

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock Tuesday, March 7, 1967

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would be good enough, Sir, to call as item No. 1 on Government Orders the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 56 at the bottom of Page 21.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The proposed motion on Bill No. 56.

Having given careful consideration to the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to refer to Citation 382 of Beauchesne, 4th Edition, which reads in part as follows: "It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill to move as an amendment to the question a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to or differing from the principles, policy or provision of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution or otherwise opposed to its progress." Following on: "It has been the practice in recent years to act upon the principle as indicated in Citation 247 of Beauchesne's 4th Edition where money bills are referred to via Table 1 to 23 as set forth." I make particular reference to Items 10, 12, 16, the latter which is explicit and definite for indicating in consideration in Committee of the Whole House.

Further to this, I would like to quote from May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition, Page 531, under the heading "Exemptions to General Practice," sub-paragraph (1). "Bills for imposing taxes or consolidation funds or appropriation bills are expressly exempted from the operation of the Standing Order and are committed automatically to a Committee of the Whole House."

In the light of this information, I felt bound to examine the previous practices of the House in dealing with bills of this kind and turned to the House Journals over the past several years. Having in mind the contents of sub-paragraph (2) of the General Rules of our Rules, Orders, Forms and Proceedings, I find that the said rules do not spell out any direction in the matter before the House. I also find that over the years, through the House Journals, bills such as this have been referred to Standing Committees for consideration and have been dealt with. Indications through the said Journals do however suggest the practice in recent years has been to refer such bills to the Committee of the Whole House for examination. In view of these circumstances and considerable thought, I'm inclined toward giving the benefit of the doubt in favour of allowing the amendment as tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I, like many of the members on this side of the House, am appalled at this particular bill because I do not think the government have proven their point that the particular tax is necessary. I think that a fine example of how the people of the Province of Manitoba feel is in the example of the tax that is to be imposed on services for dry cleaners. As I pointed out some time ago, when a person is involved in that particular area of business possibly some people will think or would think that he is not entitled to speak, but in this particular area I feel that in view of the number of petitions that I have received, I am entitled to speak. When we consider that there are 57 constituencies throughout the Province of Manitoba and there are in excess of 57,000 persons who have signed these particular petitions, and I have received upwards to 950, I believe that I should be entitled to speak because the people in my constituency have told me as a person who is involved in the dry cleaning business I should state their case, though I think the Provincial Treasurer does not need me to reiterate what the people of Manitoba feel in the tax that he is prepared to impose on the citizens of Manitoba in regard to the five percent tax.

It's as simple as this: should I buy a new suit? I am compelled, if this legislation passes - and I wonder if it will pass when we have discussion with members on the backbenches on the other side of the House - but should it pass we are compelled to pay five percent on the purchase price of a new suit, or five percent on the purchase price of a new shirt. Isn't it just a little absurd - and you in particular, the Provincial Treasurer - isn't it just a little absurd that you would want five percent of this particular tax?

MR. EVANS: That is not true.

MR. DAWSON: What is not true? You stand up and answer me. I'll sit down.

MR. EVANS: Say your speech.

MR. DAWSON: Well, I wish that if somebody is going to yell across at me from the other side of the House that it's not true, that he's prepared to tell me what isn't true, because

(MR. DAWSON cont'd)..... he's got me a little bit confused. I don't know where I go from here.

MR. EVANS: I tell my honourable friend that it's not true that you pay five percent of the cost of the suit when you have it dry-cleaned.

MR. DAWSON: I didn't say that. I'm sorry, Sir, I didn't understand you. It's not particularly true about what? --(Interjection)--Are you telling me that it is not true that each time a suit is dry-cleaned we will not pay five percent of the cleaning cost? --(Interjection)-- I see the First Minister is helping you. Usually when the people on the other side get into trouble they have to have the First Minister help them.

MR. EVANS: You'd better get somebody to help you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Hamiota may be allowed to proceed with his speech without interruption.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that I will not have to carry on the case for the dry-cleaners or the launderers. I'm sure that the Provincial Treasurer will get the message when he picks up in excess of 60,000 petitions from the citizens of Manitoba. But I would like to make a case for a particular group of people in the Province of Manitoba who have the unfortunate sickness of being deaf as diabetics. Now I noted in Bill 56, which I have here that it definitely states that all prescriptions will be tax exempt but I also note in a short message from the President of the Diabetics for Manitoba - I can't recall his name and I haven't it offhand here but I believe he resides in the City of Winnipeg - has mentioned to me that when a person is a diabetic he notices and he knows how much insulin he needs and he is not in want of a prescription. He simply walks down to the drug store and he says give me X dollars worth of insulin or X number worth of insulin tablets and he doesn't use a prescription. Now in the figures that I have been able to pick up - and they are provincial government figures - there are a tremendous number of diabetics scattered throughout the Province of Manitoba. And the majority of these people that I have been able to contact - and when I say majority I have taken a smattering of samples throughout the Province of Manitoba - tell me that they do not use prescriptions and they are greatly incensed about the fact that they will have to pay five percent on their prescriptions from now on unless they go to a Doctor and get a prescription which they feel is an unfair thing, because they know their own condition because years ago it has been told to them what their particular trouble is and they feel that is not necessary to go to a Doctor from time to time to pick up a prescription to tell them that they are diabetic and they have to have X number of strengths for insulin or X number of pills. They feel that they in particular should be exempt; not only do they feel that they in particular should be exempt but they feel - and they carry the fight for many other people that are in various degrees of sickness - that it is absolutely ridiculous that this government should want to tax patent medicines or any type of medicine that exist. And I would agree very much with these particular people.

There is another facet of your particular tax that I disagree with - and I'm sure that many Manitobans across our Province of Manitoba disagree with - and that is the fact that you are prepared Mr. Provincial Treasurer to exempt a certain facet of clothing as tax free. Now I think that every member in this House who has any children that are over the age of 14 or 16 will tell you that that is a particular age where it costs them money to clothe these people. You have mentioned that you are prepared to exempt children under 14 years of age or size 14. Well not only does my wife tell me, but so many other wives have told me, this is absolutely ridiculous because they would much rather you reverse the process and tax children of 12 years and under on their clothing and exempt any person that is going to school. And I can't help but agree with this because when one waltzes through the stores - or walks through the stores because you don't really waltz through a store - you would see that the persons or people under 10 years of age clothing is a lot cheaper.

And you know it's a pretty funny thing when you stand back here and you see you guys standing over there giggling and laughing to yourselves. I just wonder how much you're going to laugh in 4 or 5 years from now. You sit back there just like a giggling and laughing to yourselves. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would remind the Honourable gentleman that he doesn't refer to anyone as guys but rather the honourable

MR. DAWSON: I'm sorry Mr. Speaker, I wasn't pointing out any one particular person, I was just pointing out the ones in the front row. I should have made an exception and mentioned that I wasn't considering those in the back row. But I did want to mention the fact that

(MR. DAWSON cont'd).....I personally, and I'm sure that many Manitobans would like to see, if we are going to have to put up with a five percent sales tax, which I hope we won't have to, that all those that are attending Grade 12 and under would be exempt from any clothing tax, because as I mentioned before, it is the teenagers that cost us the money in keeping them in clothing. And we would prefer - not speaking as a member of the Provincial Legislature of Manitoba - but speaking as a father and I'm sure that many of the people in this House that have teenagers and young ones would prefer to see the tax imposed on the young ones rather than the teenagers. The teenagers are the ones that cost us the money and I would say that let us not impose the tax on the teenagers; let us exempt anyone that is going to high school, Grade 12 and under would all be exempt from the clothing tax and I am sure that there would be no problem in doing this.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): I wonder if I could ask a question. Is the member aware that insulin is a prescription medication?

MR. DAWSON: Well Dr. Johnson, I wasn't aware that you were the Minister of Health. However,

MR. JOHNSON: I'm not - I'm asking you a question.

MR. DAWSON: Well I will answer it in this way: I had received a phone call from a gentleman in Winnipeg, and he asked me not to use his name, but he told me this - and I am sure that he is prepared to come here and tell you the same thing - that insulin, with diabetics they get to know just what they need and should they move from the City of Winnipeg to the Town of Gimli, that they can walk into a druggist and say I need X number of pills or so much in a shot and the druggist says fine, I'll give it to you, and there is no prescription involved. You possibly as a medical doctor may tell me they are breaking the law, but I guess they have been breaking the law for a number of years then.

MR. HARRIS: If nobody else wishes to speak, I would adjourn debate, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington. If somebody else wishes to speak, it's up to them.

MR. TANCHAK: I was just getting up when the Honourable Member for Logan got up but I wasn't going to adjourn, I was going to make a small contribution to this debate.

There was a saying in the past and probably still is true, that a fool and his money soon part company, and after June 1st I presume if the government has its way, we will all be parting with our money. By this I do not mean that we subscribe to the word "fool". I hate to call myself a fool, or anybody else one. But if the people of Manitoba are going to be fools after June 1st I would say that the government should take the responsibility for putting that label on the people of Manitoba, because 8 years ago the party on the other side, which is presently the government, told the people of Manitoba that that party is going to give services to the people of Manitoba within the same tax structure and the people of Manitoba took the premier, the present premier and the cabinet ministers who spoke at that time, especially at the second election in 1959, took them at their word. Therefore, if anyone in Manitoba could be labelled so, I would say that the government, this present government is making them as such.

The government I think has no alternative at the present time but to continue its practice of annually increasing taxes, of annually increasing old taxes and resorting to new taxes, because practically in every sitting session, this government resorted to increase in taxation, either existing taxes as I said before or resorted to some new taxation.

Now why was the government forced into that position? I think it is their own doing. They were forced and are forced to bleed the people of Manitoba because of wasteful spending and improper planning --(Interjection)--so that's why they were forced to do it then. I can give you only a few very small examples when I refer to this. You take for instance - I have mentioned that many times before - where a lot of money was wasted in the field of education in constructing of new schools which were not located in their proper places and now the people of Manitoba have to pay for those schools in these increased taxes. What about others? We have had many examples brought through the years back, even as recently as a year ago, two years ago; we have had examples of land purchasing, paying an exorbitant price for land in different areas - like the Art centre. What about the Goose Pond that was referred to? That's another example. And many, many other examples that we can cite.

What about the government sitting in session - the Cabinet Ministers sitting in Session outside this House - Cabinet meetings in different areas in the Province of Manitoba. I am happy to note that this last year there weren't as many; but just two years ago, on numerous occasions the Cabinet Ministers selected a town or a village, outside this building, which is

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)...the proper place for holding cabinet meetings. And I would say that the Cabinet did it for political purposes. They, the Cabinet was actually using the people's money to promote their own party; going among the people and playing politics at the time. And what do they cost? We have asked for an Order of Return on one only and it is close to \$1,500 - one cabinet meeting outside of this House, \$1,500. And why do that? This is the right place in this building. No, but the government seems to think very little of wasting a few hundred dollars or a few thousand dollars here and there. Now if you multiple \$1,400 by about six or seven cabinet meetings outside this Legislature it still doesn't mean so very very much, but it's a large sum of money - and I'll come back to this. What about the different commissions that this government has set up and it has been charged before that the government sets these commissions up and these commissions are chaired - or the members in these commissions mostly - most of them are defeated Conservative candidates.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? Isn't it a fact that for these meetings outside of this building that now that the Cabinet Ministers will pay this out of their \$3,000 tax free allowance?

MR. TANCHAK: I couldn't answer that question. I presume that they can well afford to do it now after getting - but whether they'll do it or not I would not say. What about all these commissions? As I mentioned before the appointments made are mostly defeated candidates. And we had some defense - the Attorney-General tried to defend the action of the government or the action of the Premier on these appointments and one statement that he had made is probably they're the right people because having had experience in this House some of that experience may rub off. Oh, how ridiculous a statement. What about all those defeated candidates who haven't been sitting members in this House - and I know a number of them and they were appointed. What have they got to rub off. They have no experience sitting in this House. I think that was very ridiculous to give an answer like that.

Now you may say that's just peanuts; it's small amounts. And I'll agree it is small amounts as I said before, but the thing is that there is a principle set here. There is the principle of it. If you waste small amounts of money, hundreds, thousands, you have set a principle that you're wasting people's money and you must replace that by taxation. That's the principle that this government has set. Wasting of money by these cabinet meetings and appointing so many commissions -- we know of some of the ways, but God only knows how many more examples could be brought up if those books were thoroughly checked. If we had an auditor here that's been requested by our side to check into this we might find that there are thousands upon thousands of dollars that have been wasted. No wonder the government must resort to extra taxation - to sales tax at the present time.

What about all these commissions and committees that have been appointed by this government and some recently in this Session? The Premier himself has called for a few. I may be wrong but I can account for about 56 of these different commissions and committees of this House. That's almost one for every sitting member of the House except Mr. Speaker. These things cost a lot of money. Some of them are necessary but I doubt whether that many are necessary. Money could be saved here. And again I'll come back to this. I don't want it thrown back at me that it's just small amounts. I'm talking about the principle that this government has set and that's a waste of public money in many instances. And there are many more I can cite. What about these junket trips that the government pays to the sitting members, the Cabinet Ministers - pays their trips far and wide just for their own pleasure I would say.

MR. LYON: Name one.

MR. TANCHAK: I'm not referring to any specific one. I can cite one or two that might have been necessary and were good but there are many different kinds that this government has set up. I can only

MR. LYON:go back to the boondocks with that kind of tripe.

MR. TANCHAK: It is quite true that that is happening in the Province of Manitoba and I object to that, and I say that this government has no alternative but to resort to some other ways of taxation and I think the only remedy would be to throw the government out before the Province of Manitoba really goes bankrupt. --(Interjection)-- The Attorney-General is always very anxious to get up on his feet but we are quite used to him.

MR. LYON: If you're lucky I won't.

MR. TANCHAK: Him and his red herring. We're used to those things and I'm sure he will have one great big one to drag in across the floor here.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)...

Now I know we're not supposed to discuss different items of Bill No. 56 and I'm not going to discuss the different items, but there is one principle that's involved in here and the principle which I say is a good one and that is that some of the tools, the machinery and so on that the farmers use in their operation are exempt from sales tax and I agree with that. That's a principle we all know and we accept the principle that farmers are having a hard time, the cost-price squeeze is ever increasing, and we agree with that. But why - and this is part of the principle - why when we exclude agricultural feeds why should the government go ahead and tax drugs and medicaments used by the farmer in production of the animals that he is attempting: the pigs, the hogs, the poultry and so on. Why should the farmer be taxed on that? That principle is set out in number 4, 1 (e) when it says that drugs and medicaments will be exempt from taxation if they are prescribed by a veterinarian - exempt if they are prescribed by a veterinarian. If the drugs and the medicaments are not prescribed by the veterinarian, if the farmer goes in or the poultry man goes in and buys those drugs on his own then he will have to pay a sales tax. I think it is not fair and that section of that definitely should be amended. The farmers of Manitoba use about close to \$2 million dollars worth of these drugs and these medicaments during the course of their production and it will create quite a hardship. True; they could go to a vet and have a prescription issued, but in many cases, in many areas of the Province of Manitoba this farmer may have to travel as far as 75 miles to see the vet or ask the vet to come to examine his animal, 75 miles distance is quite costly. Most of the present producers, livestock men and poultry men know what they need for their animals, for their poultry, they know that they have to have certain for erysipelas and so on. They don't need the prescription. It's a standard procedure. So why subject them to this extra cost. I do not think it is fair. This principle which has been accepted in one instance to help the farmer should be continued right through and these medicaments and these drugs should not be subject to a sales tax, regardless of how they're purchased whether through the vet or outside. We all know, and I'm sure the Minister of Agriculture knows that as well as I do, that most feed companies can't carry these medicaments. Quite a few other stores carry these and most of these feed companies, I would venture to say that all these feed companies sell these medicines, these drugs at cost. They do not make a profit on them; they are sold at cost to the producer. The feed companies or the hatcheries provide them with chicks and poults, the feed companies provide them with feed and if the producer needs any medication he'll go to this feed company or to this hatchery and he'll get these drugs at cost. So these people are willing to forego profits on them. I do not see why the Province of Manitoba wants to make a profit off the farmer.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I intend to address myself to the amendment and to the amendment alone. I think the amendment is of sufficient importance to merit the consideration of this House because Bill No. 56 in my opinion is one of the most important taxation bills that has been introduced into this House since I have come here. And all the amendment asks is that that bill be not now read a second time but, that in the opinion of this House having regard to the public interest in the question of taxation -- and there's no doubt of that public interest. I know of no Bill which has aroused greater public interest -- and having regard to the serious effect that this taxation can have on the development and future of this province - and I think that this Bill is going to have a serious detrimental effect on the future development of this province. And having regard too to the fact that this Bill is going to have regulations that form a part of it and that these regulations have not been made known to us -- and these regulations should be made known to us before we consider this Bill, because frankly Mr. Speaker, we cannot consider this Bill intelligently and comprehensively unless we know every part and parcel of that Bill and the regulations are a part and parcel of it. Now that is all that my leader is asking. He's asking that the regulations in respect to this Bill be immediately made public and I think the public's entitled to have that information now. He's also asking that Bill 56 be referred to a standing committee on Law Amendments for consideration and report after full opportunity has been given for the public to make representations thereon. I consider Mr. Speaker, that there's nothing unreasonable in the request being made by my leader and I think that request should be given the unanimous support of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment placed before us for our consideration by the Leader of the Liberal Party. And may I say at the offset, Mr. Speaker, I do so because I see in the amendment as proposed by the Leader of the Official Opposition a

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)....basic departure from the conduct of this legislature that has prevailed in the past. I think as I look around the assembly tonight -- I'm one of about 7 or 8 members who have been in this assembly since 1953 and one who has seen on numerous occasions, both under the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party, many changes in the tax structure in the Province of Manitoba -- this is to me the first occasion however that I have known a recommendation being proposed to the House that taxation matters should be referred to a committee outside of the House itself. And I am glad that the Leader of the Liberal Party has at last come to the conclusion that the public should be considered and should be interested in changes in taxation in the Province of Manitoba. So I give to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party of Manitoba a star for their first venture insofar as the field of taxation is concerned in taking into consideration the confidence and the suggestions of the population and the taxpayer of Manitoba, because certainly they did not do it when they were in power. My honourable friends, typical, have simply just said, Mr. Speaker, that they've never imposed a sales tax. It's true, they never imposed a sales tax, but it's equally true, Mr. Speaker, that they did impose other methods of taxation which were just, or at least similar in character, that were impositions upon the people, the citizens and the taxpayers of Manitoba without consideration as to how they might affect the people and the taxpayer of Manitoba.

So, despite the ramblings of my honourable friends to my right and behind me that the Liberal Party never imposed a sales tax, this is the first instance in which I'm aware that my honourable friends who did have the reign of government in Manitoba previous to the present administration have suggested matters of taxation should go outside of this Chamber. And I think they're right; I think they're right. Hear, Hear! My honourable friends of the Liberal Party say hear, hear. I join them in saying hear, hear too Mr. Speaker. It's taken a heck of a long time to knock some sense into their heads but apparently now they've seen the light of day, and that the public of Manitoba should be considered in fields of taxation.

Now then what are we considering? In the amendment that we have before us "that in the opinion of this House having regard to the public interest in this question of taxation" -- and I suggest that while this is specific, Mr. Speaker, what the amendment should have said was "in the opinion of this House having regard to the public interest in all questions of taxation." And then the resolution goes on to say "having regard to the serious effect that this taxation can have on the development and future of our province" -- and I suggest that in the past as in the present all methods of taxation have an effect on the development of Manitoba. "And then having regard to the need for full disclosure of the potential impact of such taxation." I think that in the proposals that the government placed before us for our consideration in Bill No. 56 that we should seriously consider the potential impact of such taxation; because as far as we are concerned in this group, Mr. Speaker, the government has not established any logic, any justification, or any proof of consideration that an investigation has been made by the government of Manitoba into the impact of a sales tax on Manitoba. I think that my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer has taken the easy way out. The easy way in this particular case in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is to say well everybody else in Canada with the exception of one other province now has a sales tax in Canada. I don't think that this is proper; I don't think that it is a way out -- a justifiable way for a government to operate.

My honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer at various stages of debate in this House since we first started last December has time after time repeated the fact that he and the Treasury Department in Manitoba had not full information insofar as the revenues accruing to Manitoba from the federal sources are concerned. My honourable friend in his budget address told us that he was going to budget for a deficit of some million odd dollars; and if I recall correctly at that particular time he suggested one of the reasons for that was the lack of information from other jurisdictions.

Just the other day the Carter Commission on taxation brought down its findings. We had suggested -- my colleague from St. John's had suggested that the government would be well advised to await the Carter Commission, the Royal Commission on taxation before imposing a sales tax in Manitoba. But what did my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer do? Without waiting a week or two till the Carter Commission was brought down, he announced the imposition of a sales tax in Manitoba. I say that this government of Manitoba are failing the people of Manitoba and are failing them completely, in that they have not acted as a responsible government in considering the review that has been made over the past three or four years by the Carter Commission. I want to say to the backbenchers of government: how much have you

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)...been taken into confidence with your government or your front row? I want to say to the backbenchers in government: has the Provincial Treasurer, has the First Minister asked you of your opinions as to the imposition of a sales tax in Manitoba?

Now I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the difficulties under which the backbenchers in government may be operating, because I have seen on past occasions the Leader of the House with just a flip of a hand make the backbenchers sit down so that their voices would not be heard in this Assembly. But I suggest on this particular occasion, Mr. Speaker, that the matter under consideration is so vital to the well-being of Manitoba and its citizens that the flip of a hand by the Leader should not be sufficient to still the voices of the backbenchers of the Conservative Party. We are--(Interjection)--you fully agree with me? I'm glad to know that the Minister of Welfare fully agrees with me.

MR. CARROLL: What a dreamer.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't quite catch the words of my friend the Minister of Welfare. He says, "What a dreamer!" What a position for democracy to be in when one on this side of the House who suggests that a backbencher might have some part in government is called by the Minister of Welfare a dreamer. Is that what my honourable friend means? That I'm a dreamer to think that in the year 1966 when I suggest that a backbencher in government - who is just as responsible insofar as electors is concerned to take part in the debate of this magnitude - my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, Mr. Speaker, says that I'm a dreamer. Democracy - democracy? Oh my honourable friend, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is not me the dreamer but my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare and I would like to suggest to him that he comes out of his dream into the realm of reality and come to consider that we are living in a democracy. That every single member of this Assembly, all 57, have a responsibility to stand up and to be counted -- and not only to stand up and to be counted, Mr. Speaker, but to take full part in the deliberations.

And so I say again, Mr. Speaker, to the backbenchers in government: what have you to say? What have you to say respecting the sales tax in Manitoba? Are they going to be mute throughout all of the discussions in all of these deliberations, Mr. Speaker? I plead, I beg them, I beg the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, the Honourable Member for Churchill, the Honourable Member for St. James - yes, and the Honourable Minister of Agriculture as well - to stand up, to stand up and tell us where they stand, and not only to tell us in this House where they stand, Mr. Speaker, but in telling us where they stand tell those people who gave them their support at the polls what they are going to do on their behalf.

I say to the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in particular, I know his constituency quite well, I don't think that he represents a vastly wealthy group of people in the City of Winnipeg. I think he represents the average type of individual; the very type of individual, Mr. Speaker, who is going to be hurt by the imposition of a sales tax. And I want to know from my honourable friend, the Member for St. Matthews, is he going to have in his heart full concern as to the effects of the five percent sales tax on those who supported him during the election. I haven't heard - and maybe, Mr. Speaker, I haven't heard simply because of the fact that the debate on this very important matter has just started. Maybe I'm being cruel to my honourable friends suggesting as I do now that they should take part in this debate. Maybe they're just chaffing at the bit, Mr. Speaker, ready to get up and to say, "We don't believe in a sales tax either, Mr. Leader of the New Democratic Party," but the flipper of the hand has told us that we've got to stand up and be counted.

I thought for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Churchill was crossing the floor. You know, it has happened in other jurisdictions on similar occasions that members of government have come over and joined us in opposition and I....--(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, apparently, apparently what I have been saying is bearing fruit. Now then, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest, may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest just two more.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party has had fairly good innings and I wonder if he would co-operate with me in order that there be a little order around the House whilst he is speaking. You know I was just suggesting, he probably didn't hear me, that I felt he'd had a good inning of fun and I wondered if we could get on with the business of the House. --(Interjection)-- I felt you were being interrupted unnecessarily and I'm appealing to the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank you most sincerely for your support. I thought the eloquence of my oration, if you may call it that, was such that even though I may have been disturbing the conduct of the House that I was gaining disciples in the cause of right in the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... Province of Manitoba and possibly, Mr. Speaker, by your intrusion into the debate could conceivably be an indication that you join in the argument that I'm attempting to present to the House this evening.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is of such importance in Manitoba that as I have indicated to the honourable members opposite that it is a matter of vital and lasting concern to all of the electors, the taxpayers in Manitoba that the context of the amended proposed by the Leader of the Opposition should be under consideration and review in the public arena. Now my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition has suggested that Bill No. 56 should be referred to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments for consideration. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether we shouldn't go just a little bit further. His suggestion is the standing committee on Law Amendments. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether or not we shouldn't go just a little bit further than the standing committee of Law Amendments of this House and take this proposition directly into the standing committee of the electorate of the Province of Manitoba. (Interjection) My colleague from St. John's has suggested a referenda. He suggested that the government believes in referenda. We're going to have one on March 10th. Let's have another one. Only this time let's encompass all of Manitoba. I dare the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer to refer this matter to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba. I dare this 40 percent government that we've got to refer this matter to the electorate of Manitoba.

There are so many deficiencies and inequalities in Bill No. 56, Mr. Speaker, that I think it should be given the fullest review, the fullest investigation by all of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba. Inequalities, yes. My honourable friends in their Bill suggest that if a person buys a piece of wallboard that it's subject to the five percent tax but the labour for application in the home is not taxable. Yet on the other hand if somebody buys an electric or an automatic washing machine which requires installation that the labour for the installation of that automatic washing machine is subject to the tax as well as the washing machine itself. This government has ignored the proddings of the New Democratic Party representatives in this House for a ceiling on interest rates in the province of Manitoba. But what are they doing by Bill 56, Mr. Speaker? Not only are they not content thus far at least with a ceiling on interest rates but they're going to put a 5 percent tax on top of interest rates insofar as installment buying for such things as automatic washers installed. So they're going to charge the person who has it installed a 5 percent sales tax. If unfortunately they're the type of people economically that can't afford to pay cash for an installation of this kind and the product, that government who claim to have the well-being of the ordinary citizen at heart are going to impose an additional 5 percent tax on them. You say that there's not inequity in this tax? The person who has the money to pay for such things as automatic washers in cash doesn't have to pay any more than the 5 percent tax; but if unfortunately they haven't the financial wherewithal to pay for it that government, whose heart bleeds in their own orations for the poor people of Manitoba, is going to impose an additional 5 percent sales tax on the interest that the people have to pay. It's contained in the Act. It is contained within the Act. Yes, it is. The carrying charges and interest in the sections of the Act impose the 5 percent sales tax on the interest and the carrying charges on installment buying where an installation has to be made. Again I say Mr. Speaker, to the backbenchers, are you aware of this? Are you aware of it? My honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne shakes his head and says that he's not aware of it. Then I say to my honourable friend, forget about the hand that pushes him down and read the Act because this is a provision within the Act.

Much more can be said, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Act and I will be saying that in due course but at the present time we're dealing with the amendment as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition Party, and we are going to support that resolution because we think that Bill No. 56 is so -- I'm trying to figure a parliamentary word at the present time that would fit in to what I think of the concoction that we have or abortion that we have before us in this Bill and I'm having difficulty. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill is so ill-advised, so poorly constructed, so full of deficiencies and innuendos and false impressions, that it would be well for it to be taken out of this House to come under the scrutiny of the public eye and so that the Provincial Treasurer can have the benefit of others in really analyzing what is contained within the covers of Bill 56. And possibly, possibly, Mr. Speaker, in addition to all that it could give to the individual members of the government an opportunity to stand up on their own feet and say, "Whoa. Stop. The interest of Manitoba is far more important than the preservation of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, and we will not allow the imposition of this tax on the Province of Manitoba until at least the matter has been given every consideration."

MR. SPEAKER: I believe -- oh, you wish to speak on the

MR. SHOEMAKER: make a couple of comments, Mr. Speaker, a couple of brief comments because it is an important resolution that is before us, the amendment, and like my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk I intend to stick entirely to the amendment that is before us.

I didn't realize until last evening, Mr. Speaker, that this government intended to refer the Bill to the Committee of the Whole rather than to Law Amendments. I was amazed, simply amazed and alarmed that this government would have the nerve to say to the people of Manitoba, "Listen, you are not going to be allowed to open your mouth on this Bill. We're going to ram it down your throats and you can do what you like with it, but we're not going to let you people have one word to say in Law Amendments." After I've said to dozens and dozens of people in my constituency last week, "If you don't like the Bill get prepared and come to Law Amendments." This is what I told them to do.

A MEMBER: And they're all waiting outside.

MR. SHOEMAKER: And they intend to come; a lot of people intend to come. Mr. Speaker, nearly 60,000 people signed a petition. Am I right or am I wrong? I know that I received, I received about 500 of these in the mail. The honourable member for St. James, I believe recorded that he had received nearly 2,000 - not nearly 2,000 eh?

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): I didn't count them.

MR. SHOEMAKER: He didn't count them. Well anyway, if there were 60,000 signed and there's 57 members, it's slightly over a thousand per member. Did anybody read them? My honourable friend the member for St. James says he didn't count them. Did he read one? What does it say? What does the petition say? It says: "It is proposed that effective June 1, 1967, you shall pay a tax of 5 percent each and every time you need laundry and dry-cleaning serviced. This proposal is a new concept in taxation (no other province has it); it is not only discriminatory and repetitious but it is also insidious in that it seeks to establish for the first time a maintenance tax on personal property and the labour that serves it." And in great big solid black letters, "Act now before it's too late. The Law Amendments Committee will meet within two weeks to decide the issue so fill out the appeal in the right corner and mail it to your member now."

So what did 60,000 people say? They said, "Get prepared for Law Amendments Committee because the Bill is coming before Law Amendments Committee." 60,000 of them said that. And they naturally expected that that was where it was going to go. Surely everybody expected it was going to go there. And I was simply amazed to learn that the government had no intention at all of letting the people come as they usually do to Law Amendments Committee and breathe down our necks. Isn't this flying in the face of democracy? Our whole democratic policy is set up to provide for the people to come before the law-makers and register their objections to the proposed legislation. This is what -- this is the whole purpose of parliament and something that was established certainly at the time of the Magna Carta. And here this government says, "You can't come; you can't come and talk to us; you can't come."

Now Mr. Speaker, I can imagine that it will be embarrassing to the government. Naturally it will be embarrassing to the government to have these people come and tell us that they don't like the 5 percent tax, but this is one of the penalties that you have when you assume the responsibility to govern the province. I see my honourable friend the member for Dauphin smiling over there, and I would like to tell him that I was talking to the Mayor of Dauphin today, and the Mayor of Dauphin told me -- in fact I was talking to him twice today -- and he looked me up, I didn't look him up; and he was amazed that the government would have the gall to refer this Bill to the Committee of the Whole rather than to Law Amendments. He said, "I didn't know. I didn't know that at all." Sixty thousand other people didn't know it that signed this petition, Mr. Speaker, 60,000 other ones didn't know it.

Now my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party referred to the dreamers across the way. There's an old adage that says, "Laugh and the world laughs with you. Snore and you sleep alone," and my honourable friends should wake up once in awhile and pay attention to what the people of the province are saying. Do you know, my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare will have to adjust the whole schedule of fees on social allowance to take care of the increased amount.

MR. SPEAKER: please, the honourable member promised me faithfully that he would stay with the amendment to the but I think he's straying away.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I should have said my honourable dreamers across the way, but I will try and stick to the amendment as I said that I would.

The amendment points up the fact that the government has not yet recognized the impact that the tax will have on the economy of the province. They have not realized that, and I am absolutely certain that my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne had no notion at all that there was going to be a five percent sales tax when he introduced his resolution on Page 13 of today's Orders of the Day. He had no idea that there was going to be a five percent sales tax in Manitoba or he never would have introduced a resolution of the kind and nature that he did.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well he hasn't introduced it yet.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Because you know what -- you're right. My honourable friend says that he hasn't introduced it yet. He ducked out today when his name was called. He ducked out because it was embarrassing to him to introduce the resolution, and my guess is, Mr. Speaker, that when the vote is called on the amendment that is before us now, that one or two of the backbenchers across the way will duck out, but if we get about four of them ducking out that will suit us right down to the ground because we now have the assurance of the NDP and we can certainly count on all members of the Social Credit Party to vote with us. We can count on that and the Member for Churchill --(Interjection)-- Well he voted with us one way today so we're encouraged by his actions today and tonight. And surely, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, as I have said, the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, he had no notion, no indication there was going to be a sales tax. No notion or he would never have put on this resolution.

My honourable friend the Minister of Highways and Conservation said at that very important meeting at Neepawa - in December wasn't it? Well, he said there's going to be a sales tax maybe but it's not going to last long. Well the paper reports that. It says it will only -- the sales tax is only going to be put on to pay off the provincial debt and that's only going to take a couple of weeks and then we'll throw it out. And my honourable friend the Member for Virden, I don't recall whether -- well I know he was at that historical meeting. I don't recall what startling statements that he made but he indicated that there might be a sales tax. He indicated that there might be. My honourable friend the Minister of Highways, I believe there were two or three Cabinet Ministers that day that let the cat out of the bag, so to speak, but my honourable friend the Member for -- the Provincial Secretary isn't it? The cabinet change posts so often I have an awful time keeping up to them, but he said on far more than one occasion that there was no special reason for these taxes anyway; they just happened to need a certain amount of money and they, I suppose this time they settled on the sales tax. It was the heat tax they settled on before.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly look forward with a great deal of interest - and that is an understatement - with a great deal of interest to see what some of the backbenchers will do when the vote is called on this one. Because this amendment, what does it say? It just simply says, "Let's refer this Bill to the Law Amendments and let's give everybody in the Province of Manitoba the opportunity to come into Room 254 and tell us what they think of Bill 56. --(Interjection)-- There's not enough room there in 256? Get the Winnipeg Arena, they say, because there's going to be a lot of people there. Well I guess there's nothing in our rule book to say that we can't do that, because the Law Amendments the Law Amendments Committee can meet, I suppose, anywhere in the Province of Manitoba like the Cabinet choose to do on so many occasions. And incidentally, do you know, Mr. Speaker, the first place in the Province of Manitoba that the Cabinet met outside of the buildings?

A MEMBER: Neepawa?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Neepawa. That's right. Now you know, Mr. Speaker, I'm simply amazed at how little that the backbenchers of the government know of what is being done by the frontbenchers. I'm simply amazed at how little they know on so many matters, and I promised that I would stick to the amendment but I want to cite one example that happened today. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, when asked to name the members of the Law Reform Committee, wasn't it, that we were talking about, said that they were appointed by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and I suppose that their names would appear in one of the Gazettes. Now I wish that -- I subscribe to the Gazette because it doesn't cost me anything, and I wish that a lot of these regulations that are passed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, that they would put a little note on the outside of the Gazette and refer me to page so and so for the regulations. Why, the backbenchers once again they claim to me outside of

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).....the House that they didn't know the Cabinet Ministers were going to raise their own salaries, and yet it was done by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council on September 7th. They didn't know anything about it till two months after.

Well, Mr. Speaker, surely, surely to goodness we can expect some support from some of the backbenchers opposite on this one, because if they vote against this one they know what they're voting against. You know what you're voting against if you vote against this one, my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne. You know what you're voting against. My honourable friend the Member for Churchill, my honourable friend the

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm sure the honourable gentleman has no idea of any threat when he finishes that conversation.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I've been trying to draw their attention to how important this is and if they vote against this amendment they're denying the people of Manitoba the right to register their complaint about the sales tax that is set out in Bill 56, and so I warn some of you backbenchers -- the honourable backbenchers, the honourable backbenchers -- the position you're placing yourselves in if you vote against this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member for Logan has a motion before the House for the adjournment of the debate, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington.

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

.....continued on next page

MR. LYON: Would you be good enough, Sir, to call the second readings of Bills 17, 32 and 38, and then if we could . . . well, maybe if we proceed that far for the time being.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 17. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

MR. HILLHOUSE: If the honourable member would have no objection . . .

MR. GREEN: No objection at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well the big objection I have to this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that it's not bringing about uniformity in our law in Manitoba. My understanding is that anyone who held a Crown grant which was issued prior to 1930 and in which mines and minerals was excepted, the mines and minerals so excepted did not include sand and gravel. Now by this amendment here you are in effect saying that any person who holds a Crown grant under the old Provincial Lands Act or under the present Crown Lands Act, where mines and minerals are excepted there is included in the definition of mines and minerals so excepted, sand and gravel.

Now that in essence is what you are doing here. I feel that we have as a province taken part in the committee on uniformity of legislation, and we have tried as near as possible to bring about the laws in our province in uniformity with the laws of other common law provinces, and to me this is a departure. In fact, it's giving legislative sanction to a differentiation which does exist just now but which in my opinion has no right to exist. I know of instances where there are four individual farmers on a section of land, and I know of instances where one farmer in his Crown grant which was issued prior to 1930 from the Federal Government, had mines and minerals excepted, but under the definition which the Federal Government placed on mines and minerals they did not include in that definition sand and gravel. Yet on the other hand there is an adjoining farmer on another quarter section. He perhaps bought his land from the old Manitoba Farm Lands Board or from some other Crown agency after 1930, and his mines and minerals are excepted from his grant, and within the definition of mines and minerals is sand and gravel, and that has been the law in this province since 1930.

Now I think it's discriminating against people who acquired their land from the Crown. It's true in one instance they acquired their land from the Crown on the right of Canada and in the other instance they acquired their land from the Crown on the right of Manitoba, but in the interests of uniformity I feel that this legislation should not be brought in; in fact it should be in the reverse. We should try to bring our definition of mines and minerals in line with the definition of mines and minerals that exists in respect of federal grants, and for that reason I don't intend to support this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the Honourable Member for Inkster has leave to allow that matter to stand. Bill No. 32. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for my Leader.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, my concern in this particular bill that is before us goes beyond really the immediate bill itself and refers to the overall proposition of sewage lagoons in the Province of Manitoba. It seems to me that the example that we have before us here and where the government is now proceeding to propose some legislation, brings up many questions as to the position that the Department of Health takes in these matters. In the particular case of the Portage lagoon itself where the troubles have developed, I wonder exactly what checks the Department of Health have conducted. I understand, for example, that a certain restaurant about a mile away from the lagoon had its well checked some time after the construction of the lagoon, that the water was found to be unsatisfactory and the well was condemned. This particular restaurant then had to proceed and obtain its water supply elsewhere. Meanwhile, directly across the road, just across the section road from the lagoon itself, there was a dairy herd. Now I was interested in the area of the lagoon along with the Member for Portage, and I called on this particular farm and I understand that the water supply for this dairy herd just 99 feet across the section line from the lagoon itself was not checked. Now maybe the Minister can advise me that this was not so and that that check was conducted, but I have no indication that it was and I think the question arises then with the Minister as to what position exactly does the Department of Health take in these matters. Are they really conducting a proper analysis and a proper check of the problem? Have they proceeded to investigate all of the wells

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) in the area since that time? Have they taken all the steps that are necessary to ensure that there is no health problem involved with this particular lagoon that has developed a very serious seepage problem. I would like to hear from the Minister before we conclude the debate on this particular bill what steps the Department has in fact taken.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that when an individual in the Province of Manitoba wants to put up a septic field for his own home he has to proceed to a fairly comprehensive analysis. An inspector comes out, inspects the ground, inspects the plans, determines whether or not he can proceed to put in the septic field, and he must get a permit before it's done. We have limitations as to the size of lots that we will allow people to put septic fields in. And here we have a situation of a very large lagoon dealing with a large community. What checks in fact have been conducted? So I think this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, should prompt a definite statement by the Minister of Health and any other Ministers involved in this as to what is it that the province is doing to ensure (a) the health of people where lagoons are established, and some assurance that the lagoons in fact are going to be effective.

We've discussed this in the House on a number of occasions before, whether lagoons were the right answer to sewage problems for our various towns and cities or whether they were not. Certainly here in the Winnipeg area there's been a great deal of controversy about the sewage lagoons around the city. When one was proposed some years ago one of the municipalities adjoining Winnipeg objected most strenuously to any lagoon being built in that particular area.

Now we've asked the government on a number of occasions, do they recommend that lagoons be the answer to sewage problems or have they another suggestion. Now this bill that's before us now I think brings the matter to a head. We simply can't keep on either recommending to municipalities that they do this and then bailing them out when they get in trouble. I think the government has to decide whether or not they recommend them, and if they do then set up a system whereby there is some assurance that they are going to be effective and not cause other troubles in that particular area.

So while I don't intend to oppose second reading of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we can get a clear-cut statement from the Minister of Health as to the steps taken by his department in the case of this one lagoon in Portage la Prairie where troubles have developed, and the assurances that he can give the House that in fact every aspect of the health of people in that area, and if a dairy herd is involved, the health of the people who deal with that particular milk shed; and then beyond this one particular case, if he's not prepared to give us a statement at this time on this bill, that he can give us a statement some time during the course of the estimates as to the policy of the government overall on the construction of lagoons and the insurance that they can give to the various towns and municipalities that, in addition to the health consideration, there is some check made as to the efficiency of these lagoons, and where they are not going to be effective and they can't work, then what recommendation is the department prepared to give to that particular municipality. Because it seems to me that we are probably going to have an increase in these lagoons for various towns. With the assistance now being given and the urging given to many of our rural areas to proceed with sewage and water systems, more and more of them will be proceeding with this, and yet the soil conditions in many of the areas are not suitable. So somebody somewhere along the line has to give these people some advice.

Now it's well and fine to say, "Well the consulting engineers should do this." In this particular case, the City of Portage la Prairie did have consulting engineers and yet it seems that we're faced with problems and the government has to come in and take some particular steps, so I would hope that the Minister of Health, along with his colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs, if not on this Bill can give us at some stage an overall position of the Provincial Government insofar as lagoons, what steps they are taking to ensure that this does not recur, and on this particular Bill an assurance of the Minister of Health that all the steps have been taken necessary to protect the health of the people in the area.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the views on liquor are as varied as the sections in this Bill, but on this subject I have respect for any opinion at variance with my own as long as that opinion is sincerely and conscientiously held. At the same time I have nothing but contempt for any individual who advances an opinion for his own self-interest.

My approach to the question of liquor is based on two fundamental premises: 1. That the state cannot legislate sumptuary habits any more than it can make an immoral person moral or a dishonest person honest. And, 2. The state should not interfere with the liberties and rights of an individual except only for the general good, and then only when the methods used can be effective and can be observed and respected by all reasonable citizens.

In the field of sumptuary habits the history of state interference has been a dismal failure. In fact, its interference in most instances has had the opposite effect. My colleague the Member for Gladstone deplores the fact that there has been an increase in the number of teenagers now imbibing, but I wonder if the honourable member in the figures which he quoted took into consideration the increase in the teenage population in this province, and I wonder too if he took the percentage of the teenagers in this province and compared it with the number of teenagers who have been convicted of offenses under the Liquor Act, whether he would find that there was such a large increase in drinking among the teenage population.

But I think that there are two things that we must consider in respect of teenagers, and that is this. We are not legalizing drinking by teenagers so anything that we do in this Act should have no effect on the increase of their drinking; and the other matter which we should consider too is this: that if there is teenage drinking in this province, that is a problem that the parents of these teenagers must face up to, and I do not think that there's anything that we can do, by legislation or otherwise, to take the place of a parent towards a child.

Now the Honourable Member for Gladstone has also suggested, as was recommended in the Bracken Report, that there should be a review of our liquor laws. Well, Mr. Speaker, I feel that in introducing this Bill as it has been introduced, we are in effect reviewing our liquor laws because the minute we bring into this House an amendment to any existing Act we are putting the whole principle and all the clauses of that Act into debate, and I think that we as members of this House, representing 57 different constituencies, surely should be aware of the consensus of the people of this province, and we should be aware as to whether or no there should be any changes made in our liquor laws.

I was glad to notice in the Bill that we are legalizing the making of beer and wine in homes for home consumption, because to me it has always seemed an absolute absurdity to think that an individual in Manitoba could obtain a license from Ottawa to operate a registered chemical still of not exceeding one gallon in capacity, make his own liquor, make it legally under the federal law, and then find out once he had made it and had it in his own home he was guilty of a breach of the Manitoba Law in having liquor not purchased from the Commission. Now by bringing in the amendment which the Attorney-General has brought in - and I compliment him for that amendment - we are going to make the actions of a great number of our citizens lawful which were previously unlawful, and I don't think there was any intent on the part of any of these citizens to break the law. I'm quite sure that there are many members in this House who know numerous people who make their own wine and who make their own beer. As a matter of fact, I don't think there's very many country stores -- in fact you can even go into stores in Winnipeg, the chain stores, and you'll see malt barley on the shelves for sale, and there's a great number of people buy that malting barley and do make their own beer, and I'm glad that it's being legalized.

Now there are a great number of other matters that I'd like to refer to in this Bill but time will not permit, but I would like to refer to a letter which I received from the Selkirk Branch No. 42 of the Royal Canadian Legion in which they enclose a copy of a brief, which I believe was handed to the Attorney-General by a joint Veterans Association body which makes representations to the Attorney-General respecting amendments to our liquor law insofar as veterans' organizations were concerned. And I believe that this brief dealt with several matters. The first was that there should be a special section or part to the Liquor Act which dealt with veterans' clubs alone. The veterans of Manitoba feel that their clubs cannot be treated in the same manner, in the same way, as other clubs or other organizations, and that there should be a special section of the Act dealing with them.

Now, the veterans' organizations of Manitoba also felt that they should be given the right to sell wine and spirits without a dining room license. They argue that we are the only province in Canada, I believe, that does not permit a veterans' organization to sell wine and spirits

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) unless they have a dining room. I think most members will realize that the veterans who do attend veterans' clubs usually attend in the evening; they usually attend these clubs after dinner. And most of these clubs too are sort of cramped in space and they have not sufficient room to provide dining room facilities, but in addition to that these veterans, when they do go to their clubs in the evening, it's usually after dinner and if they do eat anything it would be a light snack there, and I think that it would make their club rooms a little more enjoyable and altogether more amenable if they were allowed to sell wine and spirits.

Another thing which they did mention to the Attorney-General in the brief was the fact that under the laws that exist just now there has to be 100 members in a club before it can obtain a license under The Liquor Act. Now that number may be realistic as far as the City of Winnipeg is concerned or as far as some of the surrounding areas of Winnipeg are concerned, but it's not realistic in certain parts of Manitoba, and the veterans of Manitoba feel that the number should be reduced to 50.

Another matter which they took exception to was the requirements that only a licensed beer waiter or bartender could serve drinks. Now they feel that up until the evening that a member of a veterans' organization should be able to go up to the bar, buy his beer, take it to the table, without having a beer waiter come to the table and serve him and go to a bartender and get it. It means a duplication of employees and cuts down in their expenses.

There's a still further matter to which they referred and that was the question of members of a ladies auxiliary affiliated with a veterans' organization. They felt that the member of the ladies auxiliary who had a card in that auxiliary should entitle her to attend at the veterans' club, not as a guest but as an auxiliary member. And I would ask the Honourable the Attorney-General to take that into consideration.

A still further matter which they referred to is the question of Remembrance Day. They feel very strongly that no permit should be granted for the sale or consumption of beer or spirits on Remembrance Day, and I think most veterans in this House and most veterans in Manitoba fully appreciate the reasons why veterans feel that way.

These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the observations that I have to make relative to this Bill. I intend to support it. I think it's a good Bill, and I think that some of the changes that have been recommended in there are timely and should be endorsed by this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I would move, with the Member from Logan seconding that, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would be good enough now to call the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary on Page 20 of our Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, WHEREAS the Provincial Secretary on Thursday, the 8th day of December, 1966, presented a White Paper entitled "Citizens' Remedies Code" to the Legislature of Manitoba; AND WHEREAS copies of the said Paper were distributed to all members of the House and reproduced in Hansard;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable and expedient that the White Paper entitled "Citizens' Remedies Code" presented to the Legislature of Manitoba and legislation arising therefrom be referred to the Standing Committee of the Legislature on Statutory Regulations and Orders;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the White Paper entitled Citizens' Remedies Code presented to the Legislature of Manitoba by the Provincial Secretary on Thursday, the 8th day of December, 1966, and legislation arising therefrom, be referred to the Standing Committee of the Legislature on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, when presenting the White Paper, at the conclusion there was a paragraph which said that because of the many proposals contained in the White Paper were - of the proposals many of them were new, it was hoped that there would be the widest possible public discussion and consideration in order that practical and workable measures might be designed for the benefit of the citizens of Manitoba, and I added at that time that at

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) an appropriate time in the proceedings of the Legislature I would present for consideration a resolution which would refer the White Paper to a committee of the House and also legislation that might arise from the White Paper.

I can report to the members that legislation that we would propose to have considered is in the course of preparation and I would expect that there would be some legislation at an early date that would be ready to go forward if this resolution receives the approval of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of referring the White Paper, as I have indicated, to a committee is to provide an opportunity for the committee and indeed the members of the Legislature itself to express their opinions with respect to the principles which are outlined in the White Paper and cover a number of matters of very important consideration to the House and to the public and it is thought advisable that there ought to be the widest possible ventilation of views with respect to them. We do not consider that we are irrevocably bound to any particular means of achieving the objectives which are set out. In other words the White Paper is a statement of principles which we hope to achieve and it may well be that as the result of public discussion, as the result of debate here in the Legislature, as a result of consideration in the Committee that many of the ideas will be refined and improved and if that should happen I'm sure that it would be to the benefit of all concerned.

There has been some public discussion following the White Paper, most of which turned on the question of the proposal with respect to the Legislative Commissioner. That seems to have attracted more public attention and more public consideration than some of the other matters which are of very far reaching importance as well. I would like to say in respect of the many proposals that it may well be that it would be in the public interest to consider many of the points that have been recommended or suggested in the public consideration that has been given to these matters. For example, there were some exclusions suggested in the White Paper with respect to the Legislative Commissioner and it may very well be that we ought to reduce those exclusions from the operation of the Legislative Commissioner. There was some views expressed with respect to the proposal that matters would be brought to the attention of the Legislative Commissioner through a member of the Legislature and I outlined as best I could at the time the considerations which led us to follow what has been the approach in the United Kingdom Parliament in this regard. However, if it is thought on balance that that is not a workable procedure we may very well find it advisable in the public interest to change it.

There was a suggestion that perhaps the person who would be the Registrar under the Consumer Protection Bureau might serve as the Legislative Commissioner combining two functions in one person, and here again we would be more than prepared to consider arguments for and against that proposal and to decide what would be considered in the -- again in the public interest. I mention these matters, Mr. Speaker, simply to indicate that we are basically concerned here with a set of principles in respect of the matters that are set out in the White Paper and are more than happy to consider any views that may be expressed that would have the effect of improving the legislation, improving the proposals in their workability for the people of the province.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as I visualize it this debate itself, that is to say this reference of the White Paper to the Committee will offer an opportunity for debate here in the Chamber when the -- if the resolution needs the approval of the House there will be opportunities in the Committee for further consideration and debate and of course there will also be an opportunity for consideration when the legislation itself in its various aspects are before the Legislature and before the Committee, and on that basis I recommend the resolution to the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I don't rise to oppose the resolution, in fact I intend to support it. But I say this with some reservations I must admit because I'm just afraid that in a number of cases the resolution is really a stalling device on the part of the government. Once again rather than taking action they are proposing to stall this. Now I'm all in favour of having proper study of all the proposals that come before this House and I'm quite prepared to have this go to the Committee provided the government in fact intends to take action.

But let me give you one example, Mr. Speaker, of some of the obvious, in fact sickening delaying tactics of this government on some of the items that are today presented in their White Paper. I'm referring to one item in particular that I have been concerned about which I think is important insofar as the people of Manitoba, which took us four years to get the government to show some concern in and then we've had three years -- two years at least -- of absolute failure to act -- and I'm referring to the matter of the ombudsman, a public protector. Starting in

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) 1962 resolutions were presented to this House on this subject. The government opposed them steadily. Then lo and behold in the Throne Speech of 1965 a little item appeared. Well prior to that Throne Speech we had introduced a resolution - in that case it was introduced by my colleague the Member for Assiniboia - asking that the government proceed with the establishment of this particular office. The resolution was introduced as I say prior to the House being called. It appeared on the Order Paper that was published when the House began. It was introduced in the House on the 26th of February. The House opened in that particular case on the 22nd of February so there was no delay in the resolution coming forward. And what happened then? Well, Madam Speaker ruled as follows, and I refer to the Journals on the 26th of February, 1965, page 29: "In considering the resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I would like to draw the attention of the honourable member to the reference in the Throne Speech which read as follows -- this is a quote from the Throne Speech: "Policy respecting highway safety, a racing commission, legal aid to indigents, the constitution, ways and means of safeguarding individual rights vis-a-vis the State, the Canada Pension Plan and certain business legislation are among the other matters with which you'll be asked to deal." And I'm quoting now from the ruling of Madam Speaker. "The proposed resolution of the honourable member anticipates the announcement made in the Throne Speech and contravenes our Rule No. 31 Rules and Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and in my opinion the proposed resolution of the honourable member is out of order." That's back on the 26th of February, 1965, Mr. Speaker, when a resolution that has previously been introduced for four years by members on this side of the House is ruled out of order by Madam Speaker because it anticipates action by the government.

MR. LYON: I'll be quite happy to enlighten my honourable friend on a point of order. The rule is that the question of anticipation arises if a matter is appointed for debate. If he would read the rule, I think it would be quite clear to him.

MR. MOLGAT: Ah, well my friend then indicates we are going to continue debating forever without the government taking action.

MR. LYON: On the same point of order the rule is quite clear. It is to prevent the same subject being debated three or four times. It is meant to convenience proper debate within the House and not have the kind of useless repetition that we very often do.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, then we have a new definition of what the Throne Speech is. The Throne Speech, which is supposed to be a declaration of government policy, now becomes simply an indication of what the government would like to have debated. This is what my honourable friend says, and he's the Leader of the House, and his statement -- and, Mr. Speaker, I hope you'll keep this one in mind the next time that anticipation comes up -- my honourable friend has just declared that from now on we can expect that anything that appears in the Throne Speech is not government policy. It is items for debate.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I rise now on a point of privilege because I didn't say that. My honourable friend can convolute and twist and distort as he is wont to do all he wishes but I didn't say it, I'll stand by what is on the record. If he would sometimes crack the Order Book which I'm afraid he never does he might find some considerable education in it.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, the crown prince is obviously not in his best of moods tonight and I regret that I'm touching on tender points with him. If he's unhappy about the interpretation that I've placed upon his remarks I regret that that is so. I would certainly like to know whether something that appears in the Throne Speech is government policy or not. I must confess that when I look at the results I can only conclude that it isn't government policy, because back in 1965 my honourable friends had in their Throne Speech then that they were going to do something about safeguarding the citizen vis-a-vis the state. We on this side of the House were prevented from presenting a resolution and debating it because they were going to do something. The Leader of the House now says they weren't, they were going to debate it. Well, all right. What happens in 1966, Mr. Chairman? Well nothing happened. Not a single thing happened from the government side between '65 and '66. We were exactly in the same position when '66 came along, in spite of the debating subject that my honourable friends had introduced in the Throne Speech, they took no action, and so in 1966 we proceeded to discuss the matter further. It had gone to committee. The committee studied the matter. We in fact had the public protector or the ombudsman from New Zealand that appeared before us, gave us a very interesting report. We had statements by the - I don't suppose it was a law reform committee - but one of the committees that study this subject recommending this to the House. The Provincial Secretary who - no pardon me, the gentleman who was then

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) Attorney-General, who is now Provincial Secretary, proceeded to bring in a report to the House, but a report that wasn't going to proceed with any action at all and we proposed at that time that there should be action that the debating society that my honourable friend the Leader of the House wanted to promote should lead to some decisions. And so we introduced once again the suggestion that the government should act, and Madam Speaker then ruled as follows - and I quote from the 26th of April, 1966: "The subject matter contained in the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has been dealt with at the present Session. The Committee appointed by the House this morning has been instructed to consider this matter. Therefore the Legislature has given its decision on the matter." So '65 the government puts it in the Throne Speech, nothing happens; '66 it's referred to a Committee and when we try and get some action out of the Committee and a definite decision, nothing happens. An election is called; the committee dies. Nothing happens. This year we propose again the resolution

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the Honourable Leader but it is now 10:00 o'clock and . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before proposing the motion for adjournment I think honourable members would like to be made aware of the fact there will be a Memorial Service tomorrow morning at 10:30 in the St. Boniface Basilica for His Excellency the late Governor-General. I would move, seconded by the

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt my honourable friend just before he places the motion for adjournment. The Honourable the First Minister the other day suggested to us if I recall correctly that the Memorial Service for the late Governor-General was a sort of an ecumenical type of a service. I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister could indicate to us please if this is so whether invitations have been extended to government and others to attend the service at the Basilica or is it a sort of a self-contained service to which an invitation has been extended to the Members of the House.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made it clear but in any case I'm glad to repeat that the service that will be held at the Basilica is open to all who care to attend. I have been especially asked to convey that invitation to members of the Legislative Assembly so that all honourable ladies and gentlemen of the Assembly who wish to attend are of course most welcome. I think that it might be useful if those who are going, particularly party leaders, were to inform my office so that we in turn could inform those in charge of the service. It was described to me as an ecumenical service. I take that to mean that it is open to all comers but I expect that the service itself will be the memorial mass. I'm afraid I haven't used the correct term for that service but members will understand what I mean.

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

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