

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 21, 1974.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the Gallery where we have as our special guests the Selkirk Steelers Hockey Club, Winners of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association Tier Two, Junior "A" Hockey Championship. This club represented Manitoba and are the champions of Canada.

This Club comes from the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, the Attorney-General.

We also have 60 students of Grade 11 standing of the Daniel McIntyre School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Rohs. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington. On behalf of all the Honourable Members I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable House Leader.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources & Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Committee on Agriculture wishes to reconvene at 3.00 p.m. this afternoon and it requires the unanimous consent of the House that this be done, I take it that it's to accommodate a group that is in town only for today and is making representations. I take it the Committee . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House agreed? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I am not rising to object to the proposal but I think that there should be an explanation made. We are on Concurrence in Agriculture and I wonder if in light of that fact that we could postpone the debate on concurrence and go on to other departments until the committee is through. And secondly, I think we should have the understanding that the committee would meet only to complete hearing of the briefs and not consider clause by clause of the bills before it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's agreeable and if we reach Concurrences before the Committee is finished, then we will certainly go into the next department.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed by the House that the Committee meet? The Honourable Minister for Tourism and Recreation.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make. I have copies for members of the Opposition. As acknowledged by yourself Mr. Speaker and by all members of the House, we have in the centre gallery a group of individuals who have achieved the ultimate in Tier Two Junior "A" competition of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association in 1974 - the winning of the Canadian Championships.

Before this past hockey season started, this team was unanimously picked for the last place in the North Division of the Manitoba Junior Hockey League. Since that prediction the Selkirk Steelers Hockey Club has reached the following goals in their championship quest:

1) Dauphin Kings Trophy - for finishing in first place in the North Division of the Manitoba Junior Hockey League.

2) Ollie Turnbull Trophy - for winning the Manitoba Junior Hockey League Championship and it is interesting to note that the present coach of the Selkirk Team, George Dorman, in winning this trophy beat the West Kildonan North Stars, the team he coached last year.

3) A trophy yet to be named - for winning their Western Canadian semi-final series against the Prince Albert Raiders from Saskatchewan.

4) The Abbott Cup - for winning the Western Canada Junior Hockey Championship against the Kelowna Buckaroos from British Columbia.

This cup was established in 1919 and the last time Selkirk won the Western Championship was back in 1920.

In winning the Abbott Cup, the Kelowna Coach, at one point in the series, referred to the Steelers as the "Selkirk Prairie Chickens". To this Coach Dorman replied, "Show me an

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) apple farmer that's tougher than a dirt farmer."

5) Centennial Cup - for winning the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association Tier Two Junior "A" Hockey Championship.

This victory against Smith Falls, Ontario was climaxed in the seventh game at 7:09 of the first overtime period with a goal by Gord Kaluzniak to give Selkirk a 1 - 0 victory.

The Selkirk Steelers road to victory was indeed similar to the story of Cinderella with a difference. Towards the end they were being likened to another championship team, the Philadelphia Flyers, now our North American professional champions. The Steelers have no one star to depend on, and throughout the year, however, they played a rough and tough brand of hockey and had the depth that is necessary for any team to win a championship. At times during the year they lacked ice time but when it was available they worked long and hard and at one point in the season, won 17 league games in a row.

Besides winning all of their championships away from home, after winning the first game of each and every series, this is the first time in the history of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association that a Junior "A" hockey club has ever won the Canadian Championship away from home.

It is only fitting Mr. Speaker and colleagues of the House, that with their presence in the Legislature this afternoon the Province of Manitoba acknowledges and congratulates the entire Selkirk Steelers Hockey Club on the tremendous victory in the Centennial Cup. This province can also be proud in the fact that this is the second year in a row that a Manitoba team has won this coveted trophy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I thank you, and I'd like to express the sentiments of the Progressive Conservative Caucus with regard to this very fine hockey team who are in our gallery today; the example that they have set across our great country as sportsmen and athletes of course is well in the record books and is one of which we are all very proud.

It also reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that Manitoba has two years in a row took the Centennial Cup, that we are getting back into the position that Manitoba enjoyed in the hockeys in the years past when the St. Boniface Seals and the Portage Terriers and the Winnipeg Monarchs were considered to be the prime junior hockey teams of those days and their record is in the books, so, again, we are very proud of these boys, these athletes, and we wish them every success for the future. Hockey's got a great future today and I'm sure some of those boys that are sitting up there will likely end up close to millionaires in a few years. We wish them well.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I join with the other parties in the House in giving our congratulations to the Selkirk Steelers for their great efforts in the past season. But, Mr. Speaker, I wonder who helped draft the statement that the Minister read, because it says in the statement that it was generally predicted that Selkirk would finish last this year. Well I never ever did believe that, in all the years I was associated with the Portage Terriers, that there's no way a Selkirk Team has ever lasted a league all the time that I was associated with it. So I do say on behalf of the Liberal Group here that, for the second year in a row we're proud of our Manitoba Hockey Teams in the Junior "A" category and we hope next year that either Dauphin Kings or one of the four Winnipeg Teams will take it all. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or tabling of reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. GREEN: Introduced (by leave) Bill No. 72 an Act to amend the Clean Environment Act.

MR. TURNBULL introduced Bill No. 67, An Act to amend the Public Printing Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

HON. RON. McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs)(The Pas) introduced Bill No. 75, The Northern Affairs Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

MR. TOUPIN introduced Bill No. 76, The Heritage Manitoba Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. STEVE DEREWIANCHUK (Emerson) introduced Bill No. 68, An Act to amend The Law Society Act (2).

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns) introduced Bill No. 77 The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act (1974). (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor).

MR. SPEAKER: Questions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister and as well in his capacity as Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if he can indicate whether it's government policy to finance or to provide assistance to the City of Winnipeg towards the installation of a proper storm sewer system for the city?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier and Minister of Urban Affairs)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, the installation of storm sewage capacity is something which is determined by the City in the light of its over-all sewer and water service requirements. There is legislation on the books now, both federal and provincial, to assist municipalities in terms of the installation of sewer and water services, expansion thereof, and this is a matter therefore which comes forward from the appropriate municipal authority.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether in the discussions with the City of Winnipeg with respect to the opportunities for participation in growth tax, representation was made by the City to the Province of the necessity of some new assistance to provide for the development of a proper storm sewer system in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the matter of storm sewage capacity was something which has not been brought forward by the city or any other municipal authority in our discussions to date.

MR. SPIVAK: By way really of a supplementary to that question. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether in the discussions with the City dealing with the opportunity for them to participate in a growth tax representation was not made to the province that requirements for capital spending particularly with reference to storm sewer was necessary and had to be contemplated and undertaken by the City of Winnipeg and by the people of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in discussions having to do with the adequacy or inadequacy of municipal tax base arguments were put forward by municipal authorities as to the extent to which they anticipated to incur expenditures for capital works in the future; which include sewer and water service; which included streets, included bridges, overpasses and the like. There was no specific singling out of storm sewer capacity as such.

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

MR. I. H. (IZZY) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister as Minister for Urban Affairs. Does the province intend to make any offer of compensation to the residents of the City of Winnipeg who suffered what appears to be several millions of dollars of flood damage over the weekend from sewage back-up?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that there has been some damage caused by torrential rainfall. Certainly I have no intention of replying to a question such as that in advance of any indication of intent or desire by the City or any other municipal-ity in that respect.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Can he indicate on what basis residents of rural Manitoba will be compensated for Red River Flood damage to their property, but people in Winnipeg who have just suffered damage apparently don't come under the same flood compensation legislation?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that an examination of the records will show that in the past there has been from time to time compensation paid by senior governments, federal and provincial, towards those communities and farmyards, towns, villages, that have suffered flood damage as a result of spring runoff flooding. There has also been in

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) the past from time to time occasional damage caused by torrential downpours and I don't believe that the records show that there's any program specifically designed for that purpose. It is a case of ascertaining whether the federal offer on disaster damage financing, repair financing, precludes or does not preclude the cost that might be incurred in torrential rainfall, other than during spring flood periods.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Would the government then undertake to hold discussions with the insurance industry in Manitoba with a view to attempting to persuade the industry that the --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ASPER: . . . with a view to attempting to persuade or otherwise convince the industry that the necessity for excluding basement flood damage from most home insurance policies no longer is relevant in view of the establishment by the Government of Manitoba of the Red River Floodway.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the last part of the question seems to imply a legal opinion and I would not want to comment on that. Certainly we can ascertain just what the law of insurance contract is in respect of damage caused by torrential downpour, and we can do that. We can also ascertain what attitude, if any, the Government of Canada has with respect to the shared federal-provincial flood cost damage compensation program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the First Minister then, if they're considering the whole of the Province of Manitoba and not just the Red River Valley, the whole of the Province of Manitoba is now flooded and many millions of acres will not be seeded this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the matter of flood damage compensation is not restricted to the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. It applies to any waterway that is designated in accordance with local reports and direct observation as having been a flood damaged drainage area. So in addition to the Red and Assiniboine Rivers there are quite a number of rivers and drainage basins in Manitoba that are designated and therefore eligible for federal-provincial compensation.

If my honourable friend now is talking about flooded arable land which at the moment is flooded or far too wet for commencement of seeding, I would simply have to indicate to him that while the outlook is not all that promising with respect to the prospects of seeding wheat that nevertheless with respect to barley and oats as my honourable friend well knows there are still - oh, two, three weeks in which it would be premature to answer the question.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question then. Could I ask the Minister if this weather is going to continue and if it will be possible to seed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources and Environmental Management. My question is simply this: has he any information that could support the belief that perhaps if the Greater Winnipeg Floodway had been in full operation during this particular period of time that there might have been some relief to the storm sewer system? In other words, the suggestion is made that the floodway not operating to capacity, perhaps the gates were closed prematurely in the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the floodgates were operating. I can't give the honourable member the actual times at this moment, but I know that the floodgates stopped operating I believe it was on Saturday morning and then were put into operation again on Sunday and that they were in full operation at the time of yesterday's torrential rainfall; and my understanding is that the water level of the Red River would have been some two feet higher had it not been for the operation of the Red River Floodway during that period. But during the period of yesterday's rainfall they were definitely in operation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. I think the obvious question is, would the water level of the Red River have been two or three feet lower had there not been any interruption of the operation of the Floodway?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is hypothetical.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the honourable member that the Floodway is

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) operated in accordance with, as he knows, schemes which are partly based on judgment, and the judgment was to set the Floodway into operation when it became apparent that the - I believe it was after Saturday night's storm. I'll have to get more precise information for my honourable friend, but my information is that the Floodway was operative in such a way as to have dealt with certainly last night's storm. I don't think it would have made any difference, it was the capacity of the sewer system etc. which caused the flooding in the basements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. In view of the increased gasoline prices this past weekend, can he indicate why the government has not moved yet to bring in its subsidization program of three to four or five cents that was announced some time ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know that there is a definitive answer to my honourable friend's question. The matter of the pricing of gasoline and diesel fuel has been announced by two of the major companies at 9.2 cents per gallon in the case of the Imperial Oil and 8.8 cents in the case of Shell. That accounts then for the price adjustment up to and including the wholesale level, it does not cover any price changes that might take place at the retail level. There is some necessity I would suggest before we make any definitive announcement as to amount of subsidy or cushioning to as much as possible ascertain what the end price, the retail price pattern is likely to be. At the moment that is not yet adequately ascertainable.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether the increased royalties are at this point accruing to the province from the increase in prices at the field level?

MR. SCHREYER: Well no, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources has legislation in draft that will be brought here very soon and in any case the total amount that is to be collected from the increment in value of crude oil will be dedicated for the purpose which we've already outlined in general.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the price subsidization has taken place in the provinces to the west of us at this point, can the Minister indicate any particular time when we might expect some degree of relief from the ten cent a gallon increase in gasoline price here?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, one can look west, one can look east, the fact of the matter is that Manitoba's oil field production is a given amount and if one calculates the amount of revenue that can be obtained by means of applying a different rate of royalty to the increment in value of that oil, and dedicate that aggregate amount towards the cost of cushioning the price of oil to - that is to say, gasoline, diesel fuel to the consumer, that is the policy which has been already announced in outline form. As to when that will take effect, it will take effect some time soon; whether it be 30 days or 45 days, I'm not in a position to indicate at this particular precise time.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Attorney-General. I was wondering if the Attorney-General had a lapse in memory, or whether he intended to answer in the question period when he promised the other day to bring forward a statement on the liquor policy of this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there was no lapse in memory. I have a statement in front of me dealing with changes in liquor policy in Manitoba, administration really than policy in itself. This is pursuant to the question from the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie.

First, in respect to the delisting of fortified wines, in that regard I wish to indicate to the House that on the basis of the experiment of the past six months, the delisting of low priced high alcohol content wines is being extended across the province, and this extension will be effected immediately the Commission has been able to carry out the administrative mechanics; a major point in that during the six month pilot project the Commission discovered a 53 percent decrease in the consumption of pure alcohol wines in affected areas. Accordingly, the Commission records that there has occurred a definite switch to lower alcohol content wines in the area in question.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd)

Another consideration is that it is felt that many people have used high alcohol products due to traditionally low prices while natural wines that have been widely stated as the drink of moderation and more associated with family living but are more costly to produce and subsequently higher in cost, have not until the period of the past five years really become a factor in Manitoba life style.

Prices of wines will be altered. Past pricing factors for many years have contributed by placing emphasis on cost without consideration to alcohol content. This seeming disregard for alcohol content in pricing is now being altered by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission and the new pricing policy being introduced will contain a factor which places more emphasis on cost per ounce of alcohol. Prices of some 300 table wines or natural wines will come down 17 percent in Manitoba, but the minimum price per 26-ounce bottle will not be less than \$1.20 to the consumer. This will make these table or natural wines less expensive to the consumer than is presently the case.

Next, it is mentioned that several low priced brands of high alcohol content wine will be delisted; other brands of fortified wines will be affected by the new pricing structure so that the minimum retail price will be \$1.85 per 26-ounce bottle. Thirty brands prices will be increased with, as I have mentioned, the minimum retail price being \$1.85 per bottle. The Commission will list a product characteristic of sherry and port wines but with lesser alcohol content than the products presently being delisted. These would retail to the consumer at \$1.40 per 26 oz. bottle.

Further to the above changes the Commission has not as yet accepted recently received price increases from Canadian distilleries but it can be anticipated that there will be an increase to the consumer for Canadian spirits within the next two months. However, the Commission advises me that the few announced prices so far received seem exorbitantly high and the Commission is negotiating for a reduction in the proposed price increases from the distilleries.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, again I say to the Minister, did he have a lapse of memory in not making it as a ministerial statement so that we could then have the opportunity to reply?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell must have a lapse in memory because this matter rose as a result of a question that was directed towards myself by the Honourable Member from Portage, and it is customarily expected that those questions are answered during the question period.

MR. GRAHAM: A further supplementary. Did not the Minister promise the House that he would have a statement to make today?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is argumentative. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, may I make a statement of non-political nature?

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Well just to prove, Mr. Speaker, that Selkirk, Springfield, Portage la Prairie aren't the only centres involved in hockey, I'd like to let you know that the north have a strong involvement with our national game, and as we all know the Philadelphia Flyers won the Stanley Cup on Sunday afternoon. It's the first expansion team to win the Stanley Cup or even to come close. It proves that Orr, Esposito and other Bruins are just normal human beings that can be taken.

I'd like to mention that the leader and the Captain of the Flyers is a young man by the name of Bobby Clarke, he's a Flin Flon boy who worked his way up in the Flin Flon hockey chain against great odds, he suffers from sugar diabetes. Bobby has proved to be an inspiration not only to the youth of Flin Flon, not only to the youth of Manitoba but to all our Canadian youth. I hope you'll all join me in congratulating Captain Bobby Clarke and the Philadelphia Flyers. (Applause)

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

MR. J. PAUL MARION (St. Boniface): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Has the Minister or his colleague, the Minister of Public Works, evaluated the functional possibilities of the Winnipeg Public Safety Building with respect to the Central Magistrates Court facility he has been talking about, and

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. MARION cont'd) also with respect to the neutral custodial force, a report of which he received from the Law Reform Commission, I believe?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, certainly this is a matter that in principle the government has felt is in need of a change in that there ought to be a separation of facilities, judges from the courts from the remand and the police facilities. It is then only a question as to how this can be best realized in order to obtain our objectives. And we have to date preliminary information from the Department of Public Works which has been doing some evaluating of the proposals, which I might mention have not come by way of any formal communication from the city but only by a reference by Councillor Steen. The preliminary information questions the wisdom at this point of accepting any such proposal from the city. 1. It is pointed out that the renovation costs may be as great as they would be involved in the erection of a new building. 2. There is questions raised at to the parking difficulties and problems that might be inherent with an acceptance of Councillor Steen's proposal.

So on the surface at the moment it does not appear to be a wise move based upon the information received from the Department of Public Works. Those inquiries are only in the preliminary stage however and there will be further investigations along that line.

MR. MARION: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. With respect to evaluating the costs of erecting a new facility and remodeling or refurbishing to fulfill the use of the Winnipeg Public Safety Building have there been any cost studies of any seriousness undertaken to guide the Minister in his decision on which facility should be used?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding there have been no detailed cost studies, that the Department of Public Works only has a basis from previous experience and upon the cost of renovations so there is no specific detailed study of the particular case at hand; and the information that they have is based on purely on their own experience from renovating such buildings.

MR. MARION: A final supplementary to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister keep under advisement the possibilities afforded the City of Winnipeg in building a new facility in the area to refurbish the general area if the province were to purchase that existing facility?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is hypothetical. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate, is it his intention to meet with the City of Winnipeg officials to discuss the flooding which has occurred during the past weekend with the possibility of consideration being given to technical and financial assistance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the city requests such a meeting we would of course want to be able to accommodate so as to meet with them in fact. Insofar as technical assistance is concerned, it's not my impression that the City Department of Works is feeling that it requires additional technical assistance although that may be, I've not been advised and so I do not assume that. And insofar as financial assistance is concerned as I've already indicated there is available to the city funds from the Special Municipal Loan Fund, labour cost of which is forgivable which the city can apply towards any desired public works that it wishes to carry out, I believe an amount that aggregates something in the order of 8 to \$ 8.2 million.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he could advise the House the reasons for the withholding of the renewal licenses for the A.I. technicians in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that they were withheld until the honourable member put his question to me a number of days ago, and that matter is being discussed internally at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister, it relates to the Air Canada Overhaul Base or the new Air Canada Overhaul Base for Winnipeg. I wonder in view of what appears to be a political controversy developing on this matter --(Interjection)-- Well

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) I wonder what appears to be a new political controversy developing then - whether the First Minister would not feel it incumbent at this time to call the Air Canada Air Policy Committee made up of representatives of all the community to be able to present a detailed report up-to-date of what has taken place and what likely will take place with respect to this matter in the next few weeks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been in communication both by direct conversation, telephone and by letter with the Prime Minister's office and with the offices of a number of Federal Ministers. We have sent to the Prime Minister's office some several weeks ago a resume of the events leading up to the present decision that has to be taken by the federal authorities with respect to the Air Canada Overhaul Base and frankly, Sir, I am uncertain as to whether or not any political action that is taken here will necessarily be productive, it could just as easily be counter productive. If the suggestion is that we should muster some large scale lobby then of course it is open to other contending cities to do the same thing. We believe that the case has been made and it is a case of a decision having to be taken. And I do not decry the efforts made by way of mustering together larger groups but that action is open to any city that wishes to counter propose.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister is in view of the fact that this committee has been in operation since, I think 1963 if I'm correct, and more or less has dealt with the government on this matter and has been informed by the government of what steps had taken place, would it not be in the interests of the government to see to it that this committee was reconvened and an opportunity given for presentation of information in connection with this matter simply because there is, I would think, a lack of information and confusion at this time as to what likely will occur?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't agree that there is a lack of information or confusion existing apart from the fact that a decision is required by the federal authorities and they have not as yet made a definitive decision in that respect. However I do not wish to leave the impression that we are opposed to the idea of convening the Air Policy Committee or an appropriate cross section thereof. I might advise my honourable friend that approximately ten days ago I was in communication with the Prime Minister indicating that we were prepared to convene a meeting of a group which could be described as the Air Policy Committee and that I would like to be advised as to the manner in which the Government of Canada would prefer to receive such a group or delegation and this therefore does not rule out the possibility that we can convene this group, although I have no means of assuring that in fact an audience with the appropriate federal authorities will be granted. That has been requested, we have not got a definitive reply as yet.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. To the First Minister. I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether the Provincial Government would be prepared to accept as one of the alternatives what has been referred to as a partial overhaul base which would not be an overhaul base but would only allow for servicing to a certain extent of the new airplanes to be purchased by Air Canada.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know that there is an answer possible to a question such as that, whether the province would be prepared to accept. The province has made its case as to why it feels that there is justification in expecting that the new air overhaul activity be carried out at the site of the Winnipeg International Airport or in very near proximity thereto, and now the decision has to be made by those who are charged with the responsibility for taking a decision such as that and I would not presume to put it in terms as to whether the province does or doesn't accept that.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It relates to the enthusiasm shown in the House in the last half hour for hockey in Manitoba. I wonder if the First Minister could report on what progress or steps are being taken to ensure that the Winnipeg Jets will be retained in Winnipeg. Has the government taken any steps, or in whose lap is the matter now resting?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I imagine it's resting in the lap from whence it originated, and if it interests my honourable friend I've asked for some indication from those who are most directly interested, for some indication as to where in Canada provincial

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) governments are financially involved with professional commercial sport and I am awaiting the answer.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, does the First Minister not consider that a precedent was established in this province, in Manitoba, when the race track was first formed by a loan from this government - or from the Government of Manitoba?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the circumstances surrounding the Assiniboia Downs' decision back in 1956 or 1957, whenever it was, and I would not take the time of the House to argue the appropriateness of the analogy that is attempted to be drawn between the paramutuals and the operation of horse racing with that of professional commercial team sport such as hockey or whatever.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs but I see he's left the Chamber due to business commitment no doubt. Maybe I could direct it to the acting Minister or the First Minister. Due to the many concerns from the Parkland region around Dauphin regarding the phase-out of the Parkland Regional Library, I wonder when the government would announce its new policy regarding this Parkland?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there is any definite commitment or approach to phase out the library on the part of the government or anybody else. I think that the question was asked some time ago if I'm not mistaken, by either the Honourable Member for Roblin or someone else, and I think at that time the Minister of Tourism and Cultural Affairs did give the answer to that question.

MR. McKENZIE: Well a supplementary question, then to the Honourable Minister. It's either a misunderstanding or my understanding was that a new policy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . and could I ask the Minister does it have to come by legislation or is there to be a policy change from the present Parkland Regional Development library system?

MR. BURTNIAK: No, I think, Mr. Chairman, in reply to that question, I think it's just a matter of time that a decision will be made by the government and the people have been told of this fact and I think that they are aware as to what action transpired or will take place in the future. I think I am quite safe in saying that there is no intention on the part of the government to withdraw that kind of a program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Resources. I wonder if in view of the statement by the U. S. Government General Accounting Office to have the Garrison project halted, or construction halted until a further accounting is provided resulting from the dispute with Canada, whether he can advise that this has at this point had any significant effect on our chances of having the project stalled?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't give my honourable friend an assessment of that. I believe I saw a statement reported in today's newspaper but I couldn't tell the honourable member the effect of it. All I can say is that if that is the position being taken by the United States State Department, it's consistent with our strategy to try to get that department to recognize the seriousness of the matter insofar as Manitoba is concerned.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a further question. I wonder if the Minister would undertake to provide the Legislature as soon as possible with the communication last week to the Canadian Government by the Secretary of State Office in the United States to the Provincial Government plus the one announced today of the General accounting office.

Furthermore, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether the Manitoba Government has considered the possibility of a Class Action Suit by Manitoba in the U. S. Courts on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Well Mr. Speaker, I'll try to deal with the two questions in order. The first one, will I undertake to give the information as soon as it becomes available? Yes. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we consider that the most effective way of proceeding is the way in which we have been proceeding.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could advise on the last question, whether or not the government has considered whether a government such as Manitoba can pursue a Class Action Suit in the U. S. Courts on the matter . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. It's a repetition. The question has been answered.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member asks me whether we have considered it, and I can tell him, Mr. Speaker, that we have considered many alternatives amongst which is the efficacy of the Courts to resolve this problem, and after giving consideration to all the alternatives, Mr. Speaker, we have decided to deal with the one which we consider to be the most effective, and that is the way in which we have proceeded.

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

MR. A. R. ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I just wanted to remind all the Members of the Standing Committee of Agriculture that we'll be reconvening immediately.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL NO. 55

MR. GREEN: Yes Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would proceed with the Bills that are on the Order Paper. Second Reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 55. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, if I could I would like to speak on this bill and have it stand in the honourable member's name.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable? The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I did not hear the First Minister's remarks when he introduced this bill, and I have not got the Hansard as yet that the remarks would be in, but I have questioned some of my colleagues on it, and his remarks were not too long apparently, but I would like to comment on the bill as I read it and the only thing that I can say, Mr. Speaker, is the government, the Provincial Government of Manitoba is legislating theft from the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, this bill puts into action one of the worst principles of Legislature that one could ever fathom, that's about the best explanation I could have. This bill is now saying to the City of Winnipeg that you cannot collect \$350,000 worth of taxes after you have provided all the public works, the water, the sewer, the fire inspection, the police inspection, clean the roads in front of the building, etc., and we now have back taxes on the Arts Centre of \$350,000, and this bill says in the last section, Mr. Speaker, that the City may not collect those back taxes.

It also says a little further up in the bill, Mr. Speaker, that if the building is ever used for anything other than an Arts Centre it refers back to the province, not the City --(Interjection)-- We've heard from the expert again, Mr. Speaker, from his seat. But, you know, here we have a situation where the government says the City cannot collect the back taxes; the City has had to provide all the services involved with this building, Mr. Speaker, but the City cannot collect the back taxes, and if the building is ever used for anything else it reverts back to the province. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's the closest thing to theft I've ever heard of in my life.

You know it was a wonderful thing, Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about who supplied the money, if there's an agreement between somebody, that's fine. If you want to talk about who supplied the money, the Centennial Centre, the Centennial Concern Hall is on Crown Lands. The Franco Society is on Crown Lands. There's a bill covering both of them by agreement; there's no bill covering the Art Centre. The Art Centre will now just refer (?) back to the province, if it's not used for anything else, after the City, after the City has given the services such as taxes, and the Honourable Member says, "who supplied the money?" Well I would say the people of Winnipeg supplied the money for the clearing of snow, for the fire inspectors, for the policemen that have been used to handle traffic in the area. I'd say that the City of Winnipeg has every right to consider.

If the province wants legislation like this, Mr. Speaker, why should they say in a section of this bill that the City cannot collect the back taxes? Why don't they say to the City, we will pay the back taxes and then we will pass legislation like this, or if necessary pass a bill for

BILL NO. 55

(MR. FRANK JOHNSTON cont'd). . . . the future, instead of saying to the City, "you must write off \$350,000 worth of taxes". Mr. Speaker, I can't really think why the province wants to do this, other than they want more control of everything.

Mr. Speaker, the member, the First Minister says the City agrees to it. Well, Mr. Speaker, did the City come up and make any agreement with the province? Did the City come up and say, we would like to negotiate this. Are we as legislators in this Chamber supposed to pass legislation stealing \$350,000 from the City of Winnipeg without knowing there was negotiation, without knowing whether the City initiated it, or who initiated it. You know, Mr. Speaker, this is just not quite according to Hoyle, as we say, after all. Now the other section, Mr. Speaker, says there'll be no grants in lieu of taxes either. That's fine, if you want to do that and put it in a bill the same as you have the Centennial Concert Hall, and the Franco Centre is already in a bill. The only effect that this bill really has on the Franco in section (c) of the Bill, the Franco Society, pardon me, Section 1 (a) of the bill, is really defining the boundaries, because there's already a bill concerning that building; but it again is on Crown land.

Mr. Speaker, then we have another little situation, which nobody seems to mention, maybe the City of Winnipeg did agree; we don't know that. I haven't been able to find that there was any meetings with the Councillors on that basis. If the City has agreed, wants to give up the taxes, I'm sure the City may say well, you know, if that's the case, we have \$350,000 owing and if the building's ever going to be used for anything else, we would like our money. Isn't it a wonderful thing to take the City Park off the City's hands, \$1,900,000 and then stick them with \$350,000 in this bill. That's a lot of help to the City of Winnipeg.

And the other area, Mr. Speaker, which I'm sure my colleague from Brandon will elaborate on, this bill is really designed to seem to being the Keystone Centre, under the involvement of this legislation. It reverts back to Bill 12 of last year where Bill 12 was brought in, or presented by somebody, to exempt the Keystone Centre from paying school taxes, and it was amended by this government so that there would be no taxes paid, and that bill didn't go through the House last year, Mr. Speaker. So now we have this little manipulation to bring the Keystone Centre in this, and the Keystone Centre has a written agreement with the Province - there are three owners of that building - under an agreement presented to the City of Brandon by the Province of Manitoba, which this bill will wipe out. Here again the City of Brandon will lose, will lose the taxes that are owing to the City of Brandon on the Keystone Centre. So, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a design first of all in the section, first part of the bill, it covers the Franco, which gives us the boundaries of that building also, but it is covered by S-40 of the Centennial's Act; there's another Centennial Act covering the Theatre Centre, giving us the boundaries; we now have the Keystone Centre boundaries put in and the Art Centre boundaries put in. Exemption of taxes - there will be no taxes charged. It will not be on the - it will be shown as a nil assessment, the Art Centre. There'll be no grants in lieu of taxes. Transfer of Title cannot be transferred unless it is approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. If the building is not used for what it is presently being used for, it reverts to the province, and the last part of it says "and any taxes that are owing to you, you cannot collect."

Mr. Speaker, I think that that's a dictatorial bill; and I think that the cities have the right to negotiate these kinds of things or initiate them. If the City wants to give a grant in lieu of taxes for the services they give - and every City gives services, Mr. Speaker, let's not kid ourselves about that. If you think police services, and fire inspection, and crowd control, is not some sort of reasonable . . . or charge that should be made upon a building, I say this government if they don't realize that that's a reasonable charge, they're wrong, and to just wipe it out and say the City will take the loss, not the government; in other words we have a government that says we will not take the loss, we will legislate that the City must take the loss, Mr. Speaker, I for one don't think that's fair legislation and, as I said at the beginning, it's almost theft from the City of Winnipeg. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The question will remain in the name of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

Bill No. 16. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Stand)

Bill No. 61. The Honourable Member for Riel. (Stand) Agreed. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, can we please proceed with Concurrences with the

(MR. GREEN cont'd) Attorney-General's Department? Department of the Attorney-General isn't it?

ATTORNEY-GENERAL - CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$16,682,400 for Attorney-General. Resolutions 20-27 separately and collectively. Pass. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Our critic to the Attorney-General's Department has gone out for a few minutes and I think because the Attorney-General wasn't in his place that he - so I think that it would be fitting now that we're talking to the Attorney-General's Department, and I see the Q. C. 's on the flow again. I thought possibly this afternoon if the Attorney-General was in his place, I could ask him if he could find an honorary Q. C. to give the Member for Birtle-Russell, who is a critic for the Conservative Party. But, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to hold up, ask the House Leader to hold up for a minute or two until our honorary Q. C. gets back. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Incidentally while we're waiting for the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, I am advised that because of flooding problems - I don't know whether this came from the Minister of Public Works or not - that the Queen's Printer is out of action and therefore Hansard will be delayed in its printing. I hope it doesn't inconvenience the Honourable Members too much. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, things are moving rather fast in this Chamber and we're into Concurrence on the Attorney-General's Department at a time when just a few minutes ago really, the Attorney-General announced a statement on the policy that is going to apply on the Liquor Control Commission. We did not get a copy of it. I've just been handed a copy of it now and I haven't had a chance to read it yet. I hope that some other members will be reading it, and will be able to make some comments on it. But I think it's rather significant, significant in two or three respects, Sir, in that while the heading of the release says that it is the Attorney-General's statement, it is my suspicion, Sir, that it is really the statement of the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission.

I don't believe that the Attorney-General has provided the leadership that is necessary. On Friday, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Minister of Finance, I was referring to the First Minister; and I think that it's only appropriate that maybe we should expand the field and take a look at one or two of the other departments too, Sir, and in a manner of being consistent Sir, I think that the leadership of the Attorney-General is sadly lacking in this department too. We realize that he is fairly new to the department, and the fact that he is now a Q. C. may have gone to his head a bit, but, Sir, there is in my opinion a definite lack of leadership in the operation of the Liquor Control Commission.

There is also, Sir, in my estimation a great lack of input into the field of alcohol education and rehabilitation. This department is probably raising the equivalent of two cents sales tax - I'm just guessing at that. I hope the Minister of Finance could maybe, when he's finished his comments with the Member for Flin Flon, maybe verify that statement. Now I'll repeat it again for the Minister of Finance. I would suggest that the revenue from the Liquor Control Commission is roughly equal to two cents on the sales tax. Is that a fairly close approximation? Would it be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member address his remarks to the Chair.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Sir, I apologize. Through you to the Minister of Finance, Sir, I would like to know just how much it does raise in comparison to the sales tax, and I would think that it is about one and a half to two cents. But maybe the Minister of Finance can give me the actual figures, but the main point is that it is a very significant amount of revenue. And the problems that are caused in the Province of Manitoba by the sale of alcohol, the problems that are personal problems for many Manitobans, that because of the policies of the Liquor Control Commission I think the remedies must become a responsibility of the government; and we don't find that the revenue --(Interjection)-- I have just received the answer from the Minister of Finance, Sir, that it's one and two-thirds. The liquor revenue is equal to about one and two-thirds cents of sales tax in the province, so we realize how significant the revenue is.

But the contribution that is made by the province to the field of alcohol education and rehabilitation has to be greatly expanded. I was hoping that the Member for Winnipeg Centre

CONCURRENCE

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) would be in the Chamber, Sir, because he has a very responsible position in that respect, and all I can do is wish him every success with the limited supply of funds that the province is giving him. I would sincerely hope that the contributions made will be greatly expanded in the very near future. Sir, we have seen the work that has been done by some of these groups. Groups of people, Sir, who are dedicated, that work far beyond their normal capacity in their effort to improve the lot of their fellow-man.

I would hope that before too long that this government will bring forward a legislative committee once again to study the entire operation of the Liquor Control Commission. We have had detailed studies made in the past but, Sir, I think that perhaps it's time the politician became involved in those studies. I would hope that the legislative committee embracing all parties in the Chamber will have the opportunity before too long to look at the problems of alcoholism in the Province of Manitoba; and also to look at the operation of the Liquor Control Commission and the great freedom that that Commission has had in its operation, freedom that I think extends beyond that of the legislation establishing it originally intended. I believe that it should be responsible to the Legislature. I believe that the policies and the operation of the Liquor Control Commission should be directly controlled by the Legislature. We have seen far too much freedom in that operation up till now.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that before we get through concurrence that there will be other members who have had an opportunity to examine the statement of the Attorney-General on this important issue. So that we should have a debate right at this time on the course that is being proposed, and unfortunately we have had very little time to study the statement of the Minister when he gave it only less than an hour ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, as you know, this is the last opportunity one might have to comment on the Attorney-General's estimates. I personally have no objection to the figure of sixteen million-odd. But one should retrace one's steps, and I feel that the points that I brought up when questioning the Minister during the handling of the estimates have certainly not been answered to my satisfaction and certainly not to the satisfaction of the people of northern Manitoba. And in particular I would refer to the jail conditions in The Pas. I know the Minister in recent months has endeavoured to improve actual living conditions in that particular situation, but I'm suggesting to him that it no way near meets the needs of the population throughout northern Manitoba. And I think I pointed out at the time that when people are awaiting trial or in custody awaiting trial, in many instances they have to be taken many hundreds of miles and held and brought back again, and then if they are convicted they're moved to jails or places of retention in southern Manitoba away from their families, and a great deal of hardship is created. And all I intended to expect from the Minister was that the government was seriously considering doing something with this situation, but the Minister did not give me the satisfaction, nor has he given the people of Northern Manitoba the satisfaction. Where the location of that particular jail may be I care not, so long as it is in the vicinity of the major settlements of people. And I believe the Minister must take this under serious consideration and move in that direction.

Another point I brought up at the time was that of native policemen, and there are many remote areas still without police protection. And here again I know the department has made an effort to train people for this work and I applaud them for it, but I don't think they're moving along fast enough to give the protection to the people that the people are asking for. And I particularly asked him for a resume as to whether or not crime was on the increase in the province, or on the decrease; certainly by an increase of 21 members of the RCMP from 490 to 511 suggests that crime is on the increase. And I feel the people of Manitoba should know, should know the facts of the matter, whether things are on the increase or on the decrease, and I believe the Minister is failing his duty by not answering that question in detail so that it can be properly published for public information.

And again, I spoke of the cost of the RCMP. In a community such as ours, and there are many around the province, I think it's terrible that the community has to put out something in the neighbourhood of \$65,000 for the protection, police protection of a community of 4,000 people. And I have seen of late whereby in the City of Toronto, they have put the men back on the beat and it has done a great deal toward reducing a lot of petty crime. And I believe that the Minister might use his good offices to pass that word down to the RCMP, because I see no

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BILTON cont'd) reason in the world why the Town of Swan River and similar towns of that size, possibly a mile square, being patrolled in automobiles. I think a great deal could be accomplished by the men patrolling the main streets and becoming acquainted with the people and showing an attitude of co-operation, which they intend to do but they can't do it from sitting in the seat of a motor car driving up and down.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister well and I hope he will spend that \$16 million in such a way that next year he'll come reducing it by four million.

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

MR. MARION: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intend on being extremely brief with respect to my comments on the concurrence motion dealing with the Attorney-General's budget. I think that during the question period I was leading to an area that particularly interests me, and that is in consequence of some of the moves that the Minister intends to take which I feel are reasonable actions on his part. I think the report that was provided to him with respect to the neutral custodial force by the Manitoba Law Reform Commission is one that warrants his attention, and I'm pleased to see that he is going to be taking the measures that are necessary to implement such a report.

His comments on the report itself were favourable, and he used as an example in some of his acceptance of the report the Vaughan Street Detention Home and the way the neutral custodial force there operates, which makes a great deal of sense to me. I think that if this were the case in the Magistrates' Court area we would be alleviating what appears to exist in certain problems, although the Attorney-General points out that this has got to be a very minimal area of complaint by prisoners who feel that they are being unfairly treated or unfairly interrogated. I would trust that the Honourable Attorney-General would take under advisement the kind of situation that the City of Winnipeg will find itself in, should in essence both steps that the Minister intends on taking, the neutral custodial force and the central magistrate court facility - if he does take these steps, it would seem to me that the City of Winnipeg are going to end up with a building, that Public Safety Building I was referring to in the question period, that will not be of a great value to them. Twenty-five percent of the area of that building is set aside as a custodial area. A great sum of money was spent on those facilities, if I can refer to them as facilities, and it would seem to me that the moment the City of Winnipeg is no longer faced with the responsibility of being custodian to people waiting for trial then those facilities are totally obsolete and something will have to be done with them.

If because of investigations made by the Attorney-General, it is found that the purchase of that building is not a feasible step to take, then I would suppose that he will take under advisement the sort of situation that the City of Winnipeg finds itself in because it will then have facilities for which it has no use, facilities which are not old and which were extremely costly. It would seem to me that perhaps the City of Winnipeg --(Interjection)-- Costly. Costly. Not having been a boarder in those facilities, I would not know whether they are top flight accommodations or not, but we might arrange for the Minister of Finance to make a tour of them to judge for himself. I would suppose that the City of Winnipeg if they really do become obsolete will be --(Interjection)-- I just don't like those places, Mr. Minister - I would suppose that if we do take the steps that render this facility obsolete the Minister will then find himself in a position of having to certainly grant some kind of assistance to the City of Winnipeg, because after all the facilities were built when the rules of the game were such that they had to be provided. If the rules of the game are changed and a facility has not been completely written off and the provincial agency doesn't feel that it wants to carry on with these facilities, then I would think that any amount and large sums of money will have to be spent to make a total floor of that Public Safety Building utilizable. It would seem to me then that the Provincial Government will have a moral responsibility in providing the funds that are required. And I would expect that the Minister would use this kind of rationale as part of his soul searching when he decides whether or not the province is interested in purchasing that facility, thereby providing the City of Winnipeg an opportunity of rebuilding the kind of facility that it needs for its own functions in the immediate area of the City Hall. And this would act as a two-pronged sort of approach, it would provide the City of Winnipeg with an upgrading program at the same time in the area immediately adjoining City Hall.

I think that I'd also like to make a very brief comment, Mr. Speaker, on the legal services that the Minister now proposes to broaden. Here again I estimate that the Minister is pleased with the way legal aid services have functioned in the City of Winnipeg in the two

CONCURRENCE

(MR. MARION cont'd) areas that they operate and he is now willing to go further in this experiment. Or perhaps we shouldn't call it an experiment at this stage, it might now be an accepted program of the Government of Manitoba, and he is intending to bring the program to other Manitobans both in the Brandon and other sections of our province. It would seem to me that this has all the possibilities of a very good program, and I can't criticize the Minister for making that kind of decision. It would seem to me however that he should be cautioned that a continual kind of appraisal of legal aid services be carried out, because it is the kind of program that cannot respond to what it was originally designed to do, and I would expect that the Minister because he is now investing very considerable sums of money in that area would have this service under continual and continued appraisal as to its functioning.

Mr. Speaker, those were the only comments I wanted to make with respect to the concurrence motion, and I also wish the Attorney-General well in his new programs and I trust that he will spend judiciously the \$16.7 million that he is being granted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take the opportunity on the estimates to comment on the just distributed statement of the Attorney-General regarding a new pricing and listing policy for the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission.

Mr. Speaker, having just had it for the last few minutes and read through it, I find it an extremely curious document to decipher what sort of rationalization could have brought about the recommendations and decisions of the Manitoba Liquor Commission, and I think that the statement perhaps has some contradictions in it, or what are apparent contradictions at least. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that while the decision here basically is to extend the ban on some of the high alcohol content wines to not only the experimental area of northern Manitoba but to the entire province; secondly, to delist some brands and to change the price structure of those that remain. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is an admission in the announcement here. It says that while natural wines have been widely stated as the drink of moderation and more associated with family living, but are more to produce, have not until the period of the past five years really become a factor in the Manitoba life style.

The point I am trying to make is there seems to be an admission in here that wines - and I would assume that this might include fortified wines - have developed a place in the life style of Manitoba that is fairly much expected, although in contradiction to this of course there's another admission here in the statement that there is certainly an abuse of the wines, particularly of the fortified nature. But if the wines in general have developed a natural position in Manitoba's life style, is it not first of all much more logical simply to put a price structure on all of these so that they're not banned, they can still develop their place in the life style, however they're used as table wines or in a particular part of the eating process - not ban them from their use, but simply make them a luxury. I'm sure that the reason that there is a problem with fortified wines, is that they're the cheapest source of booze or a drunk, the cheapest source of a drunk that there is on the shelf, and that if you remove that cheap source simply by making it a more expensive source in line with the whiskies and beers and regular wines, does this not over the long term solve the problem? So, Mr. Speaker, unless I am deadly wrong and there is evidence that has been produced that I'm not aware of or that hasn't been provided to the Legislature or to the general public, is there evidence in other parts of Canada that the problem can't be solved simply by removing fortified wines as a cheap source of a drunk? In other words, can the problem not be solved of the run on fortified wines by simply upping the price to the point where the amount of alcohol you get for a dollar is about equivalent to what you get with other forms?

So it's difficult to rationalize, Mr. Speaker, reading this statement, why the government would decide to ban the wines across the province. It seems to be based on the fact that in the experimental area that there was a marked improvement in the experimental area, but it doesn't seem to provide any proof that the marked improvement might not have occurred had they simply upped the price significantly. We're not quarreling with the right of the government to change the price structure, in fact we're endorsing it as a lever to influence drinking habits, but I don't think that the rationalization is complete here.

So, Mr. Speaker, I raise this as a - I think a major issue because the government is introducing a form of prohibition to control a problem rather than introduce an economic lever which might do it as well over a given period of time. As a matter of fact the Member for St. James here has referred to just in reading it as a form of staged prohibition, and I think

CONCURRENCE

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) probably that presents the case as accurately as possible. And our contention in reading it over this short period of time, just the period we've had to look at it and listen to what's happened over the course of the last few months, is that first of all, can the government - has it convinced itself that the economic lever of price structure alone cannot remove the fortified wines and those that are causing the trouble? Can it not be controlled by pricing them so that the abuses can't take place, but leaving them on the shelf for those people in Manitoba's life style they refer to here that may want them for a particular reason. I assume they're not talking about a communal wine here. But there certainly must be applications of fortified wines, say in restaurants and other particular eating habits people have required through the development of this life style referred to, where it's really a de-pravation to remove that; they're not abusing it, they're probably prepared to pay the price of having the fortified wine - or whenever you drink a sherry, I'm not a good enough epicurean of these matters or whatever you call it to tell you exactly when you should drink a fortified sherry, but it comes either before or after the major part of the meal, which I assume they are referring to here.

Now these are going to be removed from the shelf. --(Interjection)-- Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if he'd care to elucidate a little on the advantage of controlling the quantity of usage of wines by fixing the price, which would seem to relate to the person's ability to pay a price rather than to other factors in suggesting a cheap wine should cost a lot more as compared to, let's say, a hard liquor which also costs more.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I'm not sure I got the question exactly clear, Mr. Speaker. But first of all I'm not advocating, and I don't think this is advocating increasing the cheap wines, the regular wines, but the fortified wines which I assume are sherries and ports and so on. Then I would think that primarily the people who want to use those, and some of those I presume are included in the ban, that the people that want to use them use them in sufficient moderation that price is really not a real factor in their use. But, Mr. Speaker, if we're wrong we stand to be corrected, but the important point we want to make here, trying to make, is that people are being deprived of something here by law simply because it's not available rather than the economic deterrent that would be put on by increasing the price. And we're saying that the deterrent would be sufficient - was increase of price alone to prevent or change this problem of the people, primarily the native people who have been abusing this evidently, because you introduced it in areas where there's a high native population, they've been able to get fairly cheap alcohol by buying these fortified wines. But we're simply saying that price very likely is an economic deterrent that is going to either shift them and in all likelihood will reduce the amount of alcohol consumption, and we think that before you start banning you should try and prove out this instrument. In fact we endorse the fact that you do have the right to change the price structure to control abuses in alcohol. We think it's an effective lever to do this and we would endorse it, but we certainly find great difficulty in accepting the conclusion here that you should ban certain grades and certain brands basic on alcohol content as a means of controlling the problem. We're quite surprised to find you come to this conclusion and find it of course most difficult now to accept the fact that you have done this. We do think it is some form of prohibition that can't be successful, that the balances that you are trying to achieve you seem somehow - I would gather from the Minister of Finance's statement to say that you would be segregating on economic grounds if you followed it. I think the suggestion is there that you feel you'd be segregating these people on economic grounds but I don't think you would, because they'll shift - if they really want to, they'll shift to other areas, and if a particular problem arises here, that you shouldn't deprive the right of people to get this if they can get it elsewhere, other provinces, to be able to buy it here, that they shouldn't be deprived of it simply because a particular group of people are abusing it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit another question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question of clarification, not further debate.

MR. CHERNIACK: Clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. CHERNIACK: That's fine. Does the honourable member not accept the fact that there are expensive fortified wines that have been on sale at the Liquor Commissions for years

CONCURRENCE

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) and that there are such expensive wines, fortified wines that are still available and I assume will continue to be available, but they're of a much higher quality, is that not so?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly they wouldn't be the ones that would be being abused, so presumably they'll remain on the shelf. We don't know what is going to remain on the shelf because you haven't told us, but you have told us that some brands are going to be removed from the shelf, presumably they're in the price spectrum and the high alcohol content spectrum that makes them desirable for the purposes of abuse, but you're now forcing people that bought that group of wines for table use, you're forcing - well, you're depriving them of it; whereas you could have probably still allowed it by just changing the price structure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I only want to make one comment, and I hope the Honourable Minister would answer to my problem - or to our problem - and that's vandalism in the Flin Flon area. We had a panel discussion on this some few months ago, and conditions are bad. Two weeks ago the Minister of Commerce and I attended a Chamber of Commerce meeting, and that was the outstanding beefs they had. And they gave some examples of two young men after closing time deliberately causing \$2,600 worth of glass damage. Another case of a girl frustrated for some reason smashing out three windows on Main Street. One of the weapons, Mr. Speaker, is using beer bottles to throw through plate glass windows. It's ironic, but Mayor Goetz makes a habit of picking up any loose beer bottles on the street so they won't be used to cause destruction. He's picked up eight in one day, eight beer bottles. The Chicken Villa run by a friend of mine won't stay open after the beer parlor closes. The profit he makes isn't worth the chance of destruction that can be created through young hoodlums. The Northern Cafe, a Chinese restaurant, taken over by these young gentlemen, forced to go out of business because decent people wouldn't go in this type of restaurant, they couldn't put up with it. So he's out of business.

And what happens, Mr. Speaker? The RCMP do a good job. They catch them; they bring them up in court and they're remanded. They come from a poor environment and nothing happens. But what does happen, the police become very frustrated and sooner or later I'd assume they wouldn't even bother picking up this type of law breaker. I believe quite sincerely in doing your thing, but when this thing interferes with other people then, Mr. Speaker, someone has to step in. All I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, is for the Honourable Minister to step into this and make it a little tougher for these young punks taking over the Town of Flin Flon. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MINAKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, like my colleague, the Honourable Member from Riel, would like to make a few comments at this time after having a brief opportunity to look at the Attorney-General's statement with regards to the policy of pricing of liquor in the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission stores. And I am somewhat disturbed in that my initial reaction in listening to the Attorney-General's statement is that we are on the road to staged prohibition in our province. It started back some six months ago in the north, that a decision was made at that time; we didn't know whether it was the policy of the administrator, the Commission Chairman, or whether it was the policy of the Attorney-General and the government that such a prohibition would take place. And we never really did get a precise answer to that question.

Now we have before us a statement that in effect immediately there will be a ban of certain types of wines in our liquor stores for the province as a whole. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the problem doesn't lie in the fact that this alcohol is available to our people; I don't see how you can legislate against alcoholism, and it would appear that the government is attempting to do this by restricting the availability. And I'm not an expert on alcoholism, but I have talked to people who have had the misfortune to experience such and also to be involved with people that work in that particular field, and they have all indicated that prohibition isn't the answer to the problem, that really it's a rehabilitation problem that we have and an educating problem. And I have to commend the government to some degree that they have had an education type of program in advertisements, etc. in this regards to try and educate the drinker and we hope that there will be more of this.

But I do not believe that by censorship really that is what we have before us, Mr. Speaker, that all of a sudden the government has decided that our people who live in Manitoba

CONCURRENCE

(MR. MINAKER cont'd) cannot have a certain, particular item because they feel that they can eliminate problems by taking it off the market. I am against censorship in that type, or method. I believe that the individual should be well informed of what consequences, or what he is about to see if it's a movie, or what he is about to drink if it's a drink, that he be well aware of the consequences, or what he might experience if he should enter a show or have a drink, and give him the right to refuse if he so desires. But to turn around in our society today and say that you can't have it because you live in Manitoba, but if you happen to live out at St. Laurent and you walk across the border three or four miles, or St. Lazare, that you can legally have it in this location. Really, what we are saying to our citizens that do enjoy possibly this type of fortified wine, that you can't have it any more; you're not allowed to have it if you live in Manitoba because we have a problem in certain parts of our society. Really that is not the answer in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, because it still goes back to educating the drinker, and also the rehabilitation of those particular drinkers who have a problem and have a sickness, and by prohibition or censorship you will not achieve this, and really, all I can see is that we will probably influence to some degree the breaking of law by having people bring in the particular brand they may like to drink across the border and one could suggest, it's not as extreme as what has happened, or in this policy, that those people who like to drink sherry or port - and I have found myself, I think last year I bought two bottles of sherry, and the prime reason for buying it was at Christmas time because we would have the odd person who dropped over, I might say senior in age, who preferred a small drink of sherry, and now I would presume that that will no longer be made available to these people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MINAKER: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the alternatives would be that we give people ID cards and they might be allowed one or two bottles of this fortified wine a year, if they got their card punched at the Liquor Commission. So that that is of a less censorship than what we're looking at at the present time as a policy here.

I concur with the suggestion that we charge based on the cost per ounce of alcohol. I think that that would be somewhat of a deterrent that if this brand is available at a slightly higher cost, that the individual can choose and make his selection. I am not a wine connoisseur but I know that people drink wine, not necessarily how much it costs, but for the flavour and the aroma, and the general liking of having a glass of wine.

Because there are a certain percentage of our society, and there will always be a certain percentage of our society, who have what I have heard it described as, a sickness, that the majority of the population has to suffer, based on the decision of the government that they will remove a certain type of product from our shelves, yet they will in turn allow another product with the same particular chemical, or chemistry make-up, in it but of stronger concentration to stay on the shelf, then I say this is sort of a hypocritical approach to the problem, and if one is taking off a relatively low-cost item because it happens to have a higher concentration, isn't the answer because the people who are requiring this particular type of item or product, will get it in other sources, they'll either get it illegally, or they will harm their health by getting it in some other manner, and it all reflects back to the problem that it's one of rehabilitation.

For some reason our Commission feels it's great to pat itself on the back and say that we've liberalized drinking in Manitoba; we've made it available in the beverage room for the low income families and the young people, so that they can also have the same type of facility and services that they would normally have to pay for at a higher rate in the Liquor Lounges. So they brag about this in one statement, and then they turn around and pat themselves on the back for saying that compared to other provinces we're doing wonderfully well, based on license suspensions. For some reason they feel that they are going to overcome this problem of alcoholism by suspending licenses and closer guarding, and I compliment them for guarding and making sure that the laws are followed but what are we trying to prove? One one hand, we're trying to liberalize the laws and let more people drink, younger people drink, and when we have a problem with a certain percentage or certain person in our society, we, okay let's censor the whole thing on that particular source that we feel is a source of the problem. Yet in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that is not the source of the problem, it relates back to the individual person who decides he wants to drink, or may even be compelled to drink because of his sickness.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. MINAKER cont'd)

We have to educate the new and young drinker and the old drinker, and we also have to provide more of a rehabilitation type of service for the problem drinker that we have today, and the future problem drinker which we are going to have and we look at the revenue that comes from the Commission this year, we're looking at some \$42 million. I've tried to zero in on that amount of money that is put toward rehabilitation, and I would say it is probably less than a million dollars, yet we can take this revenue and use it for other sources, yet the actual revenue, or where we get this revenue from and the problems it creates for certain individuals, we can't find the money to pour back in and try and help these people out.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorely disappointed that the government has taken this approach to stage prohibition, or censorship, because I feel that will not give them the answer they're looking for. I would suggest that by increasing the price that they will get the same effect that they claim in their comment that the Commission has found a 53 percent decrease in consumption of pure alcohol. Well, it's only natural if they have to pay more money for a bottle that has less alcohol in it, that they will consume less alcohol. It's sort of half a dozen of one, six of another, whether you raise the price of 26 oz., or you take it off the market and make the individual drink 52 oz. in order to get the same alcoholic consumption, because if that individual needs that alcohol, or he thinks he needs that alcohol, in his system he will get it by consuming a greater volume. But the average individual who enjoys the fortified wine, or the low priced sherry, and they are, I imagine, some of our more senior citizens and our low income people, if they enjoy this type of particular drink, I'm sure that the majority of them don't drink bottles and bottles at one sitting but maybe a glass or two, and now what we're saying, or the government is saying, you no longer can have this privilege if you live in Manitoba because we think that is the cause of alcoholism in our province. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's not and that the government reviews its policy and takes a better attitude toward education and rehabilitation, where we believe the answer, or part of the answer, to solving this problem lies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I don't want to enter the debate on the specific points of alcohol and alcoholism at the moment. I think it's better covered under the Minister of Health and Social Development. But I wonder if the Attorney-General could perhaps take as notice and have someone in his department address themselves to a problem which I see arising in our society, and that's the proliferation of private police forces.

The problems which are creeping in I would suggest is best epitomized by the Province of Quebec where some of the figures show that the expenditures being made by the society for private police forces exceed the total provincial and City of Montreal budgets. We have before us an item for Concurrence of some 16 millions of dollars for law enforcement and the administration of justice within the province, and I would ask the Attorney-General if he could perhaps have someone address themselves to this problem.

Historically we have had such private police forces as the railway police, associated with the two main railways, and of course Pinkerton's, and other such organizations. But one of the things that is, I guess, that bothers me, is as a resident fundamentalist we can only have people in our society interfering with others by the sanction of law, and under the protection of law, and if you go back down to the fundamental of that, we get into the realm of habeas corpus, that a man has the right to walk free in our society without the interference of others, unless it is by sanction of law and done within the protection of law.

This of course is entering into the area referred to by the Member for St. James with reference to alcoholism as the province moves to provide facilities for people apprehended under the Intoxicated Persons Detention Act, that there will be people who are involved in holding people in custody; albeit by gentle persuasion, nevertheless I am apprehensive about some of the nuances of this. I think that the public should be aware that when we expend public moneys it is rather obvious; we have some \$16 million which is drawn to our attention, but nevertheless we lose sight of the fact that in such establishments as Hudsons Bay and Eaton's, and all the other department stores that set up surveillance systems, and quasi police forces, that these costs are rather difficult to isolate, but nevertheless they are costs which come out of the same pockets.

The Member for Swan River mentioned that we had to perhaps look at putting more

CONCURRENCE

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) moneys into the concept which seems to have gone by the Board in North America but is creeping back in that we have to put police protection back on the streets. Perhaps we should look at this total picture of what it is costing society and see if we can't redirect some of the dollars to move in the direction suggested by the Member from Swan River that some of the dollars directed to the prevention of crime and misbehaviour within the community, would be dollars well invested in the public interest. But I think to isolate this we have to be in possession of more knowledge than I personally have at the present time, as a member of this Legislature, and I would suggest that perhaps the Attorney-General's Department is the department that should perhaps come up with the information so that the members can be apprised of what is happening in the total police involvement in our community.

It is, of course, becoming more and more difficult to attract people to the police forces, because of public attitude in the past 10 years or so. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this attitude is changing, that the police are addressing themselves to their new role in society. The role of a policeman was well defined, oh I would suggest up to the middle 50s, but subsequent to the 50s, and especially during the 60s, and the sit-ins and the confrontations, and all the things that took place in our society, the lot of a policeman was truly an unhappy one because they knew not where they stood vis-a-vis the government, or the society itself.

But now it seems with the establishment of such things as police commissions and law reform commissions, the relationship between the two being that they are re-addressing themselves to what the role of a policeman is within the community as not only a law enforcement figure, which he became by and large from the 1950's, but a law prevention person in the community. I can only recall personally my experience in having grown up in the City of Winnipeg and being a mischievous Irishman perhaps, much of my learning was done as a result of the involvement with some of our Winnipeg's finest. I think of specifically a gentleman by the name of Inspector Montgomery, who I bumped into when I was a young lad, who was instrumental in helping me personally by the swift kick of a size 9 boot that sometimes a person should behave a little differently than I chose at that particular moment, but nevertheless through the years we developed a relationship that I learned a lot from, and I know many people in my particular generation relied on the old beat cop, as a member of the community.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in closing that I would ask the Attorney-General once more to perhaps have someone in his department gather together the information necessary that the members of the Assembly can see just exactly what the total cost of policing insofar as law enforcement in the community is costing us today.

. continued on next page

CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I was particularly interested in the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon because he made reference to a subject and a situation to which I have made reference myself, namely, the difficulty that the police have, and the courts have today, in dealing with certain types of offences, largely in the field of juvenile offences, and the degree to which the police themselves feel handicapped and worthless insofar as trying to enforce laws and behaviour in that area of the community is concerned. I want to ask the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker, whether he does not think that some of the difficulty lies in the provision under the Child Welfare Act for a review board which deals with decisions of the Family Court. I raised this question during the consideration of the honourable gentleman's estimates, and I am raising it again now on this Concurrence motion because I would be interested in his response to it, or at least his application to the question. Perhaps he's already looked into it; if he has, then I would appreciate his views and his comments on it.

I've had it suggested to me that one of the reasons why the courts, and the machinery of our courts and our police departments, find it difficult to deal effectively and definitively with the problem of juvenile offenders is that the Child Welfare Act makes it possible for a review board to sit in judgment on the decisions of the Family Court or Family Courts and to overturn those judgments. The incongruousness of the situation is further heightened by the fact that one of the members of the review board is supposed to be, I believe, a judge of the Family Court. So what happens is that you have one judge of the Family Court, with some colleagues, sitting in on the judgment of another judge of the Family Court, which seems to me to pose a rather incongruous situation. It looks at least on the surface like an inefficiency and an anomaly, and I would appreciate some explanation and some reasoning for that kind of procedure.

But basically whether or not there's a Family Court judge sitting in on a decision of another Family Court judge, the crux of the problem that I'm posing to the Attorney-General, and which I'm suggesting may be crucial in the whole process of dealing with juvenile offenders effectively, is this stipulation under the Child Welfare Act that sets up a review board and not only enables but indeed empowers that review board to sit in review and judgment of the decisions of the Family Court. What happens is that in many instances the decision of the Family Court, I am told, is overturned, remedial measures, or even punitive measures, prescribed by the Family Court to deal with specific offenders with whom the police are having trouble, such as those referred to by my honourable friend from Flin Flon, are oftentimes, I'm told, judged relatively arbitrarily by the review board and overturned and cancelled. As a consequence the work and the effort and the study that the Family Court has put into dealing with that particular offender is neutralized and emasculated and the offender often goes scot-free when he or she should have some kind of remedial action taken against them and imposed on them.

I'm told that the Family Court for the most part only sends juvenile offenders to detention homes after they have exhausted every other means of dealing with them. I can't vouch for that because I'm not a lawyer and I have no connection with the Family Court, but I'm told that it's the general rule that the court would only take a juvenile and incarcerate him or her in a detention home if the members of the court felt that all other avenues of dealing with that particular offender had been exhausted, that all other avenues had been frustrated and had met with failure, then they take the reluctant decision to send them for corrective confinement and training in many instances to detention homes. But they know why they're making that decision. They're making that decision on the basis of substantial investigation and substantial exposure to that particular problem.

The complaints that many members of the legal profession have voiced to me - or I'll modify that statement, Mr. Speaker, and say the complaints that some members of the legal profession have expressed to me, have to do with what they feel is the unfairness and the inequity of having a Family Court--excuse me - having a review board then come in to a situation, which to all intents and purposes is a new situation to them, come in cold, and make a judgment overruling, overturning, what the Family Court has been working on and studying and applying itself to. Further to that there is no appeal, as I understand it, from the decisions of the review board. If the Family Court decides that in the interests of society, in the interests of a community, in the interests of an individual, that individual should be directed to some corrective program or corrective institution and the review board comes along and turns that decision over, there is no appeal, as I understand it, from that review board, which in effect becomes a court of last resort.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

So I would welcome the Attorney-General's addressing himself to this particular situation which I think is an anomaly in our legal system, and I would appreciate his comments on the subject.

I know that in many cases when the review board interferes with a decision of the Family Court - and I use that term "interfere" advisedly - the new decision is made to send the offending party to a different institution than that prescribed by the Family Court. In several of those instances, in an appreciable number of those instances, I am told there are often difficulties for the officers, for the officials accompanying the offender who is being transferred to some kind of institution and escapes occur, and that results in all kinds of further difficulty for the police, for the institutional officers and for the residents of an area or a community themselves. The situation is not fictional and not isolated. I'm advised that these things do occur, and do occur largely because of a well-meaning and well-intentioned ignorance on the part of the review board, a well-meaning and well-intentioned unfamiliarity with the character and temperament of the offender, with his or her background, and with all the other aspects of the cases with which the Family Court is familiar. The review board all too often is not familiar with those circumstances, with that background, and they prescribe a different kind of institution, or a different kind of treatment or technique, or even a different kind of accompaniment in transfer to an institution, and it results in, as I say, escapes, difficulties, assaults, all kinds of problems that the Family Court foresaw and tried to head off in the first place.

In dealing with the subject first during the estimates of the Attorney-General, I suggested to him that it would be an interesting exercise for he and I and some of us to look into the number of decisions made by the Family Court that have been overruled by the review board in a given period of time in the past, let's say, during the past twelve months, and check and see what the result has been in terms of criminal activities by the juvenile offenders involved. I think that all of us would be interested in that kind of a comparison, and I think we might find some interesting statistics should we look at the number of cases overturned by the review board and the resulting criminal activities spawned by the decision.

I want to emphasize that I don't wish to be critical of the intentions of the review board, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that members of the review board are, as I've said, well-intentioned citizens who want to give the offender every break. The problem is that many of us in many situations want to bend over backwards and go beyond the point of reasonability in giving opportunities to people who don't want to meet the responsibilities of those opportunities and of society. The problem is that the Family Court looks at these things, deals with the case in toto, deals with the offender in toto, and prescribes a course of action that results from a total study of the situation, whereas the review board oftentimes comes into the situation not knowing all of the circumstances, and wishing to give the offender every opportunity, makes the mistake of going too far. In the beginning we all want to give the offender every opportunity; in the beginning the Family Court wants to give him or her every opportunity, but when those opportunities are exhausted, when the result has been frustration, and when the result has been a lack of appreciation for the opportunities given the offender with the resulting effect of more law-breaking and more difficulty for society, then the Family Court often comes down fairly hard and prescribes the kind of action, remedial and punitive, that it deems is warranted. This is the difficulty in the situation as I see it, Mr. Speaker, having acted on all the known facts of the case the Family Court is then subjected to the well-meaning intentions of an agency or an authority that all too often does not have access to all the facts of the case.

So I pose that question for the Attorney-General as to just how much difficulty in this whole area of offence, and particularly juvenile offence, could be contained and could be reduced by having a look at the review board and at its makeup and at its powers, having a look in fact at those sections of the Child Welfare Act which prescribe its existence, and perhaps introducing some new teeth in the legislation that if nothing else provide an avenue at least of appeal from a review board decision.

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the Concurrence motion to express an opinion and a few thoughts concerning the Manitoba Human Rights Commission. Before I do that I would like to deal with two matters that have been dealt with already in this House this afternoon, and to indicate a point of view that I think has to be expressed. One would deal with the Honourable

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) Member from Winnipeg Centre's remarks with respect to the problems of the private police force and generally the problems of law and order within the province.

Mr. Speaker, I would offer a suggestion to the government, which I think is a valid one because I think in discussing this matter we are entering into a debate in which the facts are really not known by the members of the government, and by the members of the Legislature. I think we've probably reached the point, Mr. Speaker, where there would be need, and the appropriate time I would think would be in between the sessions, this session and the next, for a legislative commission of inquiry to deal with the problems of law and order within this province, to deal with the problems that arise as a result of the private police forces being employed, and the symptom that that indicates of the problems with respect to policing in the urban areas of this province, the problems of the north, problems of the rural areas.

I think the Honourable Member from Fort Garry has dealt with the problem of rehabilitation and with sentencing, but involved in this is the whole question of penal reform, and it deals to a large extent with the problems of law and order; and the problems, Mr. Speaker, that face this problem with respect to a whole host of conditions and situations that must be altered if there is to be correction to some of the problems that exist in our society today. I think the need for a legislative inquiry is only, Mr. Speaker, to be in a position to indicate in sort of a definitive way the areas of concern and pinpoint the particular highlights of the areas of concern and the direction.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that if that was undertaken that someone like the head of the Winnipeg City Police Commission, including the Chief of Police, would be in a position to present before such a committee their views so that there could be some knowledge. We'd have the opportunity for those who have been involved in the rehabilitation field to present their views; we'd have the opportunity to be able to gain an insight and information, because, Mr. Speaker, I'm not satisfied from the presentation of the Attorney-General, from really the wasted years from the time of the White Paper on Corrections that was furnished by the government - and I say they are wasted years - that very much has been accomplished and that the government is really knowledgeable even of what the problems are, and I think that if anything we should fulfill the function that we have as legislators which is to recommend to government the actions to be undertaken recognizing that government will have to execute it. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would think that this would be a worthwhile activity and one which is borne out by the speeches that have been presented here today.

With respect to the Attorney-General's statement on liquor licencing policy. Mr. Speaker, I think it is well known and accepted that cigarettes that contain a high degree of nicotine can be, and have been, responsible for cancer, for lung cancer. This is I think understood, and it's agreed and accepted to be the fact. The government has regulatory power. In the case of the Liquor Commission they have monopoly power. But the government has always regulatory power to ban in the public interest the sale of anything that would be harmful to health, dangerous to the society. I have to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the actions that the government have undertaken, or appear to be undertaking, in connection with its use of its monopoly power, seem to be in direct contradiction in the principles that motivate them in this particular situation, with respect to its regulatory power ability, and I think that there is a contradiction that is pretty significant, and one which puts into question this particular action.

I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there isn't a problem, but I mean, I wonder whether the government has reached the point that it is now making the decisions for everyone, or whether they're going to allow the decisions to be made by others. If the government says that it's in the interests of the quality of life in Manitoba and in the interest of the individual for this to be banned, in other words to protect the individual from himself, then surely, Mr. Speaker, the government should be protecting the individual from being allowed to purchase cigarettes that will be without question harmful to health and will likely cause his death. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we don't have that regulatory power being exercised by the government, and I think this contradiction is there. I think the monopoly power that the government is exercising is the reason why the government doesn't use this in the same light as I have suggested. But I think that their responsibilities with the respect to the way in which they exercise that monopoly power has to follow in the same as they would deal with regulation of the purchase of cigarettes or the sale of cigarettes in Manitoba.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

I rose in this debate, Mr. Speaker, to speak on the Manitoba Human Right Commission and I'd like to, if I may, deal in the main with that and I would look forward to the response by the Attorney-General.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the Manitoba Human Rights Commission, we talk about something, or a Commission, or a body, that almost represents motherhood to every politician. Civil liberties are something that every politician is concerned about; the protection of rights exists in this Legislature, and in the House of Commons. The responsibility is ours to insure that there is political and civil liberty. But, Mr. Speaker, I think if we examine the history of the Human Rights Commission from the time of its creation in this Legislature, we would have to question at this point, not the intent, but we would have to question the result, and we would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are changes that must be introduced if the original concept that was responsible for the development of the Human Rights Commission is to be carried through.

In the report of progress of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission dated December 31, 1972, the first sentence states: "As a society evolves there is a constant effort on the part of its members to find ways to evaluate its progress." Mr. Speaker, I would apply that with respect to the Manitoba Human Rights Commission and say that as the Manitoba Human Rights Commission has evolved, there must be a constant effort on the part of the members of this Legislature to find ways to evaluate its progress. I don't think that that's been done, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact I would like to address myself to that because I believe that the time has come for some very fundamental changes to take place if we are going to carry out the original intent and purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the problems are simple. The Manitoba Human Rights Commission lacks a structure to allow it to operate effectively. In some cases, Mr. Speaker, members appear to have been appointed who have neither the interest nor the experience in Human Rights. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that an error was made in its creation in allowing the Commission to be both the investigatory body and the judicial body which would make the decision with respect to a complaint. I think, Mr. Speaker, this becomes one of the basic problems right from the very beginning, because the honourable members opposite when introducing this bill were not prepared to follow the example and the experience of Ontario but really initiated new ground; in the course of doing this have provided what is an impossible situation and that is, Mr. Speaker, to have the people who are doing the investigating be the actual people who will do the decision. Now the Human Rights Commission is an administrative body, it's a semi-judicial body, and has a semi-judicial function, and there is no way, Mr. Speaker, that the people who are involved in reviewing a complaint should be put in the position of having to judge that complaint.

Mr. Speaker, therefore the function has to a certain extent been stifled as a result of the difficulties that have arisen between its investigatory function and its function as a semi-judicial body, and the cases that took place, Mr. Speaker, or that have been appealed, have indicated that there is a problem of prejudgment and bias that the courts have found against the commission itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is I believe solutions to the problems, and I'm going to bring this forward as concrete suggestions with respect to the Manitoba Human Rights Commission. The Honourable Attorney-General suggested that there may be amendments this session to the Human Rights Commission Act, and if those amendments are to come forward I would hope they would contain some of the suggestions that I would bring forward today.

First, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Human Rights Commission should in fact be responsible to the Legislature and to the Legislative Assembly. This is not something new, it's been suggested by myself and others before. But in saying that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the appointments to the Human Rights Commission should be made by this Legislature in the same way as the appointment of the Ombudsman is made, and that Mr. Speaker, is a very important distinction. I am suggesting that because we are dealing with a semi-judicial body, dealing in an area of sensitivity, in concern with respect to our society, that the appointments made by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, nevertheless we should follow the procedure that was followed in the appointment of the Ombudsman, and this then would make the members of the Commission responsible to the Legislature. I would like to, Mr. Speaker, if I may, refer

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) to the section in the Ombudsman Act with respect to the appointment. No. 2 (1) of the Ombudsman Act states that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall on the recommendation of a special committee of the Assembly appoint a Canadian citizen as Ombudsman for the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this House, or the parties in this House, were capable of agreeing on the appointment of an Ombudsman as a result of negotiations, and I would think that the appointment, Mr. Speaker, of the Human Rights Commission should not be left to the government but rather should be left to this Legislature, if in fact the Human Rights Commission is to be responsible to the Legislature, and I start with that premise, Mr. Speaker, and that is a fundamental change to what the government has operated under in the past, and that is made in as a concrete way of avoiding some of the problem areas that I think exist as a result of the appointments that have been made, and the way in which it was operated before.

Mr. Speaker, it's necessary that there be a structure or system set up for procedures with respect to the way in which complaints are dealt with, and I suggest that my review and investigation of this has indicated that no proper system has existed in the last little while, and this has led to several problem areas. These areas are sensitive areas, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think it serves the public interest to debate them in this House but to indicate that there are problems, and I think the Attorney-General is the first one, or will be one of the first to admit that there have been problems and there is a necessity of change. I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, both in terms of the appointments and the way in which the Commission should operate, that the changes that we are proposing would have a system set up, and a structure set up, whereby complaints would be handled in a determined way and so that justice will be deemed to have been done for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important and essential that the appointments be made of people who have a very deep and real interest in Human Rights, and who have the experience and knowledge to be able to handle what is a major responsibility, and with all due respect to the honourable members opposite, and without in any way taking away from the appointments that have been made, it would seem to me that the review of the appointments would indicate that there is an improvement that could arise if you commit yourself, Mr. Speaker, to the appointment of people who are experienced in the field of civil liberties and Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, the Executive Director who was appointed should be a political. He should be competent in the area, and his appointment, Mr. Speaker, should be undertaken by a Commission appointed by this Legislature, and he should be responsible to that Commission, and he should be in a position, Mr. Speaker, to answer directly to a Committee of the Legislature as well as the Commission itself. In this way, Mr. Speaker, we would be in a position to protect the public's interest rather than to have the Human Rights Commission as a mysterious kind of body that somehow or other deals in the fields of civil liberties and takes care of specific complaints, and somehow or other processes them through and settles them to the satisfaction of everyone, because I don't believe that that is really happening, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, if anything, there has been a lethargy that has existed within the Commission that it has had the effect of discouraging and disillusioning many of the people who have been involved in this particular field.

Now I want to draw attention to the way in which the Ontario Human Rights Commission operates to indicate an alternative, an alternative approach, and suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in the way in which the Ontario Commission operates under its Act there are improvements to our Act that could be made, and there are many of the procedures that can be adopted to assist in carrying out the Human Rights Commission in a better way than it has in the past.

Mr. Speaker, in Ontario a complainant contacts an officer of the Commission. Now if the complainant has a legal basis for a claim, the complainant must put it in writing and it must be signed by the complainant. The officer investigates the complaint and attempts a conciliation with the help of a conciliation specialist. Now at this point, Mr. Speaker, the Commission has not been involved. If we were to follow the procedures here, Mr. Speaker, I think we would find that the Commission would be involved almost immediately. If no conciliation can be reached, the officer in consultation with his regional supervisor in Ontario, and with the director of the Commission, decides whether the case should be presented to the Commission, and if they make that decision, the hearings will be closed. So the first hearing, Mr. Speaker, before the Commission after a complaint has been made, and an attempt at

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) conciliation has been made with respect to the matter, will be determined and heard by the Commission in closed session.

The Members of the Commission in Ontario are appointed by Order-in-Council, and it has been an unwritten stipulation, Mr. Speaker, and I think the appointments will stand up to this condition that I have suggested, that each member has a recognized interest and reputation, experience and background, in the area of Human Rights. I do not believe that this can be said about the present Commission, or the past appointments.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission appointees are not mere political appointees. They are people who are experienced in the field of Human Rights. If any legal advice is required the Commission has reference to either independent lawyers or to the Attorney-General's office in Ontario. The Commission reviews the case, which has been heard in camera, and reports to the Minister of Labour. The Commission may recommend that a case be dismissed or the Minister appoint a Public Board of Inquiry, which would hear the case, Mr. Speaker, de novo, which would be a new trial in the open. If the recommendation of the Commission, having heard the case, is that in fact there be a public board of inquiry, it will be a trial de novo. Now they have processed approximately 5,000 cases within the past 12 years, Mr. Speaker, and only 100 to 150 have had to be taken to a public board of inquiry.

The board of inquiry which is appointed, Mr. Speaker, may consist only of a chairman, or chairman plus other members, but that chairman is not a Member of the Board of Commission. That chairman for the public board of inquiry is appointed by the government for that particular board of inquiry, and in all cases has been, as far as I understand, a member of the legal profession, and usually a member of the law faculty of one of the universities. The chairman of the board of inquiry, and that's a public board of inquiry, makes a ruling on the case and acts as a quasi court. He can order compliance with the Act, compensation, or he may dismiss the case, and the appeals from the board of inquiry lies with the equivalent of the Court of Queen's Bench in that area, which is referred to the Supreme Court of Ontario.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the way in which a complaint is handled in Ontario is not the way in which it's handled here, and the commission of inquiry is very different, or the Commission is very different from the board of inquiry. Here, Mr. Speaker, we have the Commission really involved in the first stage in the investigatory process, and involved in the next stage in the decision process, and I do not believe that that should function that way. We have first a hearing on this matter in private by the Commission, with the recommendations to the Minister, and the value of that, Mr. Speaker, is that it prevents, in some cases I would assume, frivolous actions being undertaken which can cause publicity and attention, and allow the Commission to make that independent determination with a full Commission of inquiry, and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, it allows a complete trial de novo when the matter is brought to public attention.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if we review the judgments of the court, in connection with the Bakery and Confectionary Workers International Union of America and the Manitoba Human Rights Commission, and McGavin Toastmaster Limited and the Manitoba Human Rights Commission and the Attorney-General, and the people who made the complaints, we find both in the minority and majority judgments a definite indication, Mr. Speaker, that there should not be a position where there is a prejudgment or a bias as a result of the involvement of the Commission in any way in the investigatory part of determining whether a complaint is justified before it is then heard in its public forum.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we've reached a point with the experience of the Human Rights Commission, which I suggest is not what I personally thought it would be in this period of time, and I think I share the disappointment of probably the members opposite as well, in trying to at this point make suggestions which will improve the way in which the Commission would operate. So that again it's not just a question of saying we have a Manitoba Human Rights Commission, and we have the rhetoric of a Commission that will be concerned about the protection of civil rights and civil liberties, but rather to have something that will function properly, so that there will be redress for complaints, and which will act as a proper deterrent for those who will abuse the existing laws, and will give satisfaction to those who have been discriminated against, whatever the nature of the discrimination, and that will be provided in a way in which it will be judged by people who are competent, and have some understanding of the law, of legislation, and of the whole field of civil liberties, and will give both those who complain and those who have been complained about, the opportunity for the legal steps to be taken so that

CONCURRENCE

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) the hearings will be undertaken in a proper manner, in a judicial manner, so that no one's rights will be tampered with. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the way in which we do this is by strengthening the Commission. The best way we can strengthen the Commission is by making it an appointee of this Legislature; the second way in which we strengthen the Commission is by seeing to it that the appointments are made and are not subject to the criticism of being a political appointment per se but rather be an appointment in the same way as the Ombudsman was by the Legislature, so that they are appointees of the Legislature and there has been an agreement by the parties on the appointees, which would give them a much freer rein, Mr. Speaker, than I believe they would have now as appointees of the government, particularly with respect to any matters in which there may be some sensitivity on the part of the government, or which government agencies may be involved. I think, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to recite to the Attorney-General and the members opposite, the fact that there has been a history with respect to work of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission and its officers, or its officials, in connection with some government agencies. And then allow a procedure, Mr. Speaker, that would follow Ontario's, whereby a complaint could be heard by the Commission and the Commission would have an opportunity to hear that in private, would then make its recommendations, and then, Mr. Speaker, having made its recommendations, having reviewed this matter in private, having followed proper legal procedures, having then recommended that a board of inquiry be set, that a trial de novo be held with a public board of inquiry, which would have then as its chairman and its members people who are learned in the law and are capable, Mr. Speaker, of exercising the judicial aspect which is involved in the final determination that someone has in fact violated the existing statutes, and has in fact been discriminatory in the way in which it's handled - handled themselves, and is subject to compensation or recourse by government or by the person involved.

So, Mr. Speaker, I bring this forward as a reasonable suggestion; one which may or may not receive the approval of the government; one which I would hope they would consider if in fact there is legislation to be introduced in this session, as the Honourable Attorney-General promised with respect to this matter; and one which I would think would put into perspective the evolution that has taken place within Manitoba since the Human Rights Commission was formed.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the government can in all honesty have the kind of pride that they would like to have with respect to the operation of the Human Rights Commission from Day One. The Human Rights Commission has been involved in controversy; there have been problem areas with respect to its management; they have attempted to initiate something that was essentially new, because they were proceeding in a different way than the experience of others.

There is an advantage, Mr. Speaker, at this point to now review the situation and to come forward with the kind of concrete proposals that I have suggested, or some other procedure which will distinguish very clearly, Mr. Speaker, the difference between the Human Rights Commission as the body involved in the investigation of a particular complaint, and the protection of the individual's rights, and its responsibility to disseminate information so that people will know what the laws against discrimination are, whatever they may be, and the educational function that the Human Rights Commission has, and the judicial function that has to be exercised in determining that someone was guilty of an offence under the Act. I do not believe that you can have those people who are going to be deciding that involved in the day to day operations, involved in the whole process, Mr. Speaker, because what happens is you blur their responsibility, and you prevent the honest evaluation of any particular case, and you prevent as well, Mr. Speaker, the ability for a judicial judgment to be given, which I think has to be given when one recognizes the full impact of what a decision would be against an individual or a corporation who has been found responsible for an act of discrimination.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope the Honourable Attorney-General would consider these recommendations, and will consider the recommendation particularly that the Commission be appointed and be responsible to this Legislature. If this would happen, Mr. Speaker, then I think we will have, in the words of the Human Rights Commission, evaluated the progress and evolved something better than what we have, which is really consistent with the intent and the principles which were responsible for the Act and the motivation for the legislation that was brought in by the government.

CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could enlighten me whether I have 20 minutes only to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Forty minutes.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . answer the various questions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Forty minutes.

MR. PAWLEY: Forty minutes.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): You don't need to use it all though.

MR. PAWLEY: I would sooner, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Pembina is endorsed by other members of his party to restrict my remarks to a couple of minutes and sit down.

But there were a number of questions posed that I would like to deal with and I'll deal first with the comments by the Leader of the Opposition and go in reverse, because the Honourable Member for Swan River asked a number of questions I'd like to specifically deal with.

But insofar as the Human Rights Commission is concerned, without doubt there have been weaknesses within the present legislation, and that weakness has been demonstrated by the results of some of the cases the honourable member referred to, the one involving the Toast-master case. Certainly the nub of the problem has been the indication of possible bias suggested by the court within the Commission by the merging of the two functions, the investigative and the judicial function within the Human Rights Commission. This certainly is something which we ought to want to make changes in the legislation, and there will be legislative changes introduced this session dealing with the aspect of alleged bias on the part of the make-up of the Commission because of the merging of the investigative and judicial function.

I must say to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition though that the proposed legislation does not intend to make the Commission accountable to the Legislature as a whole. We've given lengthy thought to that and with the exception of the Ombudsman I don't believe there is another - in fact I don't believe that there's a commission or board that is responsible to the Legislature as a whole, except for the Provincial Auditor and the Ombudsman would be the two exceptions to that. The Minister of Finance is not assisting me here by listing different examples, but I am saying to the Minister of Finance insofar as boards and commissions are concerned I'm unaware of any board or commission as such.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAWLEY: And the difficulty one faces in making the Commission responsible to the Legislature is that government must always hold itself accountable for the actions of government, must prove itself to be a responsible government, and there is I think always a danger if one does - well in government - attempt to shift that responsibility on to the Legislature as a whole, then in the end result you weaken the entire process of democratic government. I think government must ensure that it is responsible for its legislation passed, and certainly in the area of Human Rights Commission legislation, human rights, it in the final analysis must hold itself responsible and accountable for decisions that are made by the Commission and the appointments that the government makes to that Commission; no other body, including the Legislature as a whole, including the Opposition or members of the Liberal Party, ought to be expected to assume that responsibility. The government was elected to exercise responsibility, the government should carry through that responsibility in an effective and responsible manner. It's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that we would have serious reservations insofar as making the Commission responsible to the Legislature as a whole.

I would like to deal with the area of the Liquor Control Commission and the wines. I regret that the Member from St. James saw in the announcement an indication of staged prohibition. Certainly this was the furthest thing from the minds of government or any members of government, that we are in fact moving towards a form of staged prohibition. In fact I am rather surprised because, if anything, Mr. Speaker, this government has been accused over and over again repeatedly of being too favourable towards liberalization of liquor laws; and the accusations that I have heard in the past four or five years have always been, you're too liberal, you're too extreme, you're too open with your liquor laws. The accusations received this afternoon were tending to immediately shift into reverse and move the car backwards rather than forward with the type of accusations that we have been hearing on this side of the House over the last four or five years.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd)

I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is any intention here to either proceed in a liberalization direction or a prohibition direction, but in fact to apply the results of the pilot project which has been in effect for the past six months in northern Manitoba to the entire province. The Commission, which is responsible for the administration of the sale and the maintaining of discipline insofar as the sale of liquor is concerned, is convinced, and has made recommendations to the government, certainly consulted with the government and myself as Minister in respect to this decision by the Commission, that this pilot project be extended to the entire province. They do that on the basis of their findings in northern Manitoba. They are convinced first that from reports obtained from, for instance, law enforcement officers within areas in the northern communities as a result - and let me tell honourable members that the native people themselves were among those that had first suggested this very move by the Commission some six or seven months ago. So it has been done with a certain amount of support from that quarter, but certainly it has not been a policy which has been intended to discriminate against any region or group but simply to ascertain whether or not there would be effective results from the implementation of the delisting of certain cheap, heavily fortified wines in northern Manitoba.

In fact I can recall when we had indicated it was going to be a pilot project, honourable members questioned whether or not that in fact was being truthful, that in fact it was intended to be a pilot project, or in fact was regional discrimination. Well I think the result of the announcement today should clearly indicate to honourable members that we did intend it to be a pilot project, that we are satisfied that the results of that pilot project have been of such a nature that it justifies the extending of the delisting of certain heavily fortified cheap wines throughout the province rather than one area only, just as we'd indicated that we would be weighing the pros and cons of this type of policy.

To the Honourable Member for Riel let me say that there will be - and the Honourable Member for St. James - that there will still be available sherrys and ports, and there will be available also heavily fortified wines but in all instances of a high quality. We are not satisfied, the Commission is not satisfied, that the heavily fortified cheap wines that are being delisted here are the type of wines that a responsible Commission ought to associate with; not satisfied as to the quality of those wines, the quality was of a cheap, poor nature and not the sort of nature of a product that one would want to in any store, or any operation, wish to identify one's self with. There will be available fortified wines of a good quality still available within the Liquor Control Commissions of the province, but not wines of a poor poor quality.

Now to increase the price, as was suggested by the Member for Riel, that would in effect become a prohibition, I don't think would surely be the route that one would want to follow here, particularly when there will be available good quality wines, of a higher price true enough, that will be available in the stores. So they will be available. One doesn't have to increase in an exorbitant way, permitting exorbitant profit of these cheap heavily fortified wines by increasing the price by two, three, four hundred percent hoping to in effect bring about a prohibition through the sale of them, if not in fact by delisting.

If one looks forward to the results of this let me advise honourable members that this decision has not been one that has been taken lightly; it's been very seriously weighed, and we are rather pleased with the positive aspect here that 300 wines in Manitoba will be reduced in price, and that's the important thing within this statement, that 300 wines, natural and table wines, will be in one shot reduced in price seventeen percent on the average in Manitoba, seventeen percent. Mr. Speaker, I must say that I wonder if in this present day and age of inflation and soaring prices, if any other commission, Liquor Control Commission, anywhere in Canada can say that in one breath we are reducing the price of 300 table and natural wines in our stores. There just is none, and that is the important part of this entire statement, this move to reduce the price of the overwhelming majority of table and natural wines in our liquor stores so that we can make them more available to the wine consumer of wines of a lower alcoholic quality, but certainly of a sound good quality of consumption in our Manitoba stores. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this has probably been a first on the part of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission, of commissions throughout Canada that there is some relationship of price to alcoholic content. I understand that other countries in the world, but not within Canada, have been tying in price as to alcoholic content.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd).

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry dealt with the entire question of the board of review. The board of review was a mechanism that has been established, been in effect for some time now, dealing with decisions by the Juvenile Court judges, and I think very directly, Mr. Speaker, that it has been not the best of methods. You know for instance, to expect a Family Court judge to sit on a board of review analysing or considering the decisions by a Federal Family Court judge, surely was not a procedure that one would look to with any favour. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development has introduced to this House, and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry may not be aware of it, a bill which brings about some substantial changes with respect to the board of review. The board of review, under the proposed legislation introduced by the Minister of Health and Social Development will permit only the advising by the board of review, and no longer does the board of review intervene, and the board of review, as per the proposed legislation, will only advise at the request of the parent or minister, or some other interested party, will in fact the board of review be called in to the process. So that the Minister of Health and Social Development has recognized the defectiveness in the present board of review and he's undertaken steps to correct that defectiveness, and the Member for Fort Garry I'm sure will look forward to dealing with that proposed legislation in the House later.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre raised the entire question of the proliferization of private police forces. It is certainly true that in the space of the past few years with the building of high rise developments, and larger and larger numbers of people living in more and more concentrated areas, plus the construction of larger and larger commercial enterprises, that the trend has been toward the development of greater numbers of private police forces. We can not all be somewhat uneasy by this development because one need only look about the world, and one can not help but see that in countries of the world in which there has developed large police forces, not controlled by public bodies, private police forces, that in fact there is certain inherent dangers towards the democratic system within such a trend in development.

I don't believe for a moment that we've reached that point in Canada, but it's something that I think we would want to be aware of and to attempt to protect ourselves against. One need only refer of course to the obvious developments in countries where sometimes political parties hire private police forces to beat up on the members of other parties that they are in disagreement with, and I trust that that day will never come in Manitoba. But certainly the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre raises an important point that the Member for Fort Rouge, because the Member from Fort Rouge had earlier mentioned this very same area and I look forward to - and I have no answers to the concerns expressed because I recognize that that trend is somewhat inherent within our present social and urban development, but I undertake to members interested that I'll attempt to ascertain what alternatives there are that are available to us in view of this continuing trend, proliferization of various police forces.

The Member for Flin Flon raised a matter which I know has concerned him for a great deal of time, and let me say to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that it's not only Flin Flon that faces this problem but many other centres in Manitoba. The Member for Fort Garry dealt with this the other evening, the fact that unfortunately though the majority of our young people are responsible and law abiding, there is that small element that one can only describe as being punks. I can only say to the Member for Flin Flon that we have to be continually evaluating and re-evaluating the procedures which we develop in order to deal with the problems of crime by our younger citizens to insure that it does not get out of hand. For this reason a number of steps are being taken; one of the important ones of course is the area raised by the Member for Fort Garry dealing with changes in respect to the board of review under the Child Welfare Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will have an opportunity to continue another day. The hour being 5:30 the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 8:00 p. m. tonight.