abuse. If you want to solve the problem, let's call for more of that. Enforcement is the other part. I understand that in some liquor commissions, and I intend to relay this to my colleague, in some liquor commissions people underage are being served. There is not a careful enough checking going on in some of the retail outlets in this particular city and maybe in the beverage rooms, etc. There is not enough parental guidance. That has probably always been true. It is probably true today. It will be true tomorrow and true in the past. And also, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about drinking and the concern about driving automobiles under the influence of alcohol, that again is a matter of enforcement. That is for the police and that is a matter of education as well.

So I say in conclusion that I am one of the those who has confidence in our young people and I think that we should not demonstrate our lack of faith in them or adopt measures that will do very little to tackle a serious problem. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would say, as I support it, voting at 18, I think it is only logical to support drinking at 18 because I believe that young people do, in fact, have the rational ability to make the right decision at that age.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to take part in this debate, I first want to put my position quite plainly, that I am opposed to the proposed amendment to The Liquor Act as it has been submitted to this House by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

Mr. Speaker, I voted as a member of this Chamber for the age of majority at the age of 18. I also voted in this House for the change in The Liquor Control Commission Act for the age of drinking to be at the age of majority. You know we can come about with quite a paradox by the proposed amendment to the legislation that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye is proposing. You know it is also possible in this province to be elected to political office at the age of 18, that means to be

elected as a member of this Legislative Assembly.

A MEMBER: Show me one.

MR. JENKINS: Order please. I am sorry. —(Interjections)— I beg the honourable members' pardon but it is sometimes hard to divorce yourself from being where you are, Mr. Speaker, or where the Clerk of the House is, where I spend most of the day when this House is in Session, so when I get someone interjecting I react, and I do apologize to the honourable member. It is not my authority right now to call him to order. I leave that in your capable hands, Mr. Speaker.

But to get back to what I was saying, it is possible for someone, even though the Honourable Member for Point Douglas says, "Show me one." Well, we had, I believe at the time that the voting was at the age of 21, I believe the First Minister of this House was elected. So it is not outside the realm of possibility that somewhere, some time in the future, we will have an 18-year-old elected to this Assembly. I hope that they do because I think that is why we changed the legislation.

Now how ludicrous could we have, a member of this Assembly, and you, Mr. Speaker, when you invite us over to have your visit and you are supplying us with libations, you would have to make sure that this honourable member was served with nothing stronger than sarsaparilla because it would be your responsibility as the host. I think that is a ridiculous position to put you or to put anyone else in.

Now it may be of interest to some of the members that when this legislation changing the age of drinking to the age of 18, where I work I had an apprentice who had turned 18 just shortly before the Act came into force and he worked with me in the car department and I said to him that day, I said, "This is the day of the legislation. You are now 18 years old. It has come into effect. I guess you will be going to the pub." And he said yes, he was. So he went and the next day he came back. I thought perhaps he might have a big hangover or something, but lo and behold he was as fresh as a daisy. And I said, "Well, how many beers or what not did you have last night?" He says, "Well, I ordered two glasses of beer and I drank a glass and a quarter." I said, "How long did you stay?" "Oh," he said, "I stayed until the pub closed." He said, "I stayed because I like to hear the music." Not that he was there to drink a whole mount of alcohol.

You know it is very well and good to say, "At what age has a person discretion?" In some people they have no discretion at the age of 101. They should not be served alcohol. But you know when we get this sort of legislation, which I think the Honourable Minister of Public Works said is a sort of a wishy-washy thing, it's going to 19. I think the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has already said that he figures 20; he may even move that if this bill gets to Law Amendments. Someone else probably will say 21. You know it reminds me of the enfranchisement of women in Britain, when I believe it was brought in under a Tory government. And they didn't even say the age of 21 for women, they said the age of 30 or over. That was the enfranchisement as they saw it. It was a universal franchise, but for males at 21 and females at 30. Thank God they got rid of that.

And if I may also speak about the British Isles, they have had on their legislation for many years — I know it was there when I was there during the war — 18-year-olds could drink in public houses and they still do.

You know if we are going to start and set up second-class citizens, this is what we are going to do with this type of legislation. Why are you going to have some people being able to do certain things at a certain age? The legislation as we have it now, the age of majority is 18; the age to be able to drink legally is 18. And I dispute very much that this legislation could even be in conflict with our human rights legislation. You know Section 3.3 of the Human Rights legislation is headed "Discrimination in Public Places." Now, I think beer parlors or cocktail lounges, restaurants, even the Liquor Commission, it says as follows: "No person shall deny to any person or class of persons any accommodation, service or facility customarily available to the public or (b) discriminate against any person or class of persons with respect to any accommodation, service or facility customarily available to the public unless reasonable cause exists for the denial or discrimination."

And 3.2 says, "Things that do not constitute reasonable cause for the purposes of Subsection 1. (a) The race, nationality, color, sex, age" — and I believe now that they are talking about age in its context as the legislation that we are having the proposal here to change. Now, I think that the changing of the age of drinking from 18 to 19 — and perhaps the Honourable Member for Minnedosa who seemed to have quite a head here last week, restrictions on drinking for his age might have been in order. And so the age of discretion of when a person should drink may not be 18, 19, maybe 49, 59, maybe 101.

Now the honourable member who introduced this amendment to the Liquor Act stated that young people have been the cause of many accidents because of drink. Well if he is that concerned, why doesn't he also bring in a change to the Highway Traffic Act, that the age of driving should be 19, maybe it should be 21, maybe it should be 31.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think that this is discrimination; this is making for second-class citizens in this province; that if someone wants to change the age of majority, the age of drinking; the age of driving automobiles and various other things, then they should bring them in but just to go piecemeal picking at this, this I think is absolutely ridiculous. I think, as the Honourable

Member for St. Matthews said the other day, a study has been done, I believe, in the Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and it has been proven that the lowering of the drinking age has not increased relatively to that amount because of drinking and driving at that age. There are many young people, there are many young people in our society who are just as mature at 18 as some people are at the age of 40. —(Interjection)— I'm not picking anybody out anywhere in this House.

But thousands and hundreds of thousands of our young people went and served this country at the age of 18 and some even younger and I believe when we had the debate on the age of majority that was pointed out. All one has to do is to go over to those war grave cemeteries and see some of the ages of some of these young people that were there at a mature age, who took their part in the defence of this country and I can think of one at a war grave cemetery that I visited in Normandy in the year 1960 at a place called Boulogne-sur-Mer, a trooper blue from the City of Winnipeg, aged 18 years. You could go all through that war grave cemetery and you would see hundreds and hundreds of them, 18, 19, some even younger.

I think that our young people have proved that they have been as responsible in their drinking habits at the age of 18 as I've seen some of the adults who are much older than 18 and the way that they have behaved in our society.

I think that the only way that you are going to combat excessive drinking and alcoholism is by education and treatment, we have to treat it as a disease. But to say that we are going to go to total prohibition, what do you want to go back to, the bathtub gin days and Al Capone of the United States? It certainly didn't work there; there was more people than ever drinking. It may have been a lot cheaper but it sure as hell killed a lot of people. Some of the stuff that they drank was certainly not fit for human consumption. —(Interjection)— Well, the Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie says he makes his own. I imagine the RCMP would be very interested in knowing if you are making distilled alcohol. If you are making wines and beers, I understand that you can get a permit for that.

But again, before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I think this amendment to the bill, if the honourable member had the courage of his convictions, he would have also filed in this House a change in the age of the Act of Majority, a change in the age that people can cast ballots, changing the age at which people can drive automobiles. And let's make them all uniform.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I guess I don't have to tell you or members of this Assembly how I am going to vote on this amendment to the Liquor Control Act. I have no desire to see it go to Committee. I feel that we have had this argument five or six years ago when we made the change and I have seen no great abuse. I think, as the Honourable Minister of Public Works stated, the people who are closest to see what these kids are doing at the ages of 16, 17, 18, 19, within our schools and within our society, are perhaps the people who are in the school divisions, the people who teach them, the people who are in the classroom and they have turned it down. I have had no great phone calls from any of my constituents saying that they want the age of drinking raised to 19 in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have just a few words to say on the subject. I should say that I feel at a great disadvantage in this debate after having listened and watched the two previous speakers. I realize, perhaps for the first time, what a significant advantage it is to be on the government side of the House and the immense power that one can control. The Minister of Public Works was able to, because of his variety of solar light machines up there, to orchestrate the lighting to emphasize a point that he wanted to make and then the Member for Logan was able to acquire that ability to completely still an interjection simply by the stature of authority that he brings to bear because of offices assigned to him. It's very difficult when you have nothing but your own resources, Mr. Speaker, to try to make your case but I would say that I think many of the arguments made by the two previous speakers would certainly conform with my own thinking about it.

I simply think — as much as it hurts me to say it sometimes — the fact is that on this particular matter, I believe that the points of view put forward by the Minister of Public Works and certainly most forcefully by the Member for Logan, are really in deep agreement with my own because I feel that this particular amendment, as it is proposed, carries with it a certain degree of illogic and also a degree of inequity and I really would oppose it on both those grounds.

As I listened to the arguments being presented by the Member for La Verendrye and by others supporting the bill, it appeared to me that the basic purpose was they felt that there were too many kids showing up too drunk in too many classrooms and that the way to eliminate the problem was to raise the age by one year so that, presumably, people in the schools wouldn't be bedeviled by that particular problem.

It comes to mind, Mr. Speaker, an article I just read a couple of nights ago, written by two doctors who deal with the elderly at Deer Lodge Hospital who indicated that there is an increasingly serious problem with alcoholism amongst those above 65 and that this is having very serious repercussions in senior citizens homes and in nursing homes. Now to carry the logic of the Member for La Verendrye's point of view through as to what he's doing now, I suppose we should cut off the drinking

age at 65 in order to save the disruption and inequity of people at that end of the spectrum. Now the fact of the matter is that the same logic prevails. Now, I wouldn't recommend one or the other. What I am simply saying is that they're trying to use the same rationality on one problem but avoiding it on the other. The fact of the matter is that if the purpose is to try to cope with a problem of alcoholism or excessive drinking or disruption caused by alcohol in the schools by raising the drinking age, then I suppose the same answer would apply for the large number of elderly people.

I suppose you could take the same argument and say that the many hours lost in the workplace and the factories due to alcoholism should also then be administered by the same kind of law. The fact is that in every age sector, in every institution in our society, whether it is the school or a factory or a senior citizens home or the university or the Manitoba Legislature or wherever it may be, the problem of alcohol is one that is a serious social problem; it is abused by certain people within it and it has nothing to do with age; it has nothing to do with education; it has nothing to do with background. Alcohol is something that strikes all people in all kinds of brackets and to single out one group for special treatment by saying that all of a sudden, you are no longer capable of making your mind up for yourself, I think really it is a discriminatory Act, and it leaves all the other kinds of problems alone. It leaves alone the problem of alcoholism in the workplace and in the universities and in the political institutions and in the civil service.

Mr. Speaker, there was a report presented here, I believe, was it last year that the Minister of Labour presented the report talking about — pardon me, I think it was the MGEA who presented a paper on the serious problems of alcoholism in the Manitoba Public Service and the number of hours lost due to that. Now are we going to apply some strictures about what Manitoba Public Servants can do at lunch hour, they can't go sort of to the Fort Garry Hotel and have a Dubonnet or whatever they drink at noon hours? Whatever the reason is, by providing prohibitive laws, what it means is that you're trying to solve the problem of a minority, and a serious problem of a minority, but at the same time taking away the rights of a large number of majorities. And I think that's what we're saying to 18 year olds.

We may have made a decision generally in society that 18 is the age at which the judgment of an adult can be made. I think the Member for Brandon West was correct when he said that society and its representatives, as we are, have to make a decision at some point in time — when do we decide that an individual is now at an age where he or she is capable of deciding for themselves? We have made that decision across the board. We say to the person, you can get married at 18 without parental consent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to carry the logic of the Member for La Verendrye's position through, again we have seen statistics produced by Health and Social Development of an immense number of marriage breakdowns, the high incidence of divorce, the number of children who are affected by it. I suppose we could say one of the reasons is because we are letting kids get married too early. Should we raise the age of marriage without parental consent to 21 now? I mean, the same thing can be supplied. I suppose a lot of people could say there's a lot of political mistakes going on and maybe we could attribute that to somehow the age of 18. But the fact of the matter is, it just points out that there is a basic strain of illogic being created in the argument that you're not going to solve the problem in any way, shape or form by raising the age limit.

I think the unfortunate part about this debate and sometimes how it's couched, and the Minister of Public Works made a mistake I think sort of saying there's a group of the wets and the dries. I don't think it has anything to do with that. I think the real issue is that, as I've heard everyone speak in this House or read their comments in Hansard, everyone has expressed a concern about the problem of alcoholism in our society and I don't think that simply by voting against this amendment somehow indicates that we're for more permissiveness or more drinking or anything else. It has nothing to do with that. It's simply that this is the wrong answer to that problem. It's not the way to approach it.

And, if there is an answer to it, then I would have suggested as I went back a day or so ago and looked at the debates that occurred when the Minister of Corrections was debating the Alcoholism Foundation, it wasn't nearly as serious or as involved, or as comprehensive as this one is, and yet that is the place where we should really have been zeroing in on what is the basic sort of problem of alcoholism in our province, and how do we approach it.

But it may be that raising the age limit has a certain kind of public attention quality to it so that it focuses the issue, and to that extent I say that perhaps the amendment has been worthwhile because at least it has brought members out of their chairs to talk about the issue, which they weren't prepared to talk about when the Estimates of the Alcoholism Foundation were being examined. At least to that extent people are now saying, okay, what is the answer to it. I think that may be a much more serious issue that we should be directing ourselves towards and asking ourselves if we are taking the kind of measures in the province, not just in educating people, but also assuring that the regulations against abuse are properly being honoured which has nothing to do with age.

Again I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, a study done for the government by a Professor Wichern at the University of Manitoba on the operations of the Liquor Control Commission indicated that there

was almost virtually no inspection going on in all kinds of beverage rooms in the City of Winnipeg. I think there is something like three or four inspectors for the whole city. Well it simply means that the question of enforcement of the laws are being neglected. At the same time the Liquor Control Commission is making millions of dollars in profits. I would suggest that if we're really looking at a way of controlling excessive drinking, we should be ensuring that people sitting in beverage rooms honour the laws, which says there are certain things you can do in the beverage rooms, or in a cabaret, or in a cocktail lounge and according to that report, most of those are being broken in large numbers because there isn't proper inspection going on and the owners of the parlours get very lax in the administration of the law. And we're simply saying, on the one hand here's the Control Commission making large amounts of money, but putting very little back into the enforcement side of it and that has something to do with the incidence of drinking, but again it's not a total answer.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that there is also another question that we have to face on this one, and that is this. We've been concentrating on the problems of alcohol as it affects young people. What we should also be talking about, particularly as it pertains to this measure, is the responsibilities that we want to hand to young people at a certain age. What does this measure do to, all of a sudden, to indicate the legislators of this province, if the measure passed, no longer have confidence that people at the age of 18 can make a number of decisions in their own area. In effect we are really saying we consider them to be as a class of people, irresponsible, or not being able to be responsible for their actions.

All we're simply addressing ourselves to is a minority of people, of young people, just as a minority of people at the age of 30 and a minority of people at the age of 45 and at 60 aren't able to handle the problem, or handle it in an abusive way. And I would say that is the way in which should deal with it. Let's find out what it is that is bothering that minority, and what can be done to try to control the problem in that arena, not trying to provide an across-the-board blanket regulation that affects everyone at 18. And as other members have pointed out, to say that in effect, all the other rights that we have apportioned because one is 18, we are going to take one other away because for some reason or other we feel that that is going to be the solution of the problem of alcoholism.

Mr. Speaker, I can't really buy that logic. Furthermore, if this House did buy that logic, it would mean then in effect we would be setting up a system of inequity. We would be providing an unequal system. We would be saying to the large majority of people who are 18, who we say that in all other respects we consider you to be adults, but you are not adult enough to handle a drink. I just simply think that would be wrong.

If there are problems, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the school trustees are worried about then let them look after the problem in their own schools. There are things you can do in the schools. They can tell kids that come in who have had too much to drink to go home. They can talk to their parents. They can deal with the problem as it is in the school itself, instead of passing it back here.

If it's a problem that there are abuses in the use of the beverage rooms, then let's make sure that the laws are honoured and enforced, strictly and fairly, but let's give the Inspection Branch of the Liquor Control Commission the ability to make the enforcement of those laws. If it's a matter of not being able to tell the difference between an 18 or 19, then I think other members have suggested the use of ID cards with pictures on them. Fine, let's do these kinds of things. Let's address the problem, but not address it from the point of view where we are going to end up taking away a basic right of those who are 18 and simply denying them a certain basic confidence that we have in their responsibility and their ability to make decisions in a whole range of other areas which we consider to be important — voting, marriage, driving, employment, and everything, paying taxes, all the rest of it. We're saying in this one area, we don't think that you can match up. That would simply be a very wrong way to approach the problem, Mr. Speaker, and I think that we would have to end up rescinding that when the time comes.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm afraid the Honourable Member from Virden will have to wait till another day.

The hour being 5:30, I am now leaving the Chair, and the House will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. in Committee of Supply.