

TIME: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 18 students of Grade 6 standing of the Weston School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Debreuil and Miss Trus. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan, the Deputy Speaker.

We also have 38 students of Grade 9 standing of the McKenzie Junior High School under the direction of Mr. McCallum and Mr. Melnyk. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Highways.

We have eighteen students from Alexandria Junior High School, Minnesota, who are being hosted by students from the Stevenson Junior High School. These students are of Grade 9 standing. They are under the direction of Mr. Temple, Mrs. Dueck and Miss Swenson. Stevenson Junior High is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. James.

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

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on April 26, 1977; May 3, 1977; and May 5, 1977; to consider the Annual Report of the Provincial Auditor to the Legislative Assembly for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1976.

Your Committee received all information desired by any Member from the Provincial Auditor and members of his staff with respect to matters arising from the Report.

By resolution of the Committee, the Report of the Provincial Auditor for the Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1976, was adopted.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Roblin, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Co-operatives, the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. With respect to the applications that are being presented in early June to the CRTC regarding the service of cablevision to areas of Manitoba, I wonder if the Minister could tell the House whether the Manitoba Telephone System provided the services of an engineer as a consultant in the preparation of the application of the WestMan Media Co-operative?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): It is quite possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, was this service provided at the expense of the taxpayers?

MR. TOUPIN: The advice, Mr. Speaker, would be at the expense, if it is from Co-operative Development, of the taxpayers through the Budget voted by means of this House. If it is the Telephone System, the advice given to this group would be available to any other group.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the applications I wonder if the Minister could tell the House whether or not he has had any conversations with Madame Sauvé, under whose jurisdiction the CRTC comes? Has he had any conversations with Madame Sauvé respecting the applications from Manitoba that are to be considered by the CRTC?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, not on the specific applications before the CRTC on the 7th of June. I have had several discussions with the Federal Minister of Communications, but not specifically in regard to applications before the CRTC.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance, arising out of the meetings he was attending in Ottawa on the anti-inflation program. I wonder if the Minister can report to the House whether the agreements reached on establishing a monitoring agency indicate that each of the provinces will, in fact, have a member on that monitoring agency and has the Province of Manitoba agreed that a representative would serve as a provincial representative on such

a group.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HONOURABLE SAULA A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the member. There was no agreement *per se* that came out of this meeting yesterday. The meeting was called by the Federal Government to advise the provinces that it is their intention to issue what is known as a Green Paper to take up the whole question of the AIB and decontrol. A proposal in there is to set up a monitoring agency and other consultative mechanisms beyond that, and Manitoba indicated that it would participate. But there is no firm understanding, there are no details as to how it would exactly operate. Certainly Manitoba will play a role if asked to by the Federal Government, although basically it was pretty well understood that this is a Federal Government decision on how the mechanism would operate and that it should be a national, rather than each province setting up its own monitoring agency and its own consultative agency because to do that would simply be to fragment the effort across the nation and have ten different perspectives on what is required. So there is general agreement that the Federal Government should take the primary responsibility and would indeed take the primary responsibility.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate at the federal-provincial meeting if there was any agreement that the control program will extend beyond October 14 into some form of transition period. Does that mean that there will be a continuation of control particularly on wages for public servants in the Province of Manitoba or in those jurisdictions where the province must establish guidelines and can he indicate when there might be some announcement as to what the nature of those guidelines might be.

MR. MILLER: Again, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government was not in a position yesterday to indicate what date it had in mind. I am pleased that it was recognized by the Federal Government and other provinces that the idea that was kicked around a few months ago by some, that the private sector should be removed from AIB controls but the public sector should be continued under control, that has been pretty well the consensus that that should not occur, that the public sector would not be dealt with differently than the private sector.

Further to that, the final decision, because there is no unanimity and views ranged from all over the place, literally, the Federal Minister conceded that because there was no unanimity nor consensus, that in the final analysis the decision would be the Federal Government's. He wasn't prepared to indicate whether it was going to be a July 1st, October 1st or whatever date, but that they recognized that they would have to make the decision and the announcement unilaterally. And of course it would affect all of Canada when it did.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether he, on behalf of the government, indicated that the Province of Manitoba would be in agreement with any decision made by the Federal Government for an extension of wage and price guidelines, particularly in view of the statements of the Premier in the past that in fact the Province of Manitoba planned unilateral action to get by out by this fall if there was a continuation.

MR. MILLER: I am sure the member realizes that the Provincial Government has absolutely no authority with regard to the private sector; that as federal legislation then only the Federal Government can lift that legislation or amend that legislation. The member is talking about the public sector only.

My view, my reading, for what it's worth, of the discussions that took place, is that in fact the Federal Government is ready to move to decontrol. The method of decontrol, the pace, the period of decontrol hasn't been determined yet, but if I'm to make a guess I would say that we will not see controls beyond early fall.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Final question.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a final supplementary to the Minister. I would ask him if he could indicate what position he took on behalf of the government of Manitoba and whether the government is prepared to co-operate in the decontrol period if in fact it does require a continuation of some form of wage and price guidelines in the public sector in the province.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I indicated, not only at this meeting but other meetings, that Manitoba favoured an early end to decontrol; that with the problem facing Canada today of massive unemployment, we have to get off the tunnel-vision view that inflation is the only problem; and if we had a stimulated economy perhaps some of the pressures that are now on labour and management might be somewhat eased and not as aggravated if we had a different type of economy in which we are now operating. But insofar as the question of whether Manitoba would co-operate, I indicated if the Federal Government, through its Green Paper, in its meetings with labour, management and other groups, and these meetings will be carrying on — if it's felt that a monitoring agency should be established — yes we would agree.

I must say to the honourable member that it was the general consensus view of both the Federal and the Provincial Governments there that the monitoring agency would not be an agency in the sense of an AIB which determine the guideline and then proceeded to enforce it, but rather it would

be an agency, hopefully, through which a new kind of dialogue would develop in Canada to bring together the various elements of labour, business, etc., to create a better climate for an understanding of the need for common sense in the price of labour on the one hand; but even more importantly in the case of business so business would also order its affairs in such a way that it would not take everything out of the economy that it felt could take but would have to take into account the impact on the total economy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister of Finance. I wonder if he can indicate whether the discussion of rent controls in the provinces were discussed at this meeting and its effect on the holding back of the stimulation of the economy itself.

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker, rent control was not discussed. It was not specifically a part of this Green Paper, the outline of which was presented, so it was not discussed as a subject.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether the comprehensive employment package that's been referred to as being introduced by Manitoba yesterday in this Legislature was discussed and presented to the other Ministers, and what reaction, if any, there was to that program.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would not present to a Federal-Provincial conference a document which was just in the process of being introduced to this House. I made reference to it, but there were no details given, no information given. I simply indicated to the Federal Government that I felt as I did after I read their March 31st Budget, that the Federal Government should give greater consideration to meet the needs of unemployment in Canada because we are faced with a very major problem there, that Manitoba was acting somewhat independently to try to meet immediate needs. And I reminded the Federal Minister of his comments during his Budget Address that in the early fall the Canadian Government would look to see what impact, if any, that Budget had on the economy; and if they would address themselves to the problem of unemployment; I hope that indeed they will do so.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Finance Minister could indicate whether he urged the Federal Government, as the Premier had urged on the last two occasions, to provide further tax cuts as a means of stimulating the economy.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't give advice to the Federal Minister on how he should do it. I did suggest direct job stimulation; I did not suggest that he follow the Manitoba lead which was, in fact, a direct tax cut to every person in Manitoba as the member knows.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. This arises out of a report in the papers today and I would like to ask the Attorney-General of the number of mistakes reported to have been made by the present government, was one of those mistakes the propriety of having the Attorney-General speak at a nomination meeting in Fort Garry on behalf of one of his staff, namely the Acting Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I assume that the question is asked in jest and that the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell surely is not being serious in the question that he is posing. My reference to mistakes is that all governments commit mistakes but the mistakes that have been committed by this government have not been mistakes as a result of icy indifference in responsibility to the lot of Manitobans.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question. In light of the fact that the Acting Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission was rejected by the NDP Party in Fort Garry, is the Attorney-General now prepared to put forward another name to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to act as chairman of the Liquor Control Commission of Manitoba?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Liquor Control Commission was not rejected in that way by the constituency in Fort Garry. It just was the fact that a very presentable, a very acceptable young lady presented her name to the convention and by not a significant majority, it was decided that that young lady would be a very fitting and a very proper candidate in the constituency of Fort Garry.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. In light of the reply of the Attorney-General and the fact that his own staff member was rejected by the party, is the Attorney-General now prepared to submit his own resignation to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me advise the honourable member that my constituency will have the opportunity to accept or to reject me; that they will have the opportunity on Friday, the 13th. That may be an unlucky day for the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, also to the Attorney-General on the same topic. Is it true that the present member for Fort Garry may have packed that meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN: I could be up on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, but actually I am up on a question. I wouldn't mind an answer to that question myself. Mr. Speaker, a question to the

Attorney-general. Does he think there is any hope now that ever, at any time, the parking lot problem related to the liquor store in Fort Garry will be solved?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the Minister give us a further report on the fire at Portage la Prairie Home for Retardates?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I think it was said in this House that there will be an inquiry under the Attorney-General and then also the Minister of Labour is responsible for the Fire Commissioner and it will be up to them when they receive it to announce it to the House.

MR. BROWN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister say how many persons are still in hospital as a result of this fire?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't know as of today. I will have to check and let my honourable friend know.

MR. BROWN: My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General tell us if a date has been set for the inquest into the deaths as a result of this fire?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as of two or three days ago when I checked, the police report and the Fire Commissioner's report had not been received yet in our office. As soon as we receive those reports, then a date will be established for the inquest under The Fatality Inquiries Act, if, as a result of the reading of those reports, one is needed, which I assume it will be needed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Finance. Some weeks ago he took as notice questions relating to what might be described as an aircraft pass-over tax, and the decision of the Manitoba Queen's Bench to reject the right of Manitoba to apply this tax. I wonder if he can tell the House now whether his department has made a decision to proceed with an appeal on that decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. MILLER: I thank the honourable member for reminding me. He and I were discussing it a couple of days ago in the hallway. Yes, an appeal has been launched on this case and therefore it is still pending before the courts.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister then concurs with the decision of his department that this is a prudent further expenditure of taxpayers' money in pursuing this highly-dubious claim that Manitoba has.

MR. MILLER: Well, I guess yes, I would be concurring since it is going ahead, if that's the question. You are suggesting that this is a waste of time. Perhaps in the light of experience, it may turn out that we are not very successful. On the other hand I think there are some basic principles that we are trying to establish here, and it is for that reason that the matter is being pursued.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Corrections. Following on his answer of a day or so ago concerning the conditions at the Youth Detention Centre, can he indicate whether he or his department are planning to take any steps to prevent the same kind of conditions that occurred last weekend occurring this weekend in terms of severe overcrowding and the placement of young people detained there in improper accommodation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

HONOURABLE J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, the member should be well aware I have no control over the number of people who appear at the door. We have to take in all people who are brought there, but nevertheless as I had said, several steps have been initiated including a 24-hour-a-day capacity in the core area, which hopefully will be operational in the next six weeks. For the member's information, as of yesterday there were 188 youths detained in the Youth Centre, which is over capacity.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Minister can indicate whether he has had discussions with the different agencies that refer people to the Detention Centre, judges and the police department, to determine what alternative arrangements might be made in case there is an overflow capacity this weekend as there was last?

MR. BOYCE: I have to repeat, Mr. Speaker, if there is an overflow capacity, it will be the result of other people's decisions, but nevertheless for the past few years there have been discussions ongoing. And it is regrettable that in the scheme of things young people in conflict with the law at the federal level fell to third priority. It was the former Solicitor-General's intention to have young people in conflict with the law and the problems relative thereto considered first, but then capital punishment took precedence and now gun control and all the rest of it take precedence and young people in conflict with the law is still being considered. In many of these areas in which there are cost-

sharing arrangements which are being shifted, we will not be in a position to allocate Manitoba tax dollars in an ongoing way until we have this problem resolved with the Federal Government.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate if, under the new job program that was announced yesterday, there will be any additional opportunity for the volunteer agencies that work in this area to provide for extra capacity or extra care for those, particularly the first-time offenders, who are being picked up for detention purposes, to take over some of the responsibilities of the Detention Centre?

MR. BOYCE: Most of the applications and programs which we hope to put in place as a result of the announcement yesterday by the First Minister will be in co-operation with the private sector.

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

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Finance. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise the House if an information centre has been established for those citizens who are requesting information on the special loan that the Minister announced in the Budget Speech for availability to insulate homes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, no, I don't know of any special telephone number. I suppose it is coming through the Citizen Inquiry Services telephone number, which is as good as any. Until the details are worked out with regard to Manitoba Hydro, I am not sure that there is a special number or a special desk that can be called. As soon as that is known, I will certainly advise the House.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister. Is the Minister aware that people who have been calling the Manitoba Hydro have been advised that the Hydro is not aware of the criteria for the loans or who qualifies for these loans or the interest rates and the amount that can be loaned?

MR. MILLER: Yes, I am not surprised at that. Manitoba Hydro, whoever answers their telephone there, would not have this information. It is in the process of being developed and certainly would not be available just by a casual telephone call. These matters are being developed and when the full nature of the program is known, including the interest rates and how it is going to be administered, that information will be made public.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, the other day the Member for Portage la Prairie asked me a question concerning the architect for the Dauphin office buildings, which is Sivertson and Company, and he suggested that the bulk of the work, or some of the work, had been done in the Calgary office. I checked with the firm and they informed me that the work was done by them in their Winnipeg office and they are a Winnipeg firm.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Some two weeks ago he took a question as notice in respect to where will the tourist information bureau be relocated to that was established in the Assiniboine Museum? He took that as notice; he said he would give us the information where it will be relocated to and why it was moved from the present location.

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

HONOURABLE BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, in the Assiniboine Museum?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, that is where the tourist information bureau was located, in the Assiniboine Museum building, and they have been served notice that it will be relocated. I would like to know from the Minister where it will be relocated to, the location, and what is the reason for relocation?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I hope to have the answer for the honourable member within the next day or two.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, during my Estimates I had a request to table some of the correspondence that we have had with the **Manitoba Dental Association re: the Children's Dental Care Program**. I received permission from the association to do so, and I would like to table it. I only have the one copy; the members will have to make arrangements with the Clerk.

Yesterday the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge asked me about a letter that I received from some co-ordinators of care homes' sponsor group of Winnipeg. I did reply to that letter on April 26, 1977. I repeated the announcement that I had made in this House that we were setting up an Office of Residential Care, and their concerns were referred to. We have a new director now, as of two weeks ago, and this will be dealt with by the director who will be in touch with them at a future date.

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, there was one additional question I wanted to ask the Honourable Minister of Finance. I wonder if the Honourable Minister can assure the House that the information

will be made available to the citizens and the loans will be made available prior to the winter season, so that the citizens will be able to take advantage and have their homes done this summer and make use of the savings this coming winter on heating costs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. MILLER: If it's not made available before the winter season, I will want to know why not.

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

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the acting First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Water Resources, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to us or is he in a position to reveal to us the contingency plans that the government has available to counteract the flood that we may be getting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I am sure my honourable friend, being in agriculture the same as I am, will be very very thankful that the heavens have dampened the dry earth and that the earth is capable of looking after its own reserves without necessity of damming at this particular time. But if perchance there is a continuous downpour, then we may have to make a re-assessment of our position.

ORDERS OF THE DAY — ADJOURNED DEBATES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would kindly call the adjourned debates on second reading as they appear on the Order Paper, followed by the introduction of the two printed second readings.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Proposed Motion on second reading. Bill (No.5) — the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill (No. 13). The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL (NO. 14) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill (No. 14). The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I will be taking a few minutes to make a few comments on Bill No. 14, An Act to Amend the Landlord and Tenant Act. I will be brief — I know that there will be a considerable amount of representation before the Ombudsman Committee and perhaps the bill will meet with further amendments to improve the present legislation.

I do feel that the present legislation means that there is an indication from the tenants as well as the landlords that the legislation requires some changes and perhaps this is the time to bring in the changes that are necessary. I know that in some respects the legislation has worked — The Landlord and Tenant Act — I was in favour of the legislation when it was first presented before the House but, since that time, we have discovered that there have been some problems and there have to be some changes made. The recent rent control legislation that has been in operation for a little while indicates that there have been problems between tenants and landlords and, in fact, those problems are increasing at some rate. The reasons are quite evident, Mr. Speaker. I know that the rent controls in some respects have postponed repairs and properties in some instances have started to be more deteriorated and perhaps more drab in appearance because the landlords did not have sufficient revenue to improve their premises because of the controls. So that was a problem.

I know some of the areas that it has been brought to me quite strongly with the present landlord-tenant legislation — one of them is that it is very difficult because a tenant is perhaps not looking after the property, or is behind in rent. It is very difficult for a landlord — and when I talk about a landlord, he may be a landlord who has one property for rent; it may be a home, it may be a small apartment, it may be a duplex — and this landlord finds himself in a position that he has a very difficult time to get his premises back, even if he has the right to give immediate notice to vacate.

But I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you must be aware of what usually takes place. In one instance quite recently, a man came to the Legislature during this session and indicated to me quite strongly, he says, "I've been trying to serve a registered letter to this party and he will not accept registered mail. I have tried to serve to him personally a notice to vacate and he will close the door — he knows who is at the door and he will not open the door." So it is very difficult even for the landlord himself to serve him notice to have grounds to have this person leave the premises. For various reasons — be it for late payment, or be it for not taking care of the property — the landlord may have real good reasons to have the tenant moved or vacated but he can't do it. It's not easy.

I had our secretary phone the Landlord-Tenant offices; I also checked with the courts and, in some instances, the courts are behind as much as six weeks. So there it is — somebody may be behind in their rent for quite some time, for a month perhaps, and still there is very little you can do, there is very little the landlord can do to put the tenant out of his premises. If you go through the court process, it may take as long as six more weeks. By this time, you are probably two and one-half

Thursday, May 5, 1977

months behind, maybe three. This is what happens in some instances and this is one of the biggest arguments that I believe the landlords have in respect to this legislation. I know that there is an improvement in what we have before us, and I am sure that it will be appreciated by most landlords; and perhaps the tenants will and realize that they cannot be hiding not accepting registered mail or having papers served them then because they will not accept it, or hiding from the landlord and not accepting any notice to vacate. So I feel that at least there will be perhaps little more fairness in this area.

There are many areas, and I believe that the problems will continue to be quite grave until such time that we will increase the number of units in the city for rental purposes. I have indicated to the House that the rental accommodation at the present time — the controls have not helped it in some instances. In fact, at the present time, because of a shortage of suites or condominium suites, you have people living in some large homes, and they may be exceptionally large homes — they may be retired people, senior people who would like to move into an apartment and it is very difficult for these people to get an apartment at the present time because the vacancy rate is one percent or less. So they are still occupying a large home and are not prepared to put their home on the market or sell it because there is no other alternative way to get accommodation. So what the problem is — and I am sure that the Minister perhaps knows — that until such time we provide more accommodation for people, we will have these problems that exist before us at the present time.

The other difficulty that we have in the Landlord-Tenant Act is to do with the month-to-month tenancy agreement. This has been brought to my attention as well. Some of the landlords will say, well, it's worked quite well to the present time; at the present time we have to give three months' notice to increase our rate for a certain suite, and this creates some problems to some of the landlord-tenants. So there has been in the last while, say, perhaps in the last year, when the accommodation space got very very scarce, that these problems between the tenants and the landlords have been much more severe than they probably were two or three years ago when the legislation first came into being.

I accept the changes, some of the amendments, but I still feel, Mr. Speaker, until such time that we do something about putting more suites on the market — and perhaps the Minister should meet with the private sector to see if he can encourage some more apartments being built in this city. I know my colleague yesterday pointed out that in the last quarter, I believe there was only something like 70 units started by the private developers, while there was a considerable higher number by the Manitoba Public Housing Corporation, but, really, in the private sector, it's just a small percentage in a city that probably does not replace a small percentage of the suites that are going out of use every month. So that is, Mr. Speaker, another serious problem.

I know to some extent the controls have also distorted the present market in respect to apartment blocks and some of the owners have, if not lost money, they've lost money as far as their values are concerned — because you can look in the papers today and there are still some apartments that are within 20 years of age listed for as low as \$8500.00. Well, there is no way you can replace those for \$8,500 per unit. Perhaps a closer replacement cost would be \$25'000 to \$30'000 per unit. So, again, there is an indication that because some of these people are small individuals, they are either senior citizens that have a small apartment, a six-unit apartment; they are not aware completely about management; they are not aware of what should the market value be of the units when they were renting and now they find themselves in a squeeze that they have been renting too low for quite a few years; the controls came on and because of inflation, the cost of operation has increased and they find themselves in a squeeze so they can't even keep up the costs on the small business ventures that they are operating at the present time.

Again, something that has area, developed in this Mr. Speaker, is that the controls perhaps have distorted the market, the real resale values of many of the housing units in the city. So that's another area, another problem. As far as the single unit housing is concerned, the controls have perhaps pushed up the market — pushed up the market — by that I mean, pushed up the prices in the market in the single family unit, in a new housing development; because what has happened, there are no suites available so a lot of young people that need accommodation cannot find an apartment or a suite in a condominium so they have to purchase a home, and purchasing a new home today is a pretty expensive transaction. For a small thousand square foot unit, you are paying anywhere between \$55,000 to \$65,000 and that's a pretty high price for many young couples to pay. What I am saying is, that has happened because of the shortage of apartment units in the city, because of the controls, it has pushed the single dwelling prices away up high and it is quite difficult for many of these people. So, really, my concern is that somehow we have placed the burden of inflation on some of the very small owners of apartments or people that usually rent one unit, or one house, or a duplex, and I don't think that's fair.

Of course, I accept and I was one of the ones that wanted controls and felt we needed something. And I still agree that it served a purpose. But I think now we have to see what has happened as a result

of some of the legislation we had in the books and what corrective measures we should take. I believe there are steps and corrective measures, and I know the Minister, when he spoke either in the Throne Speech or on one of the bills, gave us a variety of the things that he would be prepared to do in co-op housing and apartment housing in meeting with the private sector. This was quite an exciting message that he delivered to us but I wonder if anything is coming to fruition and if anything is happening in this area. As far as I can see, when we have in the first quarter of this year, 70 small units in the private sector, well, Mr. Speaker, we're slipping; in fact we're going backwards instead of forward so we're not going to help the situation at all.

Somewhat I want to indicate to the House, I accept the changes. I think they are long overdue. I still believe that some of the small landlords are still having difficulty in a situation where they cannot get the tenant out in time. Before they can get it through the courts and so on it takes six weeks. In the meantime, he is already a full one month behind in his rent. So the landlord finds himself in a dilemma that he is unable to collect at least three or four months rent out of his unit. This is what's happening and this is why so many of the small landlords — because in Winnipeg primarily most of your landlords are small landlords. You can number the large ones, as a matter of fact, on one hand, Mr. Speaker. But the small ones are really having some difficulty and that's why the friction is getting worse between the tenants and landlords at the present time.

So I say as much as we can do in respect to this legislation, to improve it, that's fine. But I think that the Minister and his colleagues, the Minister of Housing and the Minister of Urban Affairs, they will have to get together and say, "What is the strategy in putting more units on the market?" So that has to be another course of action that the government has to consider.

So these are the few points that I am concerned about. I welcome the amendments to the legislation. Perhaps from the Law Amendments Committee Hearings there may be more amendments to improve the present legislation.

MR SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I'd like to thank those members of the House that have spoken on this bill. I too recognize with them that this is certainly a step forward, not the last step. I think it is one of the many steps that will have to be taken in the future. I have indicated that to both tenants and landlords; landlords as early as last Monday evening when I met with them officially to discuss some of the problems that they have.

I have to inform the Member for Assiniboia, Mr. Speaker, that not only small landlords find themselves in difficulty today, financially, you will have larger landlords finding themselves in difficulty because of not necessarily controls themselves but because of the base, not of the percentage increase allowed over the last two phases but of the base that they started. That is applicable to large landlords as it is to smaller landlords. Because you do have small landlords, Mr. Speaker, that are doing quite well financially. Others are suffering. So it really depends on the question of the base and the question of cost-pass-through that we are attempting to deal with under regulations directly related to rent stabilization itself, not related to this Act. Because the bill before us, Mr. Speaker, is attempting to deal with problems of landlords and tenants directly through the Rentalsman's office.

I leave myself open in regard to some future possible amendments, even at committee stage, in regard to suggestions and recommendations that have been made to me. I say this of this bill like I will of Bill 57 when it comes up for second reading, Mr. Speaker. Because as we go on and as we communicate, or attempt to communicate, we learn more and when we do learn more, and when we go into meetings with an open mind, I think that we are able to help solve some of the problems that we have.

Members are quite right, Mr. Speaker, that no matter what we do pertaining to laws, whether they be in forms of bills or regulations, it will not rectify problems as we have them today in our province pertaining to proper accommodation for certain people in society.

There is a shortage of housing for those on lower incomes; certainly for those that happen to be — through no fault of their own — on social assistance and we are attempting to deal with that to the best of our ability by two means. One is that MHRC itself is engaged in the construction of public housing to the degree that they possibly can. This year, I would presume, based on the Estimates presented to us, that they would be wanting to construct close to \$50 million worth of housing in the public sector. That's certainly more than we have experienced in eleven years of the Conservatives. You know, if we take that as an example — (Interjection) — No, I agree with the Honourable Member for Fort Rge; that's not much of a record.

But that's only helping, Mr. Speaker, solve one of the problems. The public and the private and the co-operative sector have to get engaged too. The Minister of Finance announced, well that is indirectly the Premier announced an employment program that I believe will be of some assistance in the housing field, in the private and co-operative field. At least I'm hoping that those two sectors will avail themselves of what has been announced yesterday. And to some degree that will help rectify the

problem.

Rent stabilization itself has had an effect. We can't hide from the fact that it has discouraged some developers from holding back on construction. I'm hoping that we can become more equitable in regard to stabilizing rents, that we can phase increases as people are able to afford to pay the increases or, if we can't do that in regard to stabilizing rent as we allow salaries to be increased, we will have to look at other means to subsidize people in need whether they be in public, private or co-operative housing. So, by all means, this is not the end itself; it's only a means to get to a more refined end that this bill is before the House. As I indicated to the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, hopefully we can consider other possibilities at the committee stage, if not through other bills or regulations, that are permitted under the existing

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL (NO. 39) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE PLANNING ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill (No. 39). The Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge on Bill (No. 39).

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, Bill 39 is one in an increasingly long series of examples of the way in which this government has approached a particularly difficult problem in a particularly awful kind of way. It hides underneath a lot of technical language some very serious issues which really mean that in the critical area of planning two major areas of the province are going to be disenfranchised. I find it really hard to believe that after the very strong statements that were made in this House by the Minister of Northern Affairs during the debate on his Estimates, about commitment of the government to preserving the autonomy and the rights of northerners, that they would then bring in a bill, called Bill 39, which completely and almost totally takes away any responsibility for planning on the part of northern Manitobans and places it almost exclusively in the hands of a Minister and a group of planners in downtown Winnipeg, on Broadway Avenue. Because that's really one of the major impacts of Bill 39 under Section 9, that they radically change the nature of planning in northern Manitoba.

I find it hard to believe that northern members of the NDP caucus would allow a bill like this to pass through. Because certainly it really means that what they have been fighting for, for the last eight or ten years, is being taken away from them in one fell swoop of the pen. The only person who again acquires powers under this Act is that czar of the north called the Minister of Northern Affairs because all the rights of public hearings, of representation, of deciding plans on a local basis were presently and previously provided under changes to The Northern Affairs Act two or three years ago and now have been taken away. All the planning now rests totally and exclusively in the hands of the Minister of Northern Affairs and under his direction, the Director of Community Planning in the Department of Municipal Affairs. Now you add that up.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the bill goes even a step further to say that the rights that are being given to other Manitobans in planning matters — right to hold public hearings, the right to make representation on those, the right to receive notice on planning matters this — are not available to northerners. I don't know why. I don't know if the Government of Manitoba had decided either that northerners are not interested in planning or they are not capable of exercising their rights in the same way that other Manitobans are. But obviously, the basic intent of this bill, as it appears in Section 9, is to take those powers away. Mr. Speaker, it really probably shows a high degree of disregard for both the interest and the ability of the northern Manitobans to look after their own affairs. And rather than being, as the government constantly prides itself on being, the spokesman for greater autonomy and self-government in northern Manitoba, this is a direct denial of that particular procedure. This sets back government in northern Manitoba a decade at least, perhaps several decades, because it is basically saying, "We are going to be paternalistic. We have to look after you. We will do the planning for you, the Minister of Northern Affairs, the godfather of the north, will decide what will be done. He will assign a task to planners down here on Broadway Avenue. They will make the plans; we won't hold any hearings; we won't ask for any representations. The plan will be made. And then if you have an appeal after the plan has been decided, there may be a hearing under the discretion of the Minister." Now that's what that bill adds up to, in its major impact.

It is very, very strange, exceedingly strange, what he'll do. I have some suspicions, Mr. Speaker, as to why it is being done which I will express in a moment. But it really is a very strong denial of the rights of people north of the 53rd parallel to have their own responsibilities in determining their own affairs. It's particularly interesting, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the back of Bill No. 39, those areas are excluded or not applied to the north, that in particular they take away things like the right to have waterfront dedications. Now we know the reason why that is being taken away, because it gets embroiled in the whole question of Northern Hydro affairs and their negotiations with the Treaty Indians in the north and the problems of major damage that is being done to wide areas of the north that of course the government is not interested in preserving any basic rights for northern Manitobans on river fronts, riverbank areas or any other kind lake front of water areas. And that is

taken out of the Act It doesn't apply to northern Manitobans any more. So again, the natural rights that are being applied to the rest of Manitoba are being taken away.

I think, frankly, Mr. Speaker, it does come down to the fact that the government has continually found itself in a state of high embarrassment over the actions of Manitoba Hydro in usurping wide areas of land and waterfront in northern Manitoba, and therefore, rather than having to deal with through it planning, the basic procedures of law in they are simply going to deal with it by taking the rights away. That, Mr. Speaker, is certainly one of the major concerns that our group has about Bill No. 39, the fact that it is really a bill that is discriminatory in the full sense of the word to northern Manitobans. Is I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister simply going to have to answer for this before we are prepared to pass the bill. We simply will not agree to a bill like this with those kinds of measures in it. We simply can't. It would be dividing the province really into two classes of citizens and we're not prepared to accept that.

If you look into other areas of the bill, Mr. Speaker, you will also see that there is another disenfranchisement going on in relation to the area around Greater Winnipeg. If there is any area of major controversy and difficulty in land planning it is in the Greater Winnipeg region. By that I mean, basically an area that would stretch out in a radius of 30 to 40 miles outside of Winnipeg including a number of places like Selkirk and Steinbach. Many of the rural municipalities around the central core of Winnipeg are now really being affected by what in terms would be called the "Winnipeg Hinterland" or the "shadow area of Winnipeg," certainly the Greater Winnipeg region, where there is a massive amount of land speculation, land development going on at the present moment.

Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion in this House before to say, "I told you so," but I went back to read the remarks I made during the debate in 1975 on The Planning Act. I suggested at that time, when The Planning Act was being considered and being heralded by the Attorney-General who was then responsible for Municipal Affairs as being one of the great advances and one of the great reforms of the Province of Manitoba, I suggested to him at that time that I had real questions about the effectiveness of that bill in dealing with the massive escalation in land development that was taking place in municipalities like Springfield, St. Andrews, Ritchot and others. And of course I was given great assurances that this bill, The Planning Act of 1975 was the answer to that problem. Well, what Bill No. 39, two years later says, is that our Planning Act hasn't worked, that that bill that was brought in two years has been a failure when it comes to providing any kind of planning control on the major area of development that is going on outside the Winnipeg boundaries. To give you one clear example of that, Mr. Speaker, in the area north of Winnipeg, the so-called "corridor area" between Winnipeg and Selkirk, in the last year, 1976, close to 600 acres of land was put up out for subdivision approval and development agreement. That amount of land, Mr. Speaker, is in total acreage, the same amount that is developed in any one year inside the perimeter route of the City of Winnipeg. In other words, there is as much action going on outside the perimeter as there is going inside, except the controls are totally different; and in fact, there is almost virtually no controls.

If you look at the number of land exchanges and transactions going on in the area of Springfield, you will find that they have gone up close to 200 percent in the last year or two. In other words, what is happening around the fringe area of Winnipeg is that there is major development going on with no planning controls. The attempt by the government in 1975 to set up the planning districts and to get municipalities to agree has obviously not worked because there has yet to be any regional planning districts established, there has been no statements of planning intent elaborated and certainly there has been no development controls put into effect. So we've had two years of inaction with some, I would concede, meetings going on, negotiations going on, but to use I guess that classic expression, we're talking about closing the barn door after the cows have left. And they've all gone. I think it is virtually impossible to say that there is any attempt to control land development in the fringe area of Winnipeg now because it is almost all over, and yet the consequences of that development are going to have very heavy costs to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Again let me give one example. There was a study done last year, I believe, on Provincial Trunk Highway 9 which is the major northmain from highway leading to Winnipeg Selkirk, Manitoba. The estimates of the engineers at that is that Provincial Trunk Highway 9 is already operating at full capacity. In other words, it has a full volume of automobile traffic and can't stand any more. And yet let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation is presently developing a large 400-acre tract in Selkirk which could bring close to a thousand new people into Selkirk, Manitoba alone. There are major developments taking place in the rural municipality of St. Andrews — 600 acres I talked about — which will add several additional thousands of people to the population. There is no new industry going in these areas which means that all those new people will basically be commuters to the City of Winnipeg. They will work in the city, they will live out in that urban fringe, in that ex-urban area. The result is that there will probably have to be a twinning of Provincial Trunk Highway 9 in a very short order of time which will probably cost close to \$30 million. And no one, if when you go through the records of the Town of Selkirk, the Municipality of St. Andrews and the planning group in the Province of Manitoba, no one has talked about that as a basic

consequence of development. In other words we are allowing a number of major developments to occur, without making any measurement of what it is going to cost, who is going to be affected, and what the consequences are. We are losing — or frankly, Mr. Speaker, I would apologize, we are not losing, we have almost lost — all the riverbank area along the Red River from Winnipeg to Selkirk. It has now turned into private development and what could have been major areas of recreation use providing sort of close at hand green areas for the people in the City of Winnipeg to make use of, has now been redeveloped, has passed out of our control.

So what has really happened, Mr. Speaker, is that there has been a number of major developments. So we now have Bill 39 designed to control them through the use of an interim planning agreement. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that that may be the only answer. Maybe it is going to require the Minister to step in and freeze everything while everyone else gets their act together. I would say, though, it is a nice gesture but frankly it is probably too late and unfortunately too late because we have lost one of our great resources in terms of that Red River Valley between Winnipeg and Selkirk. We will not be able to make proper use with some combination of how there can be a balance between public and private interests in that area. So the interim agreement, Mr. Speaker, is useful and may have some application, but frankly the problem has already gone far beyond any planning control. It is now to the point where you can't undo what has been done.

But in doing this, Mr. Speaker, the government goes one further step, which again, I think, doesn't make much sense. In fact, it could probably be more aptly described as nonsensical, and that is to exclude the City of Winnipeg from any participation in deciding what goes on in the additional zone or the regions beyond it. In other words what we are doing is we are taking the City of Winnipeg and isolating it as an island inside its overall growth area. So what we're saying is, the rural municipalities on the fringe of Winnipeg will have one set of decisions, the City of Winnipeg will make another set of decisions, and if there happens to be some coincidence that's pure luck because there is no structure being set up under this Planning Act to ensure that there is any co-ordination, any combination, any partnership in planning between the City of Winnipeg and the municipalities on its borders. They are being separated and yet, by any practical objective analysis, there is almost a total integration between those two areas. Economics, land use, transportation, housing, uses of water resources, all those are inextricably intertwined between those two areas. And yet, what is happening is that we are severing any mechanism that was previously in force to provide an answer to it. So again it's a step backwards. We're going backwards once again rather than taking a step forward.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that rather than taking the step offered in Bill 39, what really should have happened is that the government should have realized that the major growth area for the City of Winnipeg is going to be on its urban fringe, that there has to be a close combination, an integration of planning responsibilities in those areas, and they should have done, as is now being done in the province of Alberta, established a Greater Winnipeg Planning District which would have a radius of some 30 miles to 40 miles outside of Winnipeg. Each individual municipality could have had a member, it could have had the powers established under the Planning Act and there would have been major planning efforts made in these areas unlike what is happening now. And you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why these things don't happen. It's not a great radical adventure. It's not something that I don't think is going to result in great political difficulty for the government, it just makes good common sense. And maybe the only conclusion we can come to is that in areas like this the government has taken leave of its common sense. It doesn't apply common sense to its problems any further.

So in this very important field of planning, one that will have an impact upon the lives of close to 600,000 Manitobans, which will have a tremendous impact upon the use of resources in these areas, it will have a tremendous impact upon housing prices, upon the capital cost of transportation, on utilities and services and the tremendous implications in water areas. We, rather than establishing a jurisdiction or institution, a body that will be able to provide for some cohesive longer term planning, we are in fact, once again, fragmenting, severing and divorcing the parties that have to be involved.

So it simply comes down to, Mr. Speaker, that once again we have a bad bill in front of us. A bill that is not designed to solve a problem, but a bill designed purely to come up with some expediencies and therefore, Mr. Speaker, we cannot support a bill like this. Not only is it a bad bill, but as I indicated before, also has a very serious area of discrimination against northern Manitobans. And so, Mr. Speaker, it is a bill that I think again should be withdrawn from the Order Paper, should be re-examined in terms of the kind of problems it's supposed to solve and should be redesigned with a much more intelligent approach in mind. As it is now, I think that this Planning Bill will serve nobody any purpose, in fact, I think it's a major step backwards in providing for good planning law in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: We are on Bill 39. It's in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

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

BILL (NO. 50) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PAYMENT OF WAGES ACT.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few things about Bill No. 50 and I would begin, Sir, by saying that the legislation An Act to amend the Payment of Wages Act is the sort of legislation that I think can best be described, Sir, as the right idea at the wrong time. I don't expect to earn any gratitude from the Minister of Labour for the aspects that I want to concentrate on for a few moments with respect to the Bill, but I am sure that he will accept my comments in the manner in which I offer them and they are, Sir, in the spirit of the problem that we face in our economy at the present time.

I feel that this legislation is hardly calculated to rekindle the enthusiasm or the confidence of the private sector in the opportunity for doing business in Manitoba. Now, I accept the philosophy and the position from which the Minister and his colleagues begin in formulating and proposing legislation of this kind. They have their approach to the economy, their concept of what is needed in the way of economic planning. I respect that, I don't subscribe to it, but I respect it and I simply say to the Minister that, as he well knows, we have ours. We don't believe that their approach is going to stimulate the economy in the manner necessary and I hope that he is prepared to accept our criticisms of this legislation in that spirit.

I see the legislation, Sir, as I say, a good idea at a bad time. I see it as luxury type legislation that would be well worth considering down the road, if we had a buoyant economy. The difficulty that I have with much of the legislation that the Minister and his colleagues introduce in the labour and economic area at the present time, is that while being good in concept and good in principle, it strikes me, Sir, and I suggest my colleagues, as being unrealistic and impractical in the context of the present economic situation in Manitoba, and in the context of our present situation in terms of competition with other provinces and other jurisdictions in North America. So I make my comments in that spirit.

The legislation is essentially anti-business legislation, in my view. If one believes that business is bad and that it is not to be trusted and one is fundamentally cynical about business and its contribution to the economy and its morality, then one legitimately adopts an anti-business posture. I fear that that is the fundamental attitude that is held by members opposite and that is reflected in all too much of the legislation that they propose in this Chamber. Our attitude, if it needs any underscoring, is quite the opposite of that, Sir.

While we don't hold the business community up as necessarily any paragons of virtue, we do hold it up as paragons of energy and paragons of initiative. And, in that respect, very much needed in any society, particularly a society in which the economy is troubled and sluggish and bewildered. As I say, I think the legislation in front of us is similar to considerable other legislation introduced by this government in its anti-business bias and that's the thing I reject about it and repudiate about it the most. I think that the attitude reflected in it is especially unfortunate right now when more than ever we need a private sector that is energetic and ambitious, and to achieve that, more than ever we need an appreciation by governments, plural, all governments, of the vital role that the private sector can play in getting the economy moving and in steering us through our troubles. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the private sector in Manitoba has been bewildered and immobilized for some years now because of what it feels is the enmity of the present administration, and instead of receiving some encouragement now in the kind of legislation that is coming forward and some relaxation of that suspected philosophical bias, they are simply being told once again by this government that the kind of legislation that it is going to introduce as long as it is in office is going to be heavily loaded, heavily weighted, on one side of the economic scale, and that is the side of the labour unions and the labour union movement, without consideration for the necessity of equalizing that equation. I think the general feeling in the private business sector is that government's attitude toward it is one that could be best expressed by the statement that we don't trust you and we don't intend to consult with you. That is government speaking to the private sector. And I would have hoped that there might be a relaxation of that climate of confrontation in much of the legislation coming forward by this government in this particular session.

I would ask the Minister of Labour whether this legislation could not have been delayed until a more appropriate economic time. It has a laudible principle to it, but I think that he brings it into the House at a time when we are facing record high unemployment, when we are facing record low job creation, when we are facing reduced economic opportunity, when we are facing almost non-existent communication between the business sector and the provincial administration, when we are facing a wide-spread, government-induced dismay throughout the private sector, and at least until 24 hours ago, we were facing the possibility of a serious drought.

That being the case, Sir, I cannot understand or support the position of the government and the motives of the government in introducing this kind of legislation now. As I said a moment ago, if the economy were buoyant, there would be many fringe luxuries that we could be looking at, but the first job required today for our society and our economy is to revitalize the private sector so that it can do

the job necessary, and that it always does, given free and responsible opportunity, to move the economy in a growth direction. Conventional economic wisdom, it would seem to me, Sir, would suggest that there is a much more appropriate time for this kind of legislation. One has to ask, therefore, why is this legislation being introduced now? I think that it invites a couple of answers that may appear to be cynical, but nonetheless deserve some consideration.

I think one of the reasons is because of the fact that we are in a pre-election period, or in a period of election imminence. One has no way of knowing whether the election is one month away or fourteen months away but, nonetheless, we are in a pre-election period when much of the manoeuvring by government and by opposition is geared to that consideration. I think that this legislation falls into a category of election appeal legislation, based as it is on an appeal to a constituency which the New Democratic government feels is in need of certain kinds of assistance, and feels is rightfully their own. I think that is a miscalculation on the part of the government, because I think members of that constituency recognize that what is important to them and for them in terms of their livelihoods is that the economy be strong, and therefore the private sector be strong, and that if the private sector is not strong and there is no job production or job creation and no growth, that their livelihoods are in danger.

Nonetheless, the conventional approach, I think, of my friends opposite is that this type of legislation appeals to the members of the constituency which is particularly susceptible, for reasons known only to the New Democrats themselves, to this kind of legislative appeal and this kind of blandishment.

The second reason I see for introducing the legislation at this time is that I believe that it is a sincere and long held objective of the Minister of Labour to amend The Payment of Wages Act in the form suggested here. I believe that the Minister of Labour, who has indicated that he will not be participating in the next election and that he is retiring from the provincial legislative arena, would like to feel that he had accomplished and achieved one or two, or perhaps even more, of this type of objective which he has long held before he vacates his seat and his Ministry, and that is a legitimate ambition. I wish the retiring Minister well. I don't however, Sir, wish him the type of jewel in his retirement crown that is typified by legislation of this sort. I think that it would be a mistake — a serious mistake — for the House to proceed with legislation of a kind, of a nature, of the bill we have before us simply to accommodate the legitimate ambitions of any one member of this House, whatever Ministry he commands, whatever party he belongs to.

What we have to confront ourselves with and address ourselves to is the effect and the impact of legislation proposed and enacted on the problems at hand in Manitoba today. And I think that to distort one's position and allow oneself to be distracted from that objective, allow oneself to pursue other objectives, is a serious legislative error.

There are three or four specifics about the legislation that I think require very keen examination, Mr. Speaker, quite apart from the philosophic aspects of it and the philosophic aspects of its introduction at this time, which I have mentioned. The first is the section of the bill having to do with the posting of bonds by those companies that are regarded as unreliable. Where that condition always was laid on the shoulders of the Cabinet in the past, it will, under this legislation, be a responsibility that will be vested entirely in the hands of the Minister. The Minister has assured my colleague, the Member for La Verendrye, that it will be very sparingly used, will not apply to companies and corporations, generally, but only to those who have proven track records of question. I think that, notwithstanding the assurances of the Minister, that many of us will be very uneasy about that kind of an authority in legislation, Sir. I think that many of us would ask for a firmer assurance enshrined in the legislation itself that this kind of activity and this kind of action would not be vested solely in the hands of one member of the Executive Council. It doesn't take much imagination to conceive of situations where decisions, highly arbitrary, would be made and such decisions could be highly unfair. I can assure you that we would far prefer to see the decision as to the requirements for posting of bonds remain vested where it always has been and that is in the Cabinet, in total.

The aspect of the bill that specifies that the employer would be holding the wages of his employees in trust, raises a serious question, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I am not sure that it is even logical. The concept of trust — certainly in legal terms — is that wages or moneys, moneys have to be in existence to be held in trust. One can hold a certain amount of funds in trust for another person. I think to suggest that wages that haven't been paid can be held in trust is, legally speaking, a contradiction in terms, legally speaking, an impossibility. I know what the Minister means by it but I don't know that it is legally acceptable in that sense. If the wages haven't been paid, if the money hasn't been put there, how can it be held in trust? How can a concept be held in trust? So I think that legislative counsel and members of the opposition, those who may appear before a committee on this point, and the government itself, should seriously examine that suggestion in the legislation as to its correctness, as to its logic.

The provisions that put a person owing money to an employer who has failed to pay his workers in the area of responsibility, I suggest go somewhat further than appears to be fair, Mr. Speaker. Why

Thursday, May 5, 1977

should a person owing an employer, who may have particular arrangements with that employer, who may have been involved in a wide number of situations, business and otherwise, with that employer, over a number of years and who may, therefore, have come to an agreement with that employer as to how that money will be paid and when it should be paid or how that debt should be retired, why that person who is essentially innocent of the situation in which the employee of a bankrupt employer finds himself, should be placed on a first line of responsibility bothers me to a considerable extent. I don't consider that particularly democratic or fair, Sir, and I would want to have a very close look at that and a thorough going assessment of it by the Minister himself when we come to examine the bill at committee stage.

In the area of preferred claims and preferred creditors status, I would suggest again that the government, the Minister may be going unrealistically and illogically far. The Minister says that there is nothing here that is in conflict with federal bankruptcy legislation. I need to have that and I am sure my colleagues would say the same — they need to have that demonstrated and proven to them. — (Interjection)— The Minister says he didn't say that. Oh. Well, then I have misconstrued his remarks. I thought — (Interjection)— Well, I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad to have that clarification from the Minister. I had misconstrued his remarks and I was going to point out that I know that there are changes taking place in the federal bankruptcy legislation right now, certain amendments, which upgrade and improve the claim status of employees in this type of situation. Pending the outcome of that, those considerations, hopefully then we will be withholding action in this specific area in this legislation. Well, the Minister shakes his head on that so we won't be withholding specific action but he is hoping that the two positions mesh. In any event, he is hoping that his position and the federal position mesh where — (Interjection)— The Court of Queens Bench in Saskatchewan? Well, it certainly raises an interesting legal question anyway, as you can see, Mr. Speaker. One that is not resolved at the federal or the provincial level and I raised the question for that very reason.

Finally, the aspect of the bill that disturbs me is the aspect having to do with first priority preferred creditor claims, as it were, going to employees at the expense of those who have loaned or invested money in companies and corporations themselves. I think that there is a danger here, Sir, of a pretty severe discouragement to investment and to private capital. I don't expect my NDP friends opposite to concern themselves much with that but I suggest to you, Sir, that it is a matter that should be of considerable concern. It should be of serious concern to all realistic citizens.

I think when you downgrade the position of those who lend, advance, invest or are prepared to lend, advance or invest capital for enterprise projects, for companies and incorporations, when you downgrade their guarantee of security and safety where business failure is concerned, you invite the risk of their refusal to participate. You make it just that much more difficult to get the capital funding and support that businesses small and large require. I know that the objective of the Minister is to make sure that employees like himself and myself and any and everybody else in the workplace is protected against loss of his or her wages in the case of bankruptcy. But you have to go back to the situation that created the job and created the opportunity in the first place and that was the business, the enterprise that got under way. And if capital is scared off, if investment is scared off, the enterprise will never exist to try to provide those jobs. I know that there are some situations unfortunately not everything in life, even the most carefully calculated, works out to be ideal at all times.

There are some situations in which questionable operators — fly-by-night operators as they have been referred to in some reports on this legislation — invite and create difficulty for employees which is grossly unfair, grossly unethical, probably even illegal. But in the main, Sir, I don't find people in business wanting to fail. I don't think that any of us finds people in business wanting to go bankrupt. They do their best to succeed and to survive and be viable and, as a consequence, there would not be, I suggest, in total, that many situations where employees were caught in the kind of difficulty that the Minister refers to here. Those who are could be protected by legislation having specifically to do with fly-by-night operators and fly-by-night operations that doesn't necessarily cover all business in a way that this legislation proposes to do.

I would just re-invite the Minister to have a look at the kind of danger that I see as being very real here, that this particular aspect of the bill would discourage support of a financial nature for many enterprises. That's the kind of discouragement that we have had too much of in Manitoba and in Canada in recent years. It is the kind of discouragement we don't need right now. We need the opposite kind of activity — to make sure that there won't be workers looking for pay cheques that never came, on the contrary that there will be workers working with assured and guaranteed pay cheques. I don't think this type of legislation does anything to enhance that promise, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I also wish to make my contribution on Bill 50, an Act to Amend The Payment of Wages Act. Again, it is a small bill but perhaps there is an important principle involved and the principle that we have debated in this house on many occasions over a period of quite a few

years. I have no difficulty, I do see some repercussions in the bill but I have no difficulty at all in stating that when a firm is bankrupt, that the wages should be paid first. I think that's the principle that is involved in this bill and I see no problem with that. I am sure that anyone in private industry would accept that and agree and we have, in Labour had those debates before in this House Estimates.

I think that what is intended perhaps is that wage claims are to have priority over other creditors of an employer. I think this is good and fine but perhaps the implementation will not be as easy as the piece of legislation that's before us. In fact, it has been always my feeling and I have debated on many occasions in this House over a period of many years. I know some of the members even on that side, a former Member for Emerson has debated this issue. I think that wages that are earned and owed to employees should always be payable before perhaps the other creditors and that's my feeling. I think it is a provision that we just passed in this House just recently, perhaps a week ago, in the bill, Vacations with Pay Act. We must pass it. In one sense, I don't feel that it is a very major bill; I think that it is a provision that we have talked about and debated for many years and so that's what it's about.

I am concerned in some other areas and the area that I am concerned, why should the employees' wages be left to follow the tax collector? The tax people are still ahead of the employees.

MR. PATRICK: Well, as far as I see, that's the way I interpret the bill and I would like an explanation because I would — (Interjection) — Well, then I feel it should be first. I think the tax collector should be probably the last and the employees should be the first.

MR. PATRICK: I do have a concern, Mr. Speaker. The bond to be posted by certain firms, that may be quite difficult and I am sure that the Minister will discover it quite quickly, that for many small builders and for not only small builders, for large builders today, it is not that easy to get a bond. They are having some serious problems today — (Interjection) — No, no. Many of them — and I know what the Minister is talking about when he says, I see this legislation perhaps used more in a construction bankruptcy than perhaps many others. I think that's where the problem was created and I would say 99 percent or 90 percent of the problems were created in a construction industry where employees were left without wages. So that's the reason for the legislation. — (Interjection) — Well, the bond is not that easy. I know the Minister responsible for MPIC but today, even a trustee in a bankruptcy situation, as trustee, has to post a bond under the government legislation under the Bankruptcy Act. He has to post a bond or insurance to cover the assets. that he is responsible for. But in this province today, right at this date, he has got a very difficult time of getting that insurance policy. The assets, the buildings, the real estate is new, maybe three, four, five years old but because it is in a bankruptcy, there may not be a full-time caretaker in that building, and it is very difficult.

I'm telling you and that's one issue that I was going to discuss with the Minister responsible for MPIC because the risks are that great. You may have a building that's worth \$300,000 and no one company wants to go into risk. They say, well look, it's empty; it's in a bankruptcy; we're just not prepared to go into risk. At the present time, that is a very serious situation that some of the people responsible in handling the bankruptcy situation are confronted with. Still, under the legislation, when they are doing the job of an official trustee under the law, they are required to have an insurance policy and they have difficulty getting one. So it won't be that easy. I am saying that there is going to be problem as far as getting a bond.

The other point that the Minister will have to explain to me, or I would like to know how the aspect of the legislation will change where the bankruptcy occurs and there are not enough assets to pay the wages of the employees, then the directors will be responsible to pay the employees, it will be incumbent on a director. I am sure the Minister is aware in Manitoba, in many of the small corporations where we still have — they create 60 to 70 percent of the jobs in this province — is the small family sort of corporations where they may have their legal counsel as one director and a legal counsel's secretary as another director and the owner himself. So, right now, this will create a difficulty as well because he will have no interest at all in that corporation, the lawyer and the secretary, except acting as the secretary and the legal counsel. This presents a problem as to what extent — under Section 23.1 it is quite explicit that the person who is primarily liable for payment of wages under the contract of employment under which they are payable is a corporation and if the corporation fails, then the liability of the directors for the payment is joint and several. So then the directors will be responsible.

Well, I would like the Minister to explain that. What liability will it place say, in the present situation that we have in Manitoba, on the directors for the payment of wages? I agree the legislation is necessary; it's good because what's happened in some instances is you had a contractor going broke about three or four times. You know, almost like you would say it was a habit of going broke, so maybe it is incumbent on the government or somebody to say, "Look' in that situation, you will have to post a bond."

But I am concerned for all the good small businesses. The thing is, if you don't venture you don't gain. There are a lot of people who start in a business with very limited capital, hardly any capital, and

are able to create 25, 30 or 50 jobs and from that small business, you know, it grows and perhaps employment is created. It's been great that these people have been prepared to venture and a lot of them have not succeeded and they have lost perhaps what investment they had. But I would say if three out of five succeed it is pretty good batting average because if nobody tried it would be pretty difficult to have job opportunities in this province. And it is a great thing that somebody tries and somebody thus is prepared to venture and get involved in business. So that's the point that I am trying to raise with the Minister.

Perhaps in some cases it's a fraudulent bankruptcy; I wonder if there is enough investigation into those — you know, when it seems that one goes broke and still ends up with an awful lot of money and with a lot of assets. So I wonder if under the federal legislation if proper investigation . . . I think in the last four or five years there been tremendously more and proper investigation and more trained people to do that kind of job than perhaps we had before.

But I am concerned about what happens to the small businessman that was employing 25 or 30 people and through some circumstances, because of the markets or he is not able to sell his product, he happened to go bankrupt. In the meantime, he may have already put his house as collateral at a bank and all the other family assets, so what happens to the payment of wages? Now he has to look . . . for a job to establish himself, get other employment. And what happens is that he will still have to pay — if he gets a job — a certain amount of his salary towards the payment of wages. I think the idea is great; I support it. In fact, I debated it on other occasions with the Minister and in the Labour Estimates suggested that there should be a priority. But I think it will be pretty difficult legislation to administer, in my opinion, I really do. And when he talks about bonding for small businesses starting up, I'll tell you he will have to have a pretty long communication with his Minister responsible for the government insurance, because with some of the other insurance companies, if there are no assets it is pretty difficult to get any kind of a bond. They are just not prepared to bond if there aren't sufficient assets. So I could see some difficulties, Mr. Speaker.

The other question I would like to know, and I'm sure the Minister has some idea, what will be the cost of administering this part of the Act or these changes? Does he expect it will be pretty expensive or is there mechanism within the present department to administer it? That's another point I would like to know.

What is the minimum notice required when a firm has gone bankrupt or is in the process of going bankrupt and then there has to be a trustee and the money has to go . . . ? You know, the operations haven't stopped. And the way I see it in the bill the money has to be paid to the trustee for the payment of wages. Well, is there any kind of a notice, or how do we determine when that firm is bankrupt, or how will we know? That's a very very grey area and the money, I agree, should be deposited to some account that will be for the employees. But who determines, and when does anybody determine that there is difficulty within that corporation that the money can be deposited, you know, to that trust account? So somebody has to determine it and at what time and at what stage. So I would like to know.

So again I would point out that I accept that when there is a bankruptcy the wages should come first. That's fine, but the mechanism of operation, I wish the Minister could explain to me. The other point, I would like to know what onus it will have on the directors? I see big changes in most corporations and most family and small corporations, so it may have a considerable impact. And if it has, does that mean that we will have very few people prepared to venture to take a chance to form a company and go into some operation and employ people? It may stop them if we are putting too much onus on the directors, and I am thinking of the small *entrepreneurs* in manufacturing and so on.

But I would say that perhaps most of the requirement for this legislation is as a result of perhaps the construction industry, and I'm sure that the Minister will agree.

So these are the questions that I would like to raise with the Minister at the present time. I'm prepared to let the bill go to Law Amendments where I'm sure that there will be many representations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: I move, seconded by the Member for Churchill, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN: I wonder if the Member for Churchill would allow me to speak on it.

MR. BARROW: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Honourable Member for La Verendrye proceeds I'd like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 87 members of the Audubon High School Band from Minnesota under the direction of Bandmaster Mr. C. Peterson. This group is here as guests of Mr. Speaker. I bid you welcome here this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a few brief comments on this bill. I think most of the avenues of concern were touched on by both members that spoke previously but I would just like to

reiterate one or two misgivings that I have about this particular bill.

One of the aspects that I think is of concern to all members of the House is the authority that it gives the Minister to what I would call "blacklist" a company that he feels might be susceptible to having problems as far as not paying wages to their employees should they go bankrupt. And I think that's one of the big concerns on this side. For instance, is there any mechanism in the bill — and I hope the Minister could possibly explain to us — for a company who is forced to put up a bond to appeal it? In other words, if the Minister in his wisdom says that all car dealers, for instance, of which I am one, have to file this bond. If there have been a number that have been reputable dealers, is there any appeal for me to come and say, "Listen, there is no problem. The assets are there. Everything is okay. Do I have to pay this bond?"

The other concern, I think, was expressed by the Member for Assiniboia, and that is the problems as far as the initiation of new businesses in the province. As the Minister knows, in almost every business you go into there is some kind of bond that you have got to come up with, and if you are looking at another bond added on top of all the others, the onus on the particular individual might be such that that might be the straw that breaks the camel's back on getting into this particular venture of this particular enterprise.

The other thing the Minister should maybe have a look at; when we look at the failure rates of the Manitoba Development Corporation maybe you should make sure that all the companies that are related to the Manitoba Development Corporation carry this bond, too, because they have a pretty high failure rate.

I would ask the Minister — and I asked questions in the House not too long ago — when a company closes its doors and locks the workers out and does not go into receivership, I wonder if there is any mechanism that can be used by the employees if companies who are creditors of that particular company don't force that company into receivership? And I would refer him to the Manitoba Development Corporation company where the corporation has a 50 percent equity position in Evergreen Peat Moss. I understand that the doors were closed on approximately July 5th, last year, and to this date that company has not gone into receivership and there are accounts receivable outstanding to employees of that company. And I'm wondering if there are any provisions in this Act which would take care of a problem such as that.

Mr. Speaker, with those few words I think the rest of the things that I was going to discuss was covered by the Member for Fort Garry, so with that I would also pass the bill on to committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My concerns and misgivings are — as possibly the Minister in Law Amendments might explain it — is, when a company closes its doors and doesn't go bankrupt, when do the wages end? By that I mean, if the particular principals of the company, for all intents and purposes, decide to call it a day and close the door but don't officially go bankrupt, and they're not forced into bankruptcy, is there a mechanism where there is some protection for the other creditors, that claims are not put in for weeks and months after and claiming two and three weeks holiday pay besides, is there some mechanism that says that at some certain point in time the wages end then and you're entitled to 4 percent and that's all? I support the concept of wages coming first, but I have some concerns because we have a Minister over there saying he can't see any particular new staff, he can't see an administrative nightmare or a problem.

I might suggest that the enforcement by many judges — and that might be a problem and a concern — because we have on one hand the Income Tax Department; we have the Manitoba Hydro who claims priority over all; we have the City of Winnipeg who claims priority over all but a chattel mortgage; and we have the landlord claiming priority over chattel mortgage; and we have many people claiming priority. The Sheriff's office and a Writ of Execution claims priority and it's going to be a particular legal entanglement. It's probably going to be a boom to the legal profession, but it's sort of like a dog chasing its tail — everyone comes first. I'm wondering if the Minister in Law Amendments will explain how he's going to convince his other government departments that he, indeed, comes first.

My concern is also about these many bonds that are coming up. There are very few insurance companies left that will handle bonding and I think the MPIC should be getting into it — or be or forced by the Cabinet to get into it — because many small firms are experiencing difficulty and the result is that cash bonds are demanded by government now because of the lack of bonding by insurance companies and the government opposite, unlike the private sector, refuses to pay interest on these bonds. I think it's something worth looking at.

So basically those are some of the concerns that I have. Wages that are due and wages that have been earned, certainly I would have no objection to paying in a priority situation. But I'm concerned about who is going to make those rulings — is it going to be the Labour Board who is going to allow a month's holiday with pay in addition. That will create some problems to the other creditors and those are the kind of concerns that I would like expressed in law amendments. I just really think, as I say the same as my colleague here, I am concerned about many of the MDC corporations and I would like to

see the government police themselves. I would like to see that some clear example of this dog chasing its tail, where everyone is taking priority, whether it be the Sheriff, whether it be the Manitoba Hydro, whether it be the City of Winnipeg Charter or the Manitoba Charter, everyone claiming priority. I think it should be something that allows these things not to be dragged out in the courts; that all government bodies get together and amend their charters and amend their by-laws to state that we come after the payment of wages.

MR. SPEAKER: The debate will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

The next is a proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 56, The Farm Lands Protection Act.

MR. FERGUSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Listening to the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry a week or so ago on this bill, prompted me to take the adjournment to reply to him. The bill is a fairly simple and straightforward measure and I had not intended to make any remarks to it. However, when I sat and listened to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and what he had said, I was tempted to go back to the bill and to the Honourable Minister's introduction of it and even to the presentation at the Public Utilities Committee last year by the Manitoba Telephone System, to have another look at it and to find if there was any validity to the honourable member's remarks.

I had the privilege of sitting on a few committees with the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, Mr. Speaker, and I find him generally to be a most reasonable and fair man in his approach to those matters coming before the committee and I find generally his response to issues to be one imminently reasonable and fair. However, what he had to say on this particular bill I believe was not at all reasonable and not at all fair. I think that he had read far more into this bill, either deliberately or by accident, than was in fact intended.

Now what had, in fact, been intended by this bill Mr. Speaker it was that a situation existed where certain Manitobans were purchasing — privately — equipment and attaching it to the Manitoba Telephone System's switch network. In doing so, it put in jeopardy, to some extent, this system's network, communications network, and it also denied the Telephone System some revenue to which it feels it was entitled. The bill intends to be a form of compromise, Mr. Speaker, between those two positions — on the one hand banning any interconnection with the system's lines and on the other part, allowing any connection whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER: Subject to our rules, I must now switch to the Private Members' Hour unless I get direction from the members that they wish to carry on. If not, the Honourable Gentleman for St. Vital will be able to continue at 8 p.m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

BILL (NO. 9) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE BRANDON CHARTER

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this particular Bill for my colleague who agrees that it could go to committee if the House is agreeable.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

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

MR. BARROW: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 41. The Honourable Minister for Mines is absent.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say, over my years here that I had a lot of respect for a lot of members on both sides of this Chamber and at many times I've boiled because I've been tied in to a particular party of a particular rule that I didn't always agree with, but that didn't make it any less respect for that party or those members. Likewise on the other side of the House. One of those members in that category is the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. I congratulate him for making this move, introducing this bill. In my constituency it's just the same as anyone else's, there are young people that are drinking at a very young age and this won't stop that I realize, but if it does save 50 careers, or 50 lives, 50 family happinesses, then indeed isn't it worthwhile? I think the Honourable Minister of Public Works may insinuate it wouldn't be much help. Well, if it's any help, Mr. Speaker, it's got to be worth the effort and I can think of communities of the same nationality as the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, community of Kolar that I can go into and proudly go into it because I know, and you can read quickly, that they practise temperance to a high degree and while

again that community never always agreed with me and the things that we were doing when we were on the government benches, there was still a lot of respect for people in public office. That in itself is sort of . . . in the public eye I think, it went a way that I would rather it not have gone and I think that we do deserve more respect in the public eye than we get.

I feel that I have a little bit of the story of this in a first-hand route, because I could certainly take you back, Mr. Speaker, when I joined the Royal Canadian Navy real early, and I remember when we hit Halifax and I was in my teens — certainly I wasn't the legal age of drinking, but certainly there was a way and a means of getting it and that was the thing to do, the same as the young people today. Also one of the speakers said, well, if you can fight for your country, you can be illegally allowed to drink, or should be able to. I suppose that is a pretty good approach, but that wasn't so. Ask the Vimy veterans, ask the last war. If we got into a pub in uniform, it was simply against the law, it wasn't really supposed to be, and we fought just as well whether we had the booze or not.

I think, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Well, to answer the honourable member, sometimes we had plenty. But I think I am a responsible parent, too. I have four teenagers, and not being exactly sure, I may have one that has reached the twentieth birthday, and I have one that's in Grade 12 at Hamiota Collegiate, one of the collegiates who were picked to vote for this. I know my son has been trying to con me for me to ask him how he voted, and I was not going to do that. I might do it after I have spoken but I wanted to speak here freely. He did what he thought was the right thing to do and I have to congratulate the Hamiota Collegiate and the teaching staff that must have shown the leadership in this regard, because that collegiate voted very decisively for raising the drinking age. That was Grade 12, they were the very young people that were going to say we can't legally go in there, and they voted for it. And that has got to be something.

My honourable colleague to my left mentioned the word leadership or something of that area, and I think these young people are really doing the very thing, they are showing leadership to the public today. Certainly everybody isn't for one thing, but it is a move in the right direction. If we only save a handful of lives, a handful of marriages, a handful of young people, it hasn't cost us very much or the taxpayers to look at this, speak on this bill.

Certainly we see it in the places we go weekly or daily, when we know it is abused, possibly to some degree by my young people, by my friend's young people, and I think this move is a proper one. I think the media has given this a lot of press, and it shows it's popular. Just because I think it is popular doesn't make me always want to go on the thing. I have young people and I have seen my friends that were young people in days gone by that got into the stuff early. Their careers are finished. They are physically just about finished, and it is a shame, people that are younger than me. Maybe if this law had been tougher in those days, maybe one or two of those friends of mine wouldn't be in the unfortunate situation that they are in today.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, when I was on the bottom of the list I thought I was several days away, and really I haven't got myself that overly prepared anymore than I believe this, I think it is right, I think it is good for the nation, it is certainly good for the youth and I am all for it and will be supporting it when it comes to a vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. LES OSLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to enter the debate on this question and there is no way that I am voting to take away something that we have given these kids. It is just beyond me. I don't know what the devil has got into us to talk like this. This thing is like giving an aspirin for cancer; for God's sake. The whole problem of liquor is wrong in our province and it goes a long way back.

I would like to follow up on a few points to do with the Navy that the Member for Virden brought up. I can tell you I joined the Navy as a young man in Winnipeg here, and in those days we had men's drinking rooms, that is all you were allowed. Women were not allowed in. And I certainly wasn't allowed in. At that point in time, Manitoba was so backward as far as the social side of it was concerned, it was pitiful, but believe you me, drink beer they did. You were not allowed to do anything else but drink beer in that beer parlour. No music, no food, you couldn't get up and dance even men with men. In those days during the war there used to be a lot of that sort of thing, skylarking. Drink beer.

I just feel so uptight with this whole bill, and I have listened to the Member for La Verendrye speaking in support of it, and also on TV I have followed that. I have noticed in his clarification of his points as he was presenting them, that he really wasn't presenting the bill as a sort of an answer to all the problems, and I am glad that he recognizes that because this is not going to answer it.

A MEMBER: It's going to help, though.

MR. OSLAND: I believe that it is not the answer, it isn't even going to help. It is just backward.

I would like to show you the stupid position I found myself in as a young sailor, joining the Navy and offering my life on the line and all the rest of this stuff, you know. We weren't allowed in the beer parlours, that's for sure, but we got it. Anytime we wanted booze, we got it. Even if you had to break into the Navy stores to get Navy rum.

Thursday, May 5, 1977

Now at this point in time, as you came through from say — you were allowed to get in at seventeen and a half, and you can get through to the age of 20. At the age of 20, the magic day arrived, you were then allowed to draw at 11:30 in the morning when the up-spirits came. You could draw two and a half ounces of pure, unadulterated dynamite. It was called Navy grog, and you stood in front of the officer when you went up to draw it, your name was called, you held out your cup or your glass, they put two and a half ounces in the bottom, and then they filled the glass up two and a half times with water. I don't know whether you have ever drunk . . . I notice the Member for Virden gurgling in his seat over there, because that is a terrible tasting drink.

The first time I participated in a splice the main brace when King George was in the Bay of Biscayne, I had never drawn this stuff before. And I went down, you know, like a beautiful young virgin I was, and I held out my glass and they filled it up. And you had to drink it standing right there, you weren't allowed to leave the quarter deck. Well, I'll tell you in about five to ten minutes, I not only couldn't feel my feet, I couldn't feel my legs either. And of course the boys got me out of the sight of the officer at once because you were drunk, and if you were drunk you can be put on charge on board ship.

I don't know what ever happens at the age of 20 where anybody ever arrived at this magical age that you all of a sudden were mature enough to drink. And consequently, I will tell you, we developed some of the finest alcoholics in the world, and they were my friends. Just as the Member for Virden was saying, some of my best friends even took the final act of putting a gun in his mouth and blowing their heads off. Lots. I shouldn't make it so blanket as lots, but there were some. Marriages absolutely rotten, wrecked.

It isn't just changing the age limit that is going to be the answer to this thing. It is going to be when we as a society grow up and mature enough to accept it as a beverage and stop this business as using it as something to get off on to Cloud 99 and get drunk.

Now we even add another little additive to it, we start taking pep pills and all the rest of it. And we have had our bellyful of it in the Navy in the last few years with this very, very same thing, of not only having the alcohol to deal with, but adding the drug abuse along with it. You add the two together and you get some very, very startling results.

Now I've got six children, and we have raised them all with a lot of freedom, freedom I never received. My dad would not have liquor in the house. I have been filled in in a few ports in this world by getting a little drunk and not being able to manipulate myself and I talk a little bit too much when I get drunk anyway, so consequently the boys took a little action on me at different times. But I learned. I've made up my mind I would never have my kids come up into the world without becoming involved in this thing, recognizing it for what it is, accepting it and living with it. I really feel that the raising of the age is taking the symptom of the disease and rather than attacking the main disease, treating it.

The other night when we were at the dinner with the Hotel Association, it became quite a widespread discussion. There were some very, very good points put out. One of the owners of one of the hotels here in Winnipeg, who was an ex-Air Force officer and had been overseas in Europe and all around the world, I presume, had some very, very good thoughts on it. His point was that if we can instead of making it into a beverage room which is a beer parlour which is primarily there to drink and drink and drink, but to make it into a social gathering where you bring your children and bring your wife, your family, and where you kind of come down and socialize with one another. God knows we need them — we haven't got enough recreation places right now. My son's in the music racket, and there are not enough places in our city where they can put on dances, social events, where they can really relax. Not enough of them. And we need more and more of them.

We even took the old auditorium here which was one of the finest dance pavillions in the city and they made it into the Archives. I am sure that most of the members around here with a little grey hair can remember the days when a few of the top bands came all the way into Winnipeg here to perform down in the old stage down here.

I feel that we must mature as a society. I feel that this bill, by picking out an age, is trying to pinpoint the problem and trying to bring it all into focus on one little group, when really and truly, I can tell you right now that I see an awful lot of immature drinkers at 40, 45, 50 and on up the ladder.

One of the finest points that was made that I really could sit down and discuss with anyone at any time, was one of the boys made the point of why put an age limit on it at all? Why not open the doors of the beverage room and let it become a family place? Well, it would have to be done in graduation, naturally, but it can be done.

Let me tell you that beverages, for instance like wine in Italy, people don't feed their children wine just because they want their kids to get drunk on wine, because they don't get drunk on wine, they get involved with it and they get little sips of it as children, and they develop it. The reason they don't drink water is 'cause the damn sutf's polluted.

A MEMBER: Ohhh!

MR. OSLAND: It certainly is. We were in Naples there, and I will tell you, you couldn't take the

water out of the streams there, they were all polluted. Over-population has really done its damage.

I feel that there is an answer to this, that as soon as we as people start becoming a lot more understanding of the problem, and I mean a lot more people understanding the problem, right now there are only the social workers and a few like that who are coming in contact with it. The rest of us would like to write cheques when we see something go off the track and problems arise. Our answer is to pull out your cheque book and write a cheque for \$10.00. You're doing some good. The good will be done when we all start getting our elbows into the mix, and we start helping people wherever they fall off the track. And it won't be just eighteen-year-olds, it will be all the ages right up through parenthood and even into the old age section.

This is a backward step. It was a positive step when we went down to eighteen. I don't think we followed it up when we went to eighteen. It wasn't just a case of making the new drinking age eighteen, there was more than that to go with it, and we didn't follow it up and that's our fault, not the eighteen-year-olds'.

I think this is a negative thing that's happening. And you can't just, as a Legislature, come along and give it one year and take it away the next year and expect anybody to understand it. If you take the right away from some of these young men that are acting maturely with liquor at the age of eighteen, they are going to rebel against it.

A MEMBER: How many of them at eighteen?

MR. OSLAND: What do you want me to do, go out and do a head count for you, Father?

A MEMBER: Well, of course.

MR. OSLAND: I think everyone gets off on too darn hard a position. I think we have got to look at this thing. We have got a drinking age of eighteen now. We have got to make the thing work. Right now if you go down into the beer parlours, I don't know whether you go into that side or whether you go into the lounge side, I prefer the beer parlours and I go over onto the other side and they have got, right now they have got rock bands coming in, these young people are sitting there . . . you can't hear yourself think and it is no enjoyment for me, but they don't seem to mind it. And there is more listening than there is drinking in this situation. Now you take that rock band out and put in a disc jockey and right away there is nothing to watch anymore, so there is no performance, so the first thing you notice is they are bending their elbow faster. —(Interjection)— I am not too much in favour of go-go girls, but possibly there is some entertainment in it, I don't know.

I just wish that in 1940 or 1945 this question would have come up. I wonder if we would have had some of the old men that have gone through it all who would be voting the way they are going now, because I take some exception to some of the remarks that I have heard from men that have served in the services, and I would just like to tell a story as I close here.

We were in a theatre in England, in Plymouth, and it was during the blitzkrieg and they were showing — in those days they didn't have the setup that they have nowadays, but they had the old Newsweek, newsreel, I forget what was the title of it, and as they showed this bomber coming in, and it was on fire in the engines and the pilot had got it back, and they announced as he was bringing in, they actually had a photo of it, and they were announcing as he was bringing it, that all the members of the crew had already jumped to safety, that they had parachuted down, and that it was the pilot alone bringing the plane in. And he belly-landed it on the airstrip, saved the plane with no damage and no one killed. And when it was all finished, they announced that the age of the pilot was eighteen years of age. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fliin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the debate. I feel much the same as my colleague here, although I wasn't in the Navy, I was an Army man. I have had a little experience with drinking, not that I ever overdid it or anything, but once in awhile the waitress would be too nice to me. But I come from a coal-mining area where drinking was a way of life, and we had no beer parlours. We had a liquor store. And what we do, four of the boys get together, 15 or 16, and we get a gallon of Bright's Catawba, they called it. There was a kick in every ounce. I graduated from that and we had home brew, home-made beer, home brew. And when we were stuck, we always had lemon extract to fall back on. —(Interjection)— Rubbing alcohol, shoe polish, yes, shoe polish. I don't know about the navy but the army had a drink and it was a good drink. They called it "canned heat." You squeeze it through a dirty rag and drink the residue.

We thought we were doing something big when we were young fellows. What's ironic to me, Mr. Speaker, the kids of today, 18 years old is not a child to me. They do things, they have lots of energy to expend; you see them screeching their tires and driving 80 miles an hour, taking all kinds of chances, daring. Well in 1939, these are the kids that flew our Spitfires in London, doing the same gags, same kids, lots of nerve; doing the trenches, 18, 16, 17, put their lives on the line because they believed in democracy.

And you go from the young fellows to young ladies. We have all kinds of birth-control pills, but once in a while something happens; at 14, 15, they get married. So in theory, a young woman, 18, could have three children. It would be beautiful for her to go to a beer parlour — you can't have a drink

because she's the mother of three children.

The bill itself . . . and he admits, it, my honourable friend, my colleague, my friend from La Verendrye — he is going to cut-off the 18-year-olds so the 16, 17, and 15s won't drink. So in theory, raise it to 19 so we'll get the 18s, 17s and 16s, and we'll come to the 15-year-olds. It is a phony piece of legislation and I just can't buy it.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to enter this letter in the record. The Manitoba Young New Democrats have asked me to express to you their deep concern over the proposed drinking age legislation.

"As young New Democrats, we are very concerned that some our MLAs will vote in favour of this legislation without realizing its ramifications. Let us examine what Mr. Banman is proposing. He is suggesting that we should deny a certain group of society the full rights of citizenship while at the same time demanding that they fulfill responsibilities incumbent on citizens. In Mr. Banman's view, an 18-year-old is old enough to vote, is old enough to go to war, sign contracts and be elected to sit in this Legislature, but not old enough to handle his liquor.

What if Mr. Banman made the same proposal for native people, as has been suggested, in fact tried in this country for a long period in our history. Or Ukrainians or even New Democrats? Where does one draw the line when one enters into the field of discriminatory legislation? Mr. Banman's argument is based on the fact that an 18-year-old drinking age enables youths under 18 to be given access to liquor. This argument has reached even the most simple of minds. If a law is not being enforced, you do not strengthen the law, you strengthen the enforcement. The only thing such legislation will accomplish will be to increase in numbers the young people in our province who will become criminals in the eyes of the law.

We do not close our eyes to the problem of liquor-abuse amongst young people. We have what we feel constructive suggestions for the control of this problem. We advocate that a) the government bring in strong enforcement legislation which will raise fines for hotel owners across the province for serving minors and which will ensure that all 18-year-olds are issued picture identification which is the only acceptable identification in the province's bars. And second, that the province step up its campaign to educate youths about the dangers of alcohol-abuse in particular, and drug-abuse in general. If you do not believe that even these measures will curb the problem of teenage alcohol abuse, then we urge that you defeat the Banman proposal and consider a proposal to raise the age of majority. Although we dislike such a proposal, we do not view it in nearly so serious a light as the Banman resolution which would open Manitoba's doors to discriminatory legislation."

Mr. Speaker, there is the young people speaking for themselves. I support them and I will vote against this legislation.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, will the member table that letter please. **MR. BARROW:** Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments on Bill No. 49, having listened to two of the honourable gentlemen opposite this afternoon. You know, Mr. Speaker, something that concerns me and the letter that the Member for Flin Flon just read to us, I think that's the comments were made therein it's a problem. But I don't know for those that I have listened to debating on this bill, I have never heard comments made in regard to the legislation that this government brought in, Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago. That was a bill called The Age of Majority Act whereby they took the responsibility of reducing the age of 21 to 18 probably not knowing, Mr. Speaker, some of the problems that would be created after that legislation was passed. And as a result of that, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves facing one particular problem that my colleague from La Verendrye has brought before you today. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that it is a difficult one and I can appreciate the comments coming from honourable gentlemen opposite.

If I recall the debate that went on, they used the argument that if you are old enough to fight for your country, you should be classified as an adult and that is 18 years of age. And that to me was all they said, was the reason for reducing age of majority from 21 to 18. So we've gone that far, Mr. Speaker. But I can tell you and I had it brought to my attention on many occasions in recent years, of one of the problems that that legislation has given us, because today our children — that is our boys and girls — are entering the high school age in greater numbers than they used to say 20 or 30 years ago or when you and I were young. We didn't have that opportunity to get that kind of education — at least I speak for myself — didn't have the opportunity to get the kind of education I'd like to have had. I had to go out and work. I would have like to gone on to university but that wasn't available to me. And I had it said to me on more than one occasion, from trustees who have said, "You know, 18-year-old boys and girls when they are in high school, Grade 12, 11 or 12 even, in the afternoons they might go down to the local pub, spend an hour or two there for refreshments, and then they would catch the bus on the street corner before it left town to take the children home and many many times, the parents knew nothing about this and this was going on." That's one example, Mr. Speaker, as to one of the reasons why we have this legislation.

I think I speak correctly from my colleague from La Verendrye as to one of the reasons why this bill is before you. And I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, I want to hear the comments from honourable gentlemen opposite, where they are now feeling very concerned because they brought in legislation of reducing that age of majority, that they realize today that it was a big mistake and that it should never have happened. —(Interjection) Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Point Douglas said, "Who is perfect." I am not saying that it be perfect. But the arguments they used, Mr. Speaker, I did not agree with them. I felt that the arguments they used in those days were not good enough.

And the other thing I said, Mr. Speaker, I want to say now is that, and I know it's all well and good to speak now after all the years have gone by. But I have said in the past as well that I don't think it was fair to our young people to accept the responsibility of being an adult and all that responsibility that goes along with it at 18 years of age because too many of them are still in high school today compared to what they were 20 or 30 years ago. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's why I think we have this bill before us. And I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that those gentlemen opposite who are going to vote against this bill have now found themselves in a very difficult position. —(Interjection)— Maybe they haven't; all right then I'm sort of feeling them out.

Mr. Speaker, there are other reasons why we have this bill before us and I can understand the reasons why some young people may feel that if they can sign documents; they can do all other legal matters at eighteen years of age but they can't consume refreshments at eighteen years of age.

Probably maybe, Mr. Speaker, the age of majority should be changed from eighteen to nineteen, or eighteen to twenty. I just throw it out, Mr. Speaker, as a question. Is that what we should be doing? And perhaps maybe that would make it more reasonable, more acceptable to all of our young people who find themselves in that age category.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make those few points in regard to this legislation and to point out that I want to say to the honourable gentlemen opposite that they must accept full responsibility for the problems that we have got today. And the Honourable Member for La Verendrye has pointed out one good classical problem. Because I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, when that Act came into force — and we had a different age for the law insofar as an adult was concerned across the line — the border was a real problem for the officers when they crossed the line, either way. It was a real problem, Mr. Speaker, all because of the age of majority that was changed from twenty-one to eighteen by this government.

So, Mr. Speaker, having made those few comments, I want to say that I am supporting the Honourable Member for La Verendrye in this bill.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: I wonder if the honourable member would accept a question. Looking at the journals, he does not appear to have spoken on the Age of Majority Act. Could he inform us how he voted on it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: The Member for St. Johns can also look into the annals and find out how all of us voted on that bill.

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

MR. CHE. Since IACK: A second question there does not appear to have been a recorded vote, would the honourable member agree that it must have been unanimous?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on Bill 49. I'm not one to criticize a member for coming forward with his or her convictions, being only male representation in this House, the Member for La Verendrye I guess has to be congratulated for coming forward with what he considers to be advisable, for himself and for his constituents, and I believe that he believes that this is advisable for all Manitobans.

In respecting his point of view, I don't agree and I, like the Member for Rock Lake, would possibly like to deal with the age of majority instead of dealing with the age of drinking of those that are considered to be of age or not. I supported the lowering of the age of majority from twenty-one to eighteen and if that bill was before the House I would oppose an increase from eighteen to nineteen or twenty, as I will oppose Bill 49, because I happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the problem that we have in society is not related to the age itself. I, like the Member for Rock Lake, and I guess we're here to empty a part of our own hearts, was not as fortunate as others financially and I had to quit school when I was quite young and work in the bush camps when I was sixteen years old, for three years. I went back to my studies when I was going on twenty. At sixteen I weighed 185 pounds, I was stronger than I am today. I could enter any pub in the province of Manitoba and be accepted as a man because I had the size and I was known to be older than I really was, and I did on many occasions. And I said this before publicly; I went into many pubs and mainly Transcona pubs because my grandparents

lived there. The owner of the Transcona Hotel knew my grandfather and I. We sat in the pub on many occasions because he was a very close friend of mine.

I can't remember in those days, Mr. Speaker, ever abusing alcohol when I sat down with my grandfather on many occasions. But because we sat down, we talked and we confided in one another and it was a good experience because I was taught at home by my mother and by my father never to drink in excess, which I never did when I was a boy. I always had wine or beer that my mother made. I must tell you that the wine my mother made was lousy but I still drank it to please her because she made it. That's all we could afford and we had a glass of wine when we ate. She made beer which was pretty good, and as children we had a drink with our parents. Never did I see my father drink in excess; never was he ever drunk in his life, to my knowledge; never was my mother drunk; never were any of my brothers or sisters. Because we, I think, were taught to respect alcohol and I guess we never did have the, you know, the desire of using alcohol as a crutch. And I think that's the problem in society, Mr. Speaker. It really boils down to the lack of education by parents or guardians in society in regard to the possible abuse of any chemical, whether it be alcohol, drugs, you name it. — (Interjection)— Including smoke, yes, by all means; I've only quit smoking a couple of months ago. I had been smoking since 1948.

But I think it is a lack of education on all the possible abuse that we have and using these things as a crutch. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that if we attempt to relate, you know, the good or bad intentions of any member of this House, in voting for or against any bill, I think it has to be related to a basic conviction.

I could, as an example, Mr. Speaker, go back to my constituency and again, depending on where I consult, I could have a different opinion given to me. If I go, as an example, to Lorette, I am quite sure that I would get support for the position that I am taking in this House. If I go to Landmark, because of the deep belief of the people there, they'd be against my position that I'm taking now and that I took back when we voted on the age of majority. I happen to feel that certain things in society, once a person is elected on the municipal, provincial or federal level, he or she has to take certain responsibilities. I don't believe in going back all the time, in the fashion of a referendum and dealing with these problems. I think the member has to decide.

I happen to believe sincerely in the position that I am taking today based on what I am saying. I think it is really a problem of lack of education of kids today by parents or guardians. Because a lot of kids today don't have parents and they do have certain guardians. They go from one home to the other and some of them do leave to be desired because they do need a crutch and they take alcohol as a crutch and I think that's a mistake.

When I started to, Mr. Speaker — and again to relate personal experiences — be on my own later in life and I did want to be part of the crowd, I didn't really know deep down what should be done and how far one could go. I wasn't, unfortunately, as old as the two members that just spoke from Flin Flon and Churchill, I didn't get a chance to be part of the Second World War. I was only in the cadets in college but I understand some of the problems because six of my uncles were in the last war; two were in the Army, two in the Navy and two in the Air Force in the same family and they all got back.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, that it relates again to that lack of education and the lack of ability of certain people of being able to entrust themselves in something more tangible than alcohol or drugs. I took a job with Transair at a given period of time and, not knowing very much, I consulted some of my older friends that worked with me with Transair, I was in Sioux Lookout, and I knew that I was going to drink that evening and I asked one of them, I said, "You've been in the army, tell me what a guy takes if he knows he's going to drink and if there's a danger that he may become intoxicated?" And he said, "Listen Rene, you go back home and you take a bit of oil of some kind so that it will line your stomach." So I went back to my suite, Mr. Speaker, and I took a bottle, not a teaspoon, I took a bottle of . . .

A MEMBER: Castor oil.

MR. TOUPIN: . . . not castor oil, I took a bottle of olive oil. Mind you I got sick that evening, not because of booze but because of that damn oil. I started to drink, I had two glasses of Scotch — and Seven then — and they had to take me back home and you should have seen the people. They laughed at me the next morning. I didn't feel like even looking at breakfast. But again, Mr. Speaker, that's a lack of education on the part of, you know, parents, the part of guardians.

I believe that we who have been given responsibility in this House, do have a responsibility to follow up on what the Honourable Member for Churchill indicated a while ago pertaining to the age of majority, and here I include the privilege of drinking, and it is in a sense a privilege that has to be respected, it is dangerous in some cases, same as a vehicle. I think that we have to enforce the law that we have possibly to a greater extent than we have to date. Members of this House will recall that the Amusement Act was amended a few years ago making it allowable for an ID card to be prepared and acceptable in form, not acceptable on the provincial basis but in form under the Amusement Act and this was done by the Hotel Association and offered to those wanting to purchase an ID card.

We may have, Mr. Speaker, to go a bit further than that in regard to enforcing the law and even

possibly making a compulsory aspect to an ID card, not necessarily only to one segment in society. I wouldn't want to impose the purchase of a card by means of the Hotel Association. It could be made available in different forms by Health and Social Development, Highways, you know, university, as long as the card itself would be in the prescribed form, acceptable by regulation. I think that may suffice.

I have four children myself. I have two in college and my son who lives with me is 17 years old. He's not as big as I was at 17. His feeling is that we should not increase the age and he's consulted with some of the kids at college. I've consulted three other of my children who are girls, younger than the boy and that's their feeling. I respect the feeling of other kids who say that the age of majority or the age of drinking should be reviewed. You know, that's something that they decide upon themselves or through consultation with their parents or teachers. That happens to be the feeling of kids that I talked to, you know, in that environment. It could be different elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to lay this on the record. Not that I just blandly want to vote against the bill, but I do want to vote against the bill because I believe in what I've just said.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I've been very interested in what has been said on this bill today and the various points of view and I have reached the stage where I possibly shouldn't be entering into this debate because I wouldn't want people to think that I'm dictating to others as to how they should live. But it is a very important issue, Mr. Speaker, and what to do about it? I think that the remarks of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, when he was talking about the age of majority . . . I don't know that a mistake was made, but I think we were a little hasty at that time and we didn't give it all the thought that we might have given it, that is on all sides of the House.

We talk about enforcing the law and there's no one more happy to hear that attitude around and about, but with young people today, Mr. Speaker, it's not that easy. I think what is lacking is lack of education and, as I have said so many times before, parental responsibility. There's nothing wrong with having a social drink and holding it within reasonable bounds. But you probably know as well as I do, Mr. Speaker, that those that we charge with the responsibility of keeping the peace are having a pretty rough time these days. And what is the answer? And I think that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye put forward this suggestion by way of a bill in good faith and he has done a tremendous amount of research — not in books — but rather with people and the overwhelming majority replying to him suggested that he was on the right track and he's put it forward in good faith.

We heard from the Minister of Corrections this morning that the Detention Centre is full to overflowing, Mr. Speaker. I think of what we had on Vaughan Street and now the Detention Centre is somewhat of a palace compared with that. I'm sure the Minister is concerned about this overcrowding of the Detention Centre and probably the only alternative is to keep on building and building and building, to take care of these young people.

And in the course of this debate this afternoon, I wonder just how much liquor is responsible for what is going on there and I hold the finger of fate at the parents, Mr. Speaker. There's something wrong with our society today that they are not giving that guidance. You and I grew up in an age where people, for use of a better term, were more or less educated drinkers and it seems to me that what we're going through today is something entirely different and one would hope, as time progresses, that people would come to their senses and particularly the young people. How often do we read in the paper these days where our chief offenders today in crime, rape, purse snatching, abusing old people and so on and so forth, is done by youngsters from 18 to 21 up to 25. I wonder here again, Mr. Speaker, how much liquor takes part — liquor and drugs — and causes situations that people now in the City of Winnipeg are afraid to go out after dark.

Enforce the law by all means, Mr. Speaker, but let us find some way, somehow, in a reasonable, sensible way, by law if we have to, find a way to persuade people to accept these privileges of life, accept them sensibly and all would be well.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I was about to move adjournment unless somebody else wants to speak.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for St. Johns. Would he use another seconder since the Honourable Member for Flin Flon spoke?

MR. CHERNIACK: Spoke? Well, who didn't speak? The Honourable Member for Radisson. .

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 24, the Honourable Member for Morris. (Stand)

Bill No. 37, the Honourable Member for Morris. (Stand)

Bill No. 55, the Honourable Member for Logan. (Stand)

BILL (NO. 58) — AN ACT FOR THE RELIEF OF PETER MARTENS.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson) presented Bill No. 58, An Act for the Relief of Peter

Martens for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply one that does appear occasionally in the House; one in which it is to extend the statute of limitations dealing with an accident that took place in 1974, Mr. Martens was under the doctor's care for a number of months and was advised sometime last January — it's either 1974 or 1975 — and it was a period of Statute of Limitations it was actually in the 1976 he was told in January that his period of limitation was going to expire. He was told by the employees of Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation but, being human, he just did not really understand what the implications were. It was in his mind that as long as he was getting treatment from a doctor, that somehow — people advised him it wasn't the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation — but other individuals advised him that, you know, there is no need to worry. So he did not proceed to try to make a settlement. The period of Statute of Limitations had expired and then he was faced with the decision of taking the offer that was made by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation which, by the way, still stands open for him to accept. He chose not to accept it and wants to proceed by way of having this period of limitation extended so that he can go to the courts and he hopes to get redress in that fashion. He feels he is not satisfied with the offer that was made by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. This is why the introduction of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Rhineland, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Since we have now finished all of the public and private bills under Private Members' Hour, it is too late to go into Resolutions. I will call it 5:30 and return to the Chair at 8 p.m.