

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 24, 1972

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed this afternoon I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my right where there are 60 students from the Canadian Nazarene College, Grades 10 to 12 standing. These students are from the Provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and Quebec and they are under the direction of Mr. Taylor. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members I bid you welcome to our Chamber.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments that have been addressed to the resolution dealing with my salary. I appreciate that the kind words that were addressed to me were tongue in cheek in some instances with smaller or larger tongue as the case may be. I would like to deal with each and every contribution that all of the members have made but I would like to start perhaps -- this isn't an unusual technique but I would like to start with the comments of the Honourable Member from Morris particularly in the hope that their remarks can be addressed to him while he is in the Chamber. There are others that did address themselves to the Attorney-General's estimates that are not here now and during the course of the next several minutes I assume that many more of the honourable members may find their way to their seats.

But the Honourable Member from Morris concerned himself primarily with an issue that the Honourable Member from Emerson sought to raise in connection with the administration of the Liquor Control Commission and, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Emerson read into the record a rather lengthy letter from the licensee of a hotel in a small community in Manitoba -- Tolstoi, and also I believe read into the record the reply of the Secretary of the Liquor Control Commission. Prior to the Honourable Member for Morris speaking the Honourable Member from Emerson had indicated his concern about what I believe he deemed to be rather arbitrary, autocratic high handed and so on techniques of the Liquor Control Commission. I wish the Honourable Member from Emerson were here but in his absence I wish to deal with his comments and the comments of the Honourable Member from Morris on this question. These honourable gentlemen in all deference and with all respect to their viewpoint fail to recognize that what the Liquor Control Commission is administering is not free enterprise and the free exercise of individual entrepreneurs in society. It is not The Liquor Commission Act, it is The Liquor Control Commission Act. This is not unregulated free enterprise, it's strictly controlled enterprise and in most instances the licence that is granted to an individual licensee is a monopoly licence in respect to the sale of alcoholic beverage in the community. Such is certainly the case in many, many small communities in Manitoba, and as I indicated in my opening remarks if the honourable gentlemen had been in their seats and listening they would have noted that what I said about the policy and principle of the Liquor Control Commission was that they gave every consideration to the practical application of the right of the licensee to sell alcoholic beverage within the terms of his licence but subject always to the overriding consideration of the public interest and that is very important to remember.

The honourable members surely must recognize that the whole apparatus of the Liquor Control Commission was set into being as a result of decisions made in this Legislature many years ago. That apparatus hasn't been twisted or altered to conform to any new thinking on the part of the government of this day. The same type of administrative arrangements, control arrangements exist today as they did when the Honourable Member from Morris and the Honourable Member from Emerson participated on the government side of this House. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to take the time of the House to read into the record what the honourable member from the opposition should recall and these are the principles of application to the sale and distribution of alcoholic products recommended by a commission established in this province that reported in 1955, a commission headed by a former Premier of this province, a sometimes Whig, a sometimes Tory, but I don't hold political views in affiliations in the past against any honourable gentleman; I don't suggest that because the late Honourable John Bracken was a Tory at one time associated with the government of this province that that somehow made him

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) biased against fair and openminded people in this province; and that seems to be the indication given by the Honourable Member from Morris that simply because a gentleman who is presently Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission is a past President of the New Democratic Party there's something sinister, or there's something wrong about that. It was all right in 1969 to have the President of the Progressive Conservative Party a Chairman of the Minimum Wage Board but to suggest that a present Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission was a past president of the New Democratic Party and that's something very heinous and suspect. I think it's demeaning of not only the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission but everyone who takes political activity in society seriously. I don't think honourable members would want to damn anyone by feint praise or by innuendo for having stood for political viewpoint in society whether it be Conservative, Liberal, Social Credit or even New Democratic Party. And I resent, Mr. Chairman, the time from time suggestion that there's something wrong in boards or commissions reflecting a cross section of political viewpoints and even reflecting in part the viewpoint of the government in power.

I would like, Mr. Chairman, to take the time and trouble of the House to refer to the Commission of Inquiry ably chaired by the honourable gentleman I have referred to. The report published in 1955 at Page 347, Mr. Chairman, had some very significant things to say and it continues on Page 348, in respect to what was entitled the beneficiaries of the liquor trade and here dealing primarily with those who obtain licences to sell alcoholic beverage. And remember that the obtaining of a licence is not a matter of right, it's under the strict control because of government because alcohol is not just another food; it's not a food, it's a drug, a drug that to some creates very devastating results. It's something that is not to be treated lightly; it's something that has always had the consideration of society in a very formal and very intense way and the regulations, the basis of the administration of the Liquor Control Commission was the basis of very intense study, argument, discussion and final elaboration in the report to which I allude.

In the report of the Manitoba Liquor Inquiry Commission at page 347, Mr. Chairman, I read as follows: "Recommendation No. 20: Treat all beneficiaries of the trade justly but let no provincial statute make any of them a favoured section of our economic life. Competition as a factor in determining prices to breweries has disappeared and something must be found to take its pace, otherwise brewers will continue to be a favoured beneficiary of the present law." What is to be done? We must take The Liquor Act, we must make the Liquor Act a control Act, and control the printer pursuant to instructions I assume has had written in bold black-faced type "A CONTROL ACT" which it is assumed to be, not the half control which it actually is. And I pause, here, Mr. Chairman, to reflect on the admonitions of the Honourable Member for Emerson and the Honourable Member from Morris implying that there is far too much control in the administration of licensing on the part of the Liquor Control Commission.

And I go on, Mr. Chairman. Give the Liquor Control Commission power to fix prices to brewers as it now fixes them to other licensees, but make its decisions tentative until they shall have been approved by an impartial board. The Public Utilities Commission type of approach is the modern world's answer to problems of this character. But the State too is a beneficiary of the liquor trade. Let there be no apology for that. The government's "share" of liquor profits now amounts to 20 percent of the total business, but that is not the government's share it is the people's share, a recovery for them of part of the community's liquor costs.

And I wish to digress here for a moment and thank the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre for his contribution to the debate, because let no one in this House consider that the revenues obtained from the operation of the sale of alcoholic spirits is a positive thing in society because for all of the revenues that flow into the coffers of the public purse many are the costs to society generally from the abuses of alcoholic consumption. And I don't need to list for the honourable members here a catalogue of the ills and abuses in society that can be directly reflected to excessive consumption of alcohol.

And I go on, Mr. Speaker, let liquor prices be high enough to prevent excessive use, not high enough to make bootlegging uncontrollable; give every section of the liquor trade an adequate return on its investment but place any surplus above that in the coffers of the state for lessening of taxes and payment of social service and related costs.

And I wish briefly to acknowledge and appreciate the contribution of the Honourable Member from Churchill when he indicated his concern that the revenues that are obtained from the sale of alcoholic beverage be used wisely and well and to reflect the need for rehabilitation of those who have suffered from excessive abuse of -- in the consumption of alcohol.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd)

Recommendation 21, I would particularly to have liked the Honourable Member from Morris and the Honourable Member from Emerson to have heard. Recommendation 21, Mr. Chairman: "Recognize hotel proprietors as legitimate businessmen but reframe the law so that it will not tend to make of them mainly purveyors of beer for private gain rather than hotel proprietors for the provision of rooms and meals for the travelling public". I want to digress here for a second, Mr. Chairman, and point out that the present Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission and the other commissioners have taken the principles of this report very seriously. They are concerned with excessive consumption on the part of some in licensed premises and they took drastic steps earlier on this year to bring home to licensees that this Liquor Control Commission will not tolerate abuses of the privileges they have as licensees. There must be a real effort to control excessive consumption.

Recommendation No. 22, Mr. Chairman: "Reverse the trend which is now making of many hotels particularly the new ones a mere front for their beer parlors. Let future licenses be granted not on a basis that will tempt the operator to stimulate the sale of beer but rather on a basis that will encourage him to raise the standard of the hotel rooms and dining room service which he offers the public. Seek to reverse the developing trend which is transforming some clubs into glorified beer parlors. Today's clubs are not proprietary ones in the old sense and most of them are well conducted but profits from beer are tempting some to become beer parlors in disguise to the detriment of their original purpose and with potentialities of new difficulties in liquor law administration".

24. "Remove as far as possible the temptation of a powerful trade to dominate the free choice of the community in its attitude towards the use of liquor. Excessive liquor profits are not necessary to secure the liquor demands of the public and they place in the hands of the beneficiaries an unequal advantage when controversial issues are being determined".

These are bold and powerful statements of opinion and principle, Mr. Chairman, which I wish the honourable gentlemen who represent the constituencies of Emerson and Morris would listen to, read by reference to the report of the Chairman of the Manitoba Liquor Inquiry Commission or at least read the result of my comments in Hansard. And I trust that their honourable colleagues will draw that to their attention.

Recommendation No. 25. "Grant no mark-ups to new licences," and I want to repeat that: "Grant no mark-ups to new licensees that will give to them a rate of financial gain in excess of that of other retail businesses. Artificial stimulation of consumption resulting from high profits has no justifiable place in government liquor control administration. As far as possible make public drinking outlets incidental to food or other community services, not places where nothing can be done but drink liquor."

26. "Let the taxing power of the province be used for liquor control purposes not primarily for the increase of liquor profits. Heavy taxation can be either a form of prohibition or a source of government revenue. When raised beyond a certain point it defeats both purposes by encouraging bootlegging and illicit manufacture."

27. "See to it that the economy is fair to all but not generous to the liquor interest whose profits, prices and markets are under control of the government than the private interest whose profits must be earned, prices determined and markets secured in the severest kind of competition."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to underline to the Honourable Members from Morris and Emerson that the marketing of alcoholic beverage in Manitoba is not the selling of cheese or eggs; it's a strictly controlled sale of an intoxicating drug and as such must be controlled under strict and determined regulations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): . . . Minister permit a question?

MR. MACKLING: I will answer questions at the conclusion of my remarks and as a matter of fact I have some comments I think to make about the honourable member's contribution later on.

I would like to continue. The Honourable Member from Morris, Mr. Chairman, said among other things that the operator, the letters that were read -- and not having the Hansard available immediately I would like to refer to the references that the honourable member made as perhaps better transcribed by the newspaper than in my somewhat elongated shorthand. These are some of the things that he said and this is from the Winnipeg Tribune of today's date. "Warner Jorgenson, P.C. Morris, accused the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission of imposing

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) bureaucratic and unsuitable standards on licenced premises in rural communities." And he went on. He went on, Mr. Chairman: "I don't know of anything that is more ridiculous or more crassly stupid," he told the Legislature Thursday during debate, "etc. etc. --(Interjection)-- Well I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, what is crassly stupid. What is crassly stupid, Mr. Chairman, is the suggestion --(Interjection)-- is the suggestion . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the fact that the little red rooster tried to lay an egg when in fact he knows that only chickens can lay eggs is indicative of his irritation at the poignancy of my remarks. Mr. Chairman, what is crassly stupid is the analysis that the honourable member made, because although he is considered to be -- and now I enjoy listening to his debate, he's considered to be one of the better debaters in this House and that I acknowledge. One of the things he ought not to do is to be moved to speak on the basis of hearing some documentation read in this House because he speaks, maybe with his heart but not with his mind and when you speak on the basis of emotion only, you may be unknowingly leading not only yourself astray but all of the honourable members of this House. I would like for the edification of the honourable member to know something of the history --(Interjection)-- well I will pause, Mr. Chairman, because although I too enjoy the jocular habits of my honourable colleagues across the way, I think that it is significant that they should learn something of the facts rather than be kept abysmally ignorant of them.

Mr. Chairman, this government was elected to office in June of 1969. The then Liquor Control Commission presumably had been appointed by representatives of Her Majesty's loyal opposition. In March 4th, 1969, while the Honourable Member from Lakeside was smiling about the prospects of having a great election victory, as he now smiles from the other side of the House, says a member of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition --

A MEMBER: Happier there.

MR. MACKLING: Happier there probably. And the Honourable Member from Morris dreamed of the great new Cabinet position that he would have. The Liquor Control Commission of March 4th, 1969 -- I would like the Honourable Member from Morris to not only speak but to listen sometime -- that commission which was appointed by his administration; I say his, he wasn't part of it, I don't fault him for that, but certainly the Honourable Member from Lakeside confirmed, confirmed a decision taken by the Liquor Control Commission in consultation with the licensee at Tolstoi to terminate the licence, terminate their licence of March 31st, 1972 and that was the kind --(Interjection)-- March 31, 1972 -- and that was the arbitrary dictatorial, unfair, highhanded, autocratic -- autocratic administration for which the Honourable Member from Lakeside and some of his colleagues, the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell and others had appointed.

Now the Honourable Member from Morris has left, I regret that, because that decision confirmed by the Liquor Control Commission appointed by the government that preceded us in office, was taken as a result of discussions and considerations with that licensee. --(Interjection)-- Oh that was terrible, autocratic decision.

Let me go further into the facts of this case. It was significant to point out that the building involved was over 60 years old, a similar situation to a small hotel in the Village of Gardenton. Because of the long list of substantial requirements which had been outstanding for many years, the previous Commission decided at the annual meeting of the Licensing Board, as I said, on March 4th, 1969 that the converted house hotel at Tolstoi would be placed on a three-year limit with the licence expiring March 31st, 1972. Now that wasn't a bureaucratic, arbitrary, decision; no it must have been a fair decision because after all it was a board appointed by the previous administration. It should be noted that the licensees attended that Board meeting, were well aware of the situation and according to the commission record, agreed to the three-year limit during which period the Board and the Commission withdrew all requirements except those having to do with basic fire, safety and sanitation. The licensees agreed to this decision which left them free from all capital expenditures over the three-year period. It should be noted also that the records indicate that there had been no renovations or updating on that hotel for a period since 1954, approximately 15 years.

A similar decision was made by the Board regarding the licenced premises at Gardenton except that the Gardenton licenced premises were placed on a one-year life limit. Nothing was heard from the licensees until several months prior to the termination of their three-year life limit period and fairly recently they wrote the commission, and you heard the letter, asking for

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) a reissuance of their license beyond the term set to expire March 31st, 1972 and what did this bureaucratic arbitrary dictatorial board do? They extended the licence for another year. Isn't that shocking; that's destroying the life style of that community isn't it? Isn't that sad and tragic. The freedom -- I'm sorry, it should be noted that the present commission administration which the honourable member so bitterly attacked extended that license and as honourable members can appreciate that license can be extended again; and as the letter indicated the commission suggested that since the licensees don't intend to build, that it'll be open for any other interested person to build another licensed outlet.

And what are the qualifications? I mean what are the demands. They have to build a hotel portion to accommodate four units and that's not inordinate, that's not excessive, that's not designed to frustrate and cripple the life style of small communities. And I suggest to you that hasn't been changed and any suggestion that now this government is trying some way to arbitrarily ram down the throats of small people in rural communities or large people in rural communities or many people in rural communities some different standards, is not only playing with words but it's abusive of the facts. That licensee in Tolstoi was given the freedom from anything but the basic fire, safety and sanitation requirements. Nor does the commission I understand take the position that this is one of generosity but they took this decision for the simple reason that the structure is beyond repair, the amount of money necessary to adequately repair it would amount to an inordinate and undue expense. But certainly the commission didn't want to take away from the community the only licensed premises when there was an obvious need for something in that community. But let me reiterate, Mr. Chairman, the licensee and the licenced premises are not there to assist themselves, it's to assist the public good, the environment in which we operate. And I suggest to you the record indicates that perhaps more could have been done to brighten, refurbish and renovate this place in the many many years it has existed.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Board has taken the attitude in applications that wherever possible they will try particularly in the smaller communities to exercise discretion to ensure that some basic facilities are maintained; but the overriding consideration must be the interests of the people in the community themselves and not the interest solely of the licensee. As I pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that de facto when a license is granted to an individual in a smaller community it's in fact a monopoly, because to grant the licence to another individual in direct competition where there isn't sufficient demand would have the effect of crippling both operations and making for the possibility of not only the demise of both licensees but the possibility of very serious abuse.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that although I report to this House on behalf of the Liquor Control Commission, honourable members communicate freely, the lines of communication are open and uninhibited between the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission and any honourable member of this House; and when honourable members have between sessions, during sessions, at any time approached me with a problem in respect to some application of the Liquor Control Commission Act I have attempted to give them the consideration that I ought to give, but furthermore have urged them to communicate directly with the chairman because they have as much right to information from him as I have.

So, Mr. Chairman, after I hope having dealt perhaps at inordinate length with the question of the operation of that particular licenced operation, I want to move now to much more general remarks in respect to some of the submissions that were made in respect to the operations of my department.

I regret the fact that the Honourable Member from Swan River isn't in his chair because he had a number of remarks addressed to me. Really he covered the waterfront of the department, if I can use that expression. He touched on most of the items and I recognize the sincerity of his concern in respect to some if not all of the items he mentioned. The overriding consideration that seemed to be made by the Honourable Member from Swan River was a concern in respect to the totality of the costs of the estimates reflected by the estimates. And I can assure the honourable member and members of the House that the costs of government generally are not lightly considered by members on this side of the House, but when you have demands for services then those demands for services when met occasion ever burgeoning expense. I indicated in my opening remarks the basis for much of the total increase in my estimates, or the estimates of my department, but let me reiterate them for the benefit of all members of the House. The general salary increases which approximate -- well 15 percent over two years.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) As a matter of fact, as I understand it, a salary adjustment that was negotiated prior to our attaining office involved an expenditure of \$400,000.00. --(Interjection)-- I would prefer to leave the questions to the end if I may because it may be that I will answer his question before I get through.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the Honourable Minister that he has five minutes.

MR. MACKLING: Why, I'm not aware of any curtailment of time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a time limit of 40 minutes.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the rules, the report of the Rules Committee has not been adopted as yet and there is no fixed limitation on the time as yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In our present House rules the time limit is 40 minutes. The proposed House rules are 30 minutes, which we're still operating under the old House rules. I would remind the Honourable Minister that he has five minutes.

MR. MACKLING: I didn't believe that affected committee.

MR. ENNS: Just on the point of order if I may --

MR. MACKLING: Ask a question, then I'll get on . . .

MR. ENNS: Just to further clarify the Chairman's ruling, I think it has been understood that the committee operates under the same rules as the House and that while there has been no adoption of new rules we are under those rules and for that reason your ruling is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well I don't know whether honourable members want their questions answered now or later, it's --(Interjection)-- I believe that I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, point of order been raised by the Honourable Member from Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Will the question as to whether the Attorney-General be given leave to be given extra time to answer our questions be put to the committee for unanimous consent, vote?

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the old House rules and it's very difficult, I'm just as confused as you are. I imagine that if the Attorney-General asked for leave and the House granted it that he will be given leave. --(Interjection)--

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, without wasting precious time, as I understand it we are operating under the old rules and if the Attorney-General chooses at this particular time to use up the 80 hours of the debate on the Attorney-General's estimates we are operating under those circumstances --(Interjection)-- and I know he's not going to do that but I would want you to know, Mr. Chairman, that you are, and the Attorney-General is under no firm specific rules at this particular time, limiting the consideration of his estimates to the five or six hour rule that we have discussed earlier this morning. At this stage of the game, we are still working under the old rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct, The Honourable Attorney-General. You have four minutes.

MR. MACKLING: Pardon me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Four minutes.

MR. MACKLING: Well I lost a minute in the interjections apparently. I think though, Mr. Chairman, I can certainly arrange to carry on and have another forty minutes if that's necessary. I would rather go uninterrupted for maybe ten or fifteen minutes and be able to conclude, but if it's necessary I am sure that one of my colleagues can make a contribution and I can respond to that for another forty minutes. But I don't intend to take other than the time that is necessary to give answers to the questions that have been raised by honourable members.

To reiterate then the major increases in the budget of the Attorney-General's department, as indicated, the general salary increase, which amounts to approximately \$400,000; new positions provided for, 18 new positions in the total department, \$123,600; an increase in the number of men and the cost of RCMP, Royal Canadian Mounted Police services, \$1,200,000; and the significant increase in legal aid appropriation, which I indicated earlier, of a quarter of a million dollars; total of \$1,973,000. Thus the increases are not what I consider inordinate, or excessive.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd)

The Honourable Member from Swan River made something of the boards and commissions. He was concerned about the police commission and of course, the police commission has but recently been formed and will be meeting, as I indicated in my preliminary remarks - it hasn't held any inquiries to date, and the honourable member from Swan River, should be aware of that.

He was concerned with the application of the Lotteries Commission and again voiced a concern that perhaps, because I indicated that there would be some greater control over unlicensed lotteries, that there would be again some concern to frustrate smaller community organizations who wanted to use the technique or a small lottery to raise funds, and again I categorically deny that there is any inhibition or frustration of the right of individual organizations to obtain a license from their individual community for the holding of a lottery within the limits that are prescribed by the regulations, and those regulations were developed after very protracted and considered consideration of what techniques were advisable for lotteries of that scope.

The Honourable Member from Swan River further was concerned about considerations in respect of smaller hotels and I think, Mr. Chairman, that I have adequately dealt with that whole question.

He was concerned as to whether or not there had been any investigations by any departmental staff in any way related to the kind of arbitrary rights that were indicated as possible to some administrative procedures in respect to licenses, and so on, and so far as I know there has not been any application to the courts for leave to seize documents, or files, or records of any kind under any statute of this province that I am aware of except of course the application to the court in a criminal matter in respect to the seizure of records involving The Pas Forestry complex.

He asked a question about the expansion of native constables and I have had communication with the Honourable Member from Swan River in the past about this, and pointed out to him that native constables are in fact employed by the Federal Government under the Indian Affairs Branch, but we have as yet to decide or formulate any separate constables of Metis culture or community in respect to communities that are largely Metis populated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the Honourable Minister that his time has expired.
The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take too much time but I would like to take this opportunity to speak on a couple of items, drugs and alcoholism. I understand that the Attorney-General also deals with pornography and other matters, but I understand that I can speak on it under another department.

A couple of the members made references here to the evils of alcoholism and some alluded to drugs and I think in view of the fact that we have the presidential commission or American commission presently dealing with drugs, and there is a possibility that there may be some canonization of the drug, I think it's important that it gets full discussion in this House, particularly when we know that the LeDain Commission is going to release its report in about two or three weeks and I understand that it's going to be favourable to taking Marijuana out from under the Criminal Code. I think that we should get facts together, and I hope that the Attorney-General thinks it's important enough that he will get someone, some specialist in his department to gather statistical information and data that has been researched throughout the world, because the drug problem, like the alcohol problem, is an old one. In our society it's not, but in Libia, Lebanon, and those countries, the drug problem has practically destroyed some of the nations and I hope that before our government takes any action regarding the LeDain Commission, or makes any recommendations, that they take an awful close look at it, because notwithstanding what LeDain says -- and I say right now I have absolutely no confidence in them, I believe one of the members was using drugs himself, and another member I question very much his ability and integrity to sit on the commission, and I fear that the report that's going to come out is going to be one that's not going to be very favourable to those of us who think drugs are very dangerous. I really urge the Attorney-General to pay close attention with his department in the months ahead regarding drugs because it's an explosion like venereal disease. It's exploding and it is slowly reaching epidemic proportions in highly concentrated areas of a city.

Some of the Members here mentioned about -- I believe the Member for La Verendrye talked about the changing of the laws, lowered the crime rate in British Columbia, and I would

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) like to inform him that I have clippings in front of me here, which, just for highway traffic, I see. This is a clipping from the Tribune last week, I believe, and the headline is "B.C. Leads in Crime". And I would like to just read a brief section of it to show you the connection between drugs and crime.

"The western flow has been for the most part beneficial but it has also brought many misfits, not the least of whom are drug addicts, whose contribution to the crime rate is sustained by a need for far greater income than most legitimate occupations can fill. In 1970 the highest rate for murder, manslaughter, rape, breaking and entering, theft over \$50 and petty theft" and they go on in this article to show that drugs, no matter what they say about marijuana and LSD and the other drugs, are definitely responsible for the sky rocketing crime rate.

In another article dealing with heroin, which is one of the hardest drugs, it talks about heroin and the other drugs being the largest industry in British Columbia, and according to this Vancouver report raising the threat of a massive increase in crime within the next two or three years. How big is the industry? Police suggest a turnover of \$150 million annually would be a fairly conservative figure. And they go on to point out that a total fish catch is only \$123 million, which indicates the lucrative business that drugs is. And the drug people are not concerned about the consequences I suppose, not much more than the distilleries and governments who sell alcohol. The Member for Winnipeg Centre I think, made a very intelligent statement when he said that the profits are artificial. At the conclusion of my remarks I will read a couple of excerpts from an article done by Harold Greer, which proves the very point that the member for Winnipeg Centre was making.

Now I'd like to give a few statistics - I spent several hours last night researching my files, which are pretty massive and trying to distill some of the pertinent facts to prove the case that I have been trying to make in Cabinet with my colleagues and I hope to try and make here. So those of us who don't have time to pay any attention to it will have the benefit, not of what I say but the benefit of the experts throughout the world who have made some of them a life study into the effects of drugs.

One of the statistics that's pretty shocking is that 50 to 80 percent of crimes and robberies are drug related. Marijuana has become - and I'm quoting - "a gold mine for smugglers and pushers". And unquestionably there is below the surface subtle agitation to legalize it; and when it comes to pushing for legalization I think we have to consider three other groups in our society. I just read a report the other day - some of you may have seen it - that the doctors in Australia are the heaviest drug users and, in fact, the Medical Journal of Australia has put out a warning to the doctors that if they do not stop using drugs that they will be subject to having their licenses lifted. So one can see them if you hear a doctor saying, "Let's legalize drugs because they are not harmful", one really has to question their motives, that's right - they have a vested interest in seeing it legalized. And I think the same applies for professors and university students. I've met some of them here in Winnipeg; I've met some in Toronto when I spoke down there, and some of them openly smoke pot, advocate it, and we shouldn't be shocked when we find out that our children come out of the universities using drugs or having the permissive attitude, that there is really nothing wrong. And again these are the people that have been in the forefront of pushing for the legalization of marijuana. And their argument, Mr. Chairman, has been, and continues to be, is that drugs are no worse than alcohol. Well I don't believe that. But let's take their argument on its face value and say its true. Let's accept it as true. What is the cost of alcohol? You know anybody that's been involved in the Alcohol Foundation, or in highway safety, or the clergy, or the Salvation Army tell you of the wife beatings, child beatings, family neglect, the broken homes, the divorce, slaughter on the highway - you know the cost is estimated in the United States to be approximately \$20 million. Now that seems a pretty shocking figure when you consider that our gross, our total budget, federal budget is, I believe, around \$16 billion, and taking the American figures and reducing them on a population basis, it would seem that our figures must be about \$2 billion. So it makes you wonder, Mr. Chairman, it really makes you wonder whether these people that are pushing it - what facts are they reading, what statistics are they reading, you know - do they really care?

I'm amazed at some of my colleagues in Cabinet in the backbench who shrug off --(Interjection)-- Well sometimes when I hear you talk I feel that maybe I should be over there. But I think that its incumbent upon us, if no one else, because we are elected here to make laws. Surely at least those of us who sit in this Chamber should acquaint ourselves with the facts of what drugs really are, notwithstanding what LeDain or the American Commission tells us. One

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) of the members here yesterday mentioned that in England they give out free drugs, or free heroin, not drugs. This is the most expensive and the most deadly drug in the world, and I think the life span of a person who uses heroin is about 30 years.

And one of the members suggested that the way to get rid of this problem is to give it to them free. Well, you know, in England right now if you register as a drug addict they will give you heroin - registered - ordinary family doctors will give out doses. I think, it's daily, or every second day, they'll give out free heroin and there is no question they have eliminated the street pushers. And they have eliminated a lot of the crime because it is estimated to get say \$50 per day to sustain your habit, you have to steal 200. So there's no question, that part of the crime has been eliminated. And if nothing else it proves what we have been saying that drugs do cause crime, and in England they admit it, and they have seen the drop the minute they legalized it.

But what has been the net result, Mr. Chairman? In the last ten years drug addiction in Britain has quadrupled. The figures I have for 1970 and '71 show that they have increased 16 percent per year. Now that's a pretty shocking figure when you consider the population of Britain, and you don't have to be a mathematical genius to realize what will happen in Britain if that projection is carried for just ten years.

And what is the result of this legislation, Mr. Chairman? Well I think the first thing is they give the guy the drug and he goes home, and he comes back the next day, and what have we really done? The first thing that has happened is it has lured innocent people into drug use, because instead of buying pot, which you still have to buy in Britain, or alcohol, or some other drugs, you simply get hooked on heroin and the government supplies you for the rest of your natural life, so what Britain is doing, is they are luring innocent people to get hooked on the hardest and the most destructive drug in the world.

And the other thing it seems to me that it's an awful cruel and inhumane way of dealing with people, to say to him, almost like you're saying to a drunk instead of trying to cure him through AA's or some other technique, "here's your fifth", you know, "go and get drunk and don't bother us."

That really is the attitude they're taking. We don't care that you're going to die next year, or you are going to drop dead in the street, and that your family is going to be on the public dole for the rest of their lives. It seems to me that that is such a cowardly and inhuman and insensitive way to deal with the drug problem. And those who come into this House and preach to adopt the British System, I suggest that they should spend a little time and study what the British system has done. And I tell you that the British people are going to reap the whirlwind one of these days when they find out that half the population is on drugs, and the other half are going to be working, paying tax, to buy the heroin and to look after them and later on to bury them and to look after their families. --(interjection)-- The recommendation - there is no solution, Mr. Chairman. There is no genius in this House unless we could take the Member for Fort Garry who said yesterday that he wants the budget for the Attorney-General cut by 15 percent, or 16 percent, and we're going to have better police service. You know if he can do that then I suggest that the Attorney-General he should hire him at a high salary because there's nobody in the world that's been able to give better enforcement of our drug or alcoholic, or traffic laws but cutting appropriations. And there is no simple problem there and I suggest to you there's no simple problem for drugs.

They have in the United States an organization that is set up, it is called Synomon, it's the Synomon System, named after a drug addict, I think, who couldn't pronounce the proper word and it's working, but it's a drop in the bucket. You know, they get a handful of people -- I don't know what they could take in there, 50, 150 per year and the rehabilitation success I think is something like 90 percent. The other system used by Americans and by us is about 10 percent, the 90 percent go back, so it seems that just to simply dry up the - or stop the traffic as President Nixon is doing by paying Turkey to stop growing poppies, that's not going to solve the problem. It's a necessary step but we must eliminate the demand and I think then you have to turn to the social scientists . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point has been raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Speak to the point of order please.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it's not my wish to interrupt an otherwise interesting dissertation on the problems of social abuse of drugs in our community by the Member for Thompson. However it's my understanding that when several of our members raised a similar question

(MR. ENNS cont'd) yesterday in the House the Attorney-General correctly referred them to the fact that this subject matter could well be discussed under the estimates of the Minister of Health and Social Development who has a fair degree of responsibility in this particular area, and I would ask you, Sir, to perhaps consider whether or not this is not a proper occasion to discuss this matter, and perhaps we should be talking and referring to this subject matter under the estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is well taken. I would direct the member to confine his remarks to the jurisdiction under which the Attorney-General's Department operates.

MR. MACKLING: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the same point of order?

MR. MACKLING: On the point of order that was raised. The Honourable Member from Lakeside indicated that I had prevented discussion of -- well that I had raised objections to the continuation of comments in respect to drug laws or concern about the enforcement, or lack of enforcement of laws dealing with drugs. That is not the case. I rose on two occasions to draw attention of honourable members to the fact that they were considering a corrections program for which I am not responsible. They were considering application of laws dealing with the rehabilitation of those who had been incarcerated and I have a colleague who deals specifically with that. But with all respect I did not interfere with the contributions of honourable members on this subject that the Honourable Member for Thompson is dealing with now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: On the same point of order. I accept the advice just given by the Attorney-General. I believe that we would certainly be prepared to accept and continue to listen to the Honourable Member for Thompson if he were confining his remarks as to how the Attorney-General's Department should be involving, you know, the enforcement problems, the criminality involved in the abuse of drugs, or the lack of enforcement by his department, and so forth, but I think quite -- I think all of us who have been listening with interest to the Member for Thompson he is talking about the general social problems, problems of rehabilitation; the problems of rehabilitation that a country like Great Britain is attempting in the area of drugs and their failure in this area in his opinion, and I think in this respect my original remarks stand, Mr. Chairman, that if we talk about the social problems or the rehabilitation problems and the approaches that should be taken by any aegis of government, then that quite properly falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Health and Social Development and we should be discussing that matter under that department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Chairman, with all due respect . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the same point of order?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, on the same point of order. In all due respect to the opinion and the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, when you deal with the problem of drugs, corrective measures are to be taken by both Health, Social Development and the Attorney-General's Department. So I do believe that the comments that are being made by my colleague, the Member for Thompson, could be well acceptable.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Same point of order? The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: . . . I'm forced to -- and now this will be my last issuance of this point of order. I welcome the comments of the Member for Thompson when he directs those comments to how the Attorney-General's Department and his police officers, and his judges, and our court systems can deal with the matters of drug abuse that are under jurisdiction of his department. I sit down now and welcome those remarks by the Member of Thompson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson, and I would suggest that the honourable member confine his remarks to the jurisdiction under which the Attorney-General's Department operates. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I'm **certainly** attempting to do that. At the same time I think to get to drive home a point one has to draw on references elsewhere. I wouldn't be so presumptuous as to tell the Attorney-General, these are my ideas and you better carry them out, or I'm the only guy that knows anything. I would prefer to quote -- I would prefer to quote people who have spent years or a lifetime researching these very important problems that have plagued society for centuries. I think the Russians called it the capitalist disease, alcoholism.

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) Well maybe they're right or maybe they're not, it doesn't really matter, it is a disease, and it's one that's costing us tremendous in this country. --(Interjection)-- Well you can call it social disease. I think the Chief of Police in Winnipeg put out a report which I hope will be distributed in the Legislature where they deal with some of the causes and some of the suggestions they have made, the Chief and some other person I don't recall his name - it's a three-page brief dealing with crime in Winnipeg, and drugs, and all the rest of it, and again they didn't come out and say we think the Attorney-General must do this; they made suggestions, they dealt with the problem. I am simply doing the same thing, quoting these people, hoping that if enough of us here care about this problem - I'm sure we all do. It's just it seems that somehow it's difficult to start grappling with the problem, possibly because part of it is Federal. You know, it seems that when you want to legislate certain legislation that you have to get consent from Ottawa and most -- largely that's a good idea but sometimes I feel frustrated, and I think some of us feel frustrated that we think we have a good law or a good solution to a serious problem, but we can't implement it because it falls under the federal jurisdiction.

Again speaking on drugs there is one other reference I'd like to make to prove the seriousness of drugs and there was a place called Height Ashbury in San Francisco, I think, and that was a hippie dream and was the utopia for the young kids; all the flower children went down there, and the amazing thing about it, Mr. Speaker, at that time - that's not so many years ago I think in 1962 to 65 - this was going to be the making of a new world, a new drug culture. And the politicians and the press they blew it up out of all proportions, said these kids really have something; they've dropped out of this wretched society and they're doing their own thing. And even some of the clergy --(Interjection)-- that's right. They love --(Interjection)-- Yah, that's right. They used love and peace and all the other symbols which we squares accept, except that they didn't follow their own preachings. Even some of the clergy were saying - even some of the clergy thought it was a great thing, but things turned out pretty bad. Under the effect of drugs their morals sank to a low that made an alley cat look prudish. There was knifings, there was killings, there was maimings, robberies - about every imaginable crime was committed in that Height Ashbury. And after a few years they changed the name to "Hate Ashbury". That's how bad things got. And I think if somebody wants to really study the effects of drugs on people he should read the story of Heights-Ashbury, and I think there's a thousand stories that can be written. But those that I have read are enough to make you sick in your stomach when you see what it has done to innocent 14, 15 year old kids - it's turned them into mindless vegetables that will be useless to society, to their family for the rest of their lives. And we as citizens, or in that case Americans, are going to have to build expensive institutions to keep them locked up there so they won't harm themselves and they won't harm society. And I think if you want to study drugs that probably of all places would give you the best example of the injurious effects of drugs.

Now one of the statements made by the Member for Winnipeg Centre is about the artificial, the artificial profits we have in alcohol. Well I'd like to read this, particularly in view of the statement made by the Member for Rhineland when he was complaining that the alcohol -- I believe the price of liquor is too expensive in Manitoba. Well here's the -- this is an article by Harold Greer and the heading is "The Low Cost of Alcohol, The High Cost of Alcoholism - Toronto. This could be the year that Canadian governments, federal and provincial, finally do something about the liquor problem. A number of diverse developments are now combining to produce a situation where given a modicum of political guts, governments can make at least a start in controlling the consumption of alcohol through the tax structure."

And it goes on to say, "And what is the relationship between the price and consumption of alcohol. Like any other commodity there is a high correlation in fact. Research by the Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario has established that 95 percent of changes in the consumption can be accounted for by the amount of money people have to spend and the price they have to pay for alcohol in its various beverage forms."

Now that's a fresh breeze blowing into a "musky" old Chamber where we've always said that no matter what the price is the people will turn around and they will go ahead and buy it. That may be true in drugs but I think the Ontario Alcoholism Foundation which is one of the most respected in Canada has done an indepth study and they have found, and I'll read on a few more paragraphs. "This can be seen in stark and simple form by comparing consumption levels in say Newfoundland and British Columbia. Newfoundland has very low income levels and very high liquor prices relative to the rest of the country. Its intake at least at last calculation was

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) 1.18 gallons of absolute alcohol annually per capita. British Columbia incomes are some 60 percent higher and liquor is much cheaper. B.C. beer is about 50 percent cheaper. The B.C. consumption level is around 2.13 gallons of absolute alcohol per capita. It is apparent enough that alcoholism is not only the nation's foremost drug problem but it's the biggest health and social problem as well." I'm skipping through the article, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to read it all. "It is equally apparent that if governments are serious about alcohol problem and want to diminish the fantastic medical, social and economic costs that alcoholism entails, they can and must do it through a tax-price structure which is entirely under government control. And finally, it is quite incredible for example that the LeDain Commission on drug abuse should spend over two years to issue a report which recognizes alcoholism as the country's most serious drug problem but have nothing to recommend except more and better treatment of persons once they become alcoholics." Sounds like they're making the same mistake that Britain made. "Economic preventatives are the major research discovery of the last decade but not a word about them does the LeDain Commission report."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I read this thing here only because of the comments made by the Member for Rhineland where he said that we shouldn't increase the price of alcohol. I don't know what the political repercussions are if this government raises the alcohol -- the cost of the booze or the joy juice, or whatever you call it. I will tell you that if I had the power, the singular power, I would increase the price of alcohol 15 percent immediately; and then I would tie the cost of alcohol to the cost of wages or living or whatever, so as the cost of living goes up let the alcohol go up, you know. And if we can accept that the necessities of life, whether they're bread, or milk, or meat, and we can tolerate them continually climbing every year, surely we can tolerate the increase in the alcohol, which not only can we live without but which it does us a heck of a lot of damage. So I hope that the government, or the Cabinet, in their wisdom when they bring in their budget to raise the money for some of their programs, will have a substantial increase in alcohol. And I don't mind saying publicly I will be the first to rise and support it. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I would just like to make some comments in connection with what the Minister just stated, or the former Minister of Highways, just stated. I wonder if he would first of all table the brochure that he had on this matter of alcoholism.

I wonder whether the government has made any surveys in connection with those people on relief. I think here we have an ideal opportunity to do some research work and I think we should make use of that, and do that because, in other words, we're supplying the dollars for them to buy liquor. Is that not the case? I'm sure it's the case in many instances and I think we should then go ahead and do some research in this area where we have people on welfare and for which we are supplying the liquor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've one question for the Member for Rhineland. From his remarks would he follow up and indicate whether he was in favour or opposed to the change that was made several years ago - the Government of Canada and the provinces were required to abandon the voucher system and go onto a cash system of welfare.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: In a way the voucher system certainly would in my opinion, be beneficial. On the other hand, by giving them cash they are more free to spend it for the item that they wish to, even though the money when it is allocated to them, is allocated so much for specific items, but that doesn't always say that they use it for that particular item, that they may use it for alcohol instead in many cases. I don't know whether at this time, I'm quite prepared to make a statement and give a reply to the First Minister. I'll certainly consider it and give him a reply later.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek

MR. E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to be very brief but, and I want to . . . this down back to the Attorney-General's Department, I'm not really too concerned with the First Minister's comments because he always refers to something else, some other time, some other place than let's say that we're living in now. But I would like to basically identify myself with the remarks from the Member from Thompson and he went into detail about alcohol and my comments on that is we have that problem and we have to solve it, and we are hopefully working to solve it.

Alcohol is here and we must say two rights, or two wrongs don't make a right when we talk about drugs. So getting back to the Attorney-General's Department, when it comes to soft drugs I would request or hope that the Attorney-General, when it comes time for this province to be stood up and counted regarding the legalization of soft drugs, that we would oppose it right down the line, and for basically one reason, which the member from Thompson has not brought in. I'm quite content for the member from Thompson to carry his battle. There is just one thing that I wish he would do; he seems to be identifying himself personally with it. I think if he would use the word "we" or "all Manitobans" or "most of the Manitobans are opposed" that he would have much more support. He's putting himself in the position of being the only man, and I think that what he doesn't realize is most Manitobans are on his side and he should say "we and the majority are for this".

The only thing that I would like to say, if you're talking about soft drugs and somebody says that you haven't got the same -- you've got the same problem with liquor, you're just kidding yourself. At the present time liquor is in a bottle, or you buy it in a bar, or you drink it in a beer parlor or something of that nature. But you're not talking about the same time when you're talking soft drugs being legalized. If you're going to legalize with them it could be in this cigar in this room. Everyone of you smoking could be as high as a kite -- and I don't want any smart comments about that -- but it could happen with the cigar. It could happen with a man driving down the street, driving his car. We're in a society today where there's snowmobiles, boats, cars and everything mechanized and somebody has the damn foolish attitude to turn around and say, legalize soft drugs so that when you're driving down the street in your car, walking down the street, or even the people sitting in offices, could sit there getting pretty high on soft drugs. Now the Member from Thompson didn't bring that out and I bring that out, that your control over soft drugs is absolutely impossible. You may have some control over liquor, and we can maybe try and solve the problems with liquor, and I'm not as strong on the liquor problem as the Member from Thompson because some people can handle it and some people can't. None of us should drive a car but -- (Interjection) -- I'll take any of you on any time, really, but if you want to put it that way -- (Interjection) -- Yah, Yah . . . But fine, that's fine, but just back to the serious point, the Attorney -- (Interjection) --- I've bought. But I would like to get back to the statement when the Attorney-General has to represent this province on that particular issue, keep one thing in mind, you just haven't got the control. You just can't control it; you can't stop a person from throwing a pill in their mouth; you can't really find a law that will do it right now. It's hard to do. But to say that it's legalized, you're just asking for more problems than you're ever going to realize by saying a guy can drive down the streets smoking a cigarette in his car getting plastered. People can sit in the office and the boss comes out and he's gone. You know really, where are you truly trying to put society if you legalize this situation. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I would like to be able to conclude a review of the many remarks that have been addressed to me in respect to my estimates and I realize that honourable members would like to have answers to some of the questions that they posed, and some comment on some of the suggestions that were made and I find it therefore incumbent to hurry along with a review of some of the more salient points, or arguments that were advanced.

Mr. Chairman, one of the considerations of the Honourable Member from Swan River was the need for better public relations between the police officers and peace officers in our society and people in society generally. And I agree with him most wholeheartedly and that, Mr. Chairman, was one of the basic purposes why this government at it's last session established a Provincial Police Commission which will be able to initiate programs to advance

MR. MACKLING cont'd.) the interests of better public relations between society on the one hand and the police forces who work within society. — (Interjection) — Yah, all right, I know. Well I understand but I'm never going to get finished, I'm sorry, forget it, forget it.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Swan River also had a very legitimate concern in respect to the technique of advancing the revised statutes and I want to assure members of the House that valid concern has been considered and steps have been taken to rectify the problem that we now have. We've got a very — (Interjection) — I understand. We have now a very sophisticated technique of the reform of our statutes without there having to be a great time delay of 10 or 15 or 20 years before we have a revision of our statutes. The technique now is for the revision to be ongoing. But with all new things, and I don't want to mention Autopac and the computers, there has to be increases in the systems; there has to be new techniques advanced to make sure that this system works properly. And we have within the Estimates of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Internal Services, which I will advance later, provisions under the Queen's Printer for an annotation of the statutes to make sure that there will not be the trouble that we had in producing the statutes, the revised statutes, in a reasonable length of time. In the time interval that we're working with now, however, I have given instructions to the Queen's Printer that the bills as enacted, either by Royal Assent or by proclamation, pursuant to an Order-in-Council by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, will be forwarded to all of those who are on the list for the revised statutes, so that they will have at least within their possession a set of the laws as they are in being in the Province of Manitoba. And there has been that problem; I frankly recognize it, and indicate that we have taken steps to rectify it and with the improvement that I foresee by making adequate provisions under the Queen's Printer, we hope to resolve it in a fully effective way in subsequent years.

The Honourable Member from Swan River also was concerned about the purported deletion of the identification with the Royalty in the name of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and I want to indicate that I fully subscribe to the concern that was manifest but I for one having heard the categorical denials that were made, at least read, of the categorical denials by Mr. Goyer under whose department the force operates. I accept people at their work and I didn't make any personal representation because shortly after the concern was manifest there was a complete denial. I have had no representation made to me by anyone in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police indicating anything to the contrary and I really feel that that matter has been dealt with adequately before this day.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to honourable members, in particular to the Honourable Member of Swan River when he reads in Hansard, that we have been called upon to participate in the formal celebrations in respect to the 100th Anniversary of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and one of our department has been designated to work in connection with those festivities.

He also, he, I mean the Honourable Member from Swan River also indicated a concern, and I think one other honourable member in the House also, in respect to security of tenure of provincial police magistrates. That is a matter that has been given attention by me and my department over the course of the last year and a half, and I expect that later on in this session to be advancing a bill to make provisions in this regard.

I would like to turn now to the contributions made by the Honourable Member from Churchill, whose remarks I touched on earlier and with favor. The honourable member's concern has been manifest by a number of members of the House in respect to the increasing incidence of alcoholic disease, is one that certainly I am most concerned about and I think it will be reflected in the further substantial appropriations that are to be found in the department of my colleague the Minister of Health and Social Development.

There was a reference also by the Honourable Member from Churchill from the article that my honourable colleague the Member from Thompson read from at some length just a few moments ago, and I think there is an argument to be advanced in respect to the nature, the relative nature of excessive consumption levels and prices of alcoholic beverage. And that's one thing that I have had conversations with, and dialogue with, with members of the Liquor Control Commission, and comparisons of costs and pricing have been made from time to time. And I'm sure that will be a matter of continuing concern and discussion and there well can be changes in policy from time to time in that regard.

MR. MACKLING cont'd)

The Honourable Member from Assiniboia unfortunately had to leave. I know he was anxious to make further submissions but he made such devastating comment earlier that I certainly wanted to have the opportunity to reply to the claims that he made in the House the other day.

He questioned - quite a contrast from Her Majesty's loyal opposition spokesman - quite a contrast. He thought that our budget didn't reflect the kind of spending which should see much more attention paid to rehabilitation, to the efforts . . . advancing human rights, and all that sort of thing. Then he went on with quite a strong attack on the courts, and I must reply to this attack by categorically denying that there is any really inordinate delay in the Family Court or the Juvenile Court. He suggested - and I refer to the Winnipeg Free Press of this morning's edition - he said that the Family Court is outmoded and its docket overcrowded because it doesn't work, and its docket overcrowded, Mr. Patrick said. Mr. Patrick said it now takes two or three months for a woman seeking a legal separation to get into Family Court in Winnipeg and the delay in Magistrate's Court is equally as long. I want to assure honourable members that when there has been this sort of criticism evidenced, and from time to time someone who feels that their case has languished has written to me, and in one instance the lawyer did complain to me that he felt that there was far too great a time lag. I've had discussions with Roy St. George Stubbs, who is an excellent Family and Juvenile Court Judge, and he has assured me that they are prepared at any time to have a special sitting to deal with any case that involves a situation where there could be jeopardy of human life, where there's any likelihood at all of some real abuse tendered toward an applicant for relief to the court.

I'm satisfied that the court is able to respond to that kind of need. And to suggest that people have their physical well-being in jeopardy because of the failure of our Family Court to react to their needs, is completely false and a severe attack on the integrity of the members of the court which I categorically deny. One of the factors that Roy St. George Stubbs, our senior Family Court Judge and Juvenile Court Judge, has pointed out, is the need for effective probation, particularly in respect to the young people that come before the court, and I've had a very great concern in connection with that and as a result of our mutual concern I'm happy to say here again that within the estimates of my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development will be found some increases in respect to the expenditure for more probation officers. And to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the court dockets are unduly delayed is completely improper.

One of the techniques that has long been employed in the Family Court is to bring the contending parties, and I decry that it's an adversary system. That's one of the reasons I urged the Law Reform Commission to re-evaluate the whole basis and course of handling of domestic relations. I decry the adversary system per se that exists in our Family Court system, but given that system the judges make the most of the opportunities when the applicant and the respondent are brought before them to try and determine whether or not it is possible to keep those people united to maintain family life, particularly where there are infant children involved.

And one of the techniques that is used, and has been used for many years by not only the present Family Court judges but previous Family Court judges, was the technique of delay. The opportunity that once the parties have been brought before them to refer them to family councillors who were provided in the court, to discuss the problems that are dividing the family so that a conscientious effort can be made to try and resolve those problems and keep the family unit together. And this is paramount - it's paramount that the Family Courts' system try to re-establish the unity of the family, not in the interests of the husband and the wife particularly but paramountly for the concern of the children. Because let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that all of the sociologists and criminologists will confirm that an overwhelming number of those who find themselves adrift, aimless in society, that either lose all inspiration for work or creativity, are the result of broken homes. A failure on the part of the family unit to provide the love and affection which is vital to the nourishing of growing character of people. And to suggest that people should be processed in a quick manner through the courts so that they can get there and knock each others heads together and then go away, and one of them take one child, one take the other, or one take both, is not the system that we urge. The judges use every technique, every persuasion, every argument to determine whether or not it is possible to resolve differences and keep family units together. So to suggest that we should reform the system so that we can wheel people through the courts

MR. MACKLING cont'd) quickly is completely foreign to the principles of what should constitute a proper approach to the problems in the domestic field. So I categorically deny the attacks that the Honourable Member from Assiniboia made on our family court system.

And there were the concerns manifest by the Honourable Member from Brandon West - I always have a problem Brandon East, Brandon West - but I have got you right this time. And his was a justifiable concern. At the present time that problem, the problem of increased magistrate assistance is under active consideration by my department, and I want to assure the honourable member that there will be in the not too distant future some further judicial input in that area. As the honourable member knows, there has been a significant increase in the advance of the needs of the administration of justice in that area, as I indicated earlier, by the appointment of a full-time family court judge and additional Crown counsel, but it is a growth center and the needs of that area are certainly not overlooked by my department.

I would like to hurry on, Mr. Chairman, because there were such a great number of contributions and some of them very well made.

The Honourable Member from Assiniboia, whose strong language I reject, indicated that our system was a disgrace and I wish that he would speak to any one of the Family Court judges and research his case, before he makes the damaging aspersions that he did in the House. They are damaging because an institution is held up to ridicule in an unfair and arbitrary manner without really doing his homework.

He also was concerned about turnover in my staff, and I must admit that I have some cause for concern there as well. I have made every effort to encourage the development of expertise within the government, in the attorney-general's department. We have had negotiations in respect to better appropriations for salaries, and they are reflected in our budget. If we are going to have excellent attorneys working for government, we have to pay them more and be prepared to pay them more, and we are doing that, but and in many cases we don't have great difficulty in recruitment of new counsel, but counsels get expert training. Some of them are perhaps some of the finest attorneys in the province. We have some whom I'm sure can command some of the highest fees of any practicing lawyer, and as a result, in many instances, they are lured away, justifiably to meet their own priorities, to either private practice, and in some cases by our federal counterpart who pays more in order to get the best attorneys.

From time to time, I have had discussions with my colleagues and I assume that there will be further dialogue. We will have to pay as much as it is necessary to pay to recruit and maintain the best counsel we can. There have been - - (Interjection) - - well its true that CFI has engaged a great many counsel and I am sure that the bill when we finally can amass it, will be a rather disturbing sum. However, that's something which I think all honourable members, though they may regret sincerely, will feel is a necessary expense. So we have lost a number of attorneys, and we will be losing more. I can only wish them well in their endeavour to seek other fields to conquer, other fields to prosper.

There was also some concern on the part of the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, who was concerned about how the legal aid system was working under the new system, and I want to assure honourable members that if they were under some misapprehension in my remarks that the new system was already in being, I want to clarify that is not so. The arrangements that exist with the Law Society of Manitoba for a continuance of that legal aid system that was operated by them, continues until the new system has been fully developed, regulations have been made, and tariffs agreed upon, and so on. And I expect that within a matter of months, that new legal aid systems will become operational.

The Member for Assiniboia further was concerned about some matters dealing with the Liquor Control Commission - I think I have justifiably answered, or I should say in justification, I think that I - not spending any more time now, I think I have answered those questions.

He was concerned about whether or not there was going to be a detoxification centre to deal with those who are suffering from alcoholic disease, and I can say that I believe that there will be some further announcement about that during the course of the remarks of my colleague the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, with whom I have had continuing discussions in respect to the need for a detoxification centre.

I would like to turn then to the remarks of the Honourable Member from Rhineland, whom as has been his custom has addressed to me his concern for a departmental report, and he indicated that he felt from his recollection that there may have been a departmental report

MR. MACKLING cont'd) in the past. I was a bit concerned about that because I didn't want to be defaulting in any undertaking that a previous Attorney-General had made in respect to this Assembly, but when I talked to my senior staff about this report they indicated that well, when the Attorney-General was responsible for corrections, there was a form of report that was filed with the Assembly, Mr. Chairman, and as a matter of fact, the reason that I think that he was able to recall this particularly vividly, was the fact that there was a good deal of humour and then great heat engendered by the concern in this Assembly about the extensive number of turnips that were being produced at the Headingly farm at one time, and then there was great protracted heated discussion of the loss of one prize bull that apparently one of the inmates had had the audacity to lead away to the slaughter house and sell. But so far as a formal departmental report, apparently for the entire department, that was never the case.-- (Interjection) -- On the Corrections, yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Rhineland shared the concerns about the need for effective police-public relations with society, and I think I have already touched on that.

The Honourable Member from Rhineland was concerned about capital punishment and I am sure that he would like me to spend some time in elaborating my views on capital punishment but in view of the patience of my honourable colleagues and members of this House, I won't inflict upon you all my collective thoughts on that question, except to say this, that I think that the system as it now is, the law as it now is, is being held up to contempt; because the law as it now provides for noncapital murder and capital murder, capital murder invoking the death penalty, and being confined to the taking of human life in respect to a police officer or a security guard. I think that the logic of separating out those two groups as strongly as it was advanced, really ought not to be supported today. I have the utmost respect for the dangers that police officers, security guards are faced with, and I am heartsick that we don't in our society pay the kind of respect to those people who at the risk of their lives oftentimes protect our family lives.

I am concerned also about the lack of good will that sometimes exists in our society towards police officers. And I think that through the aegis of the police commission you will see an advance of better public relations and recommendations for new departures and techniques, which I certainly have under consideration and have had for some time. But in respect to the taking of human life, I don't believe that human life should be taken by law or by any way. I think that when human life is taken, particularly in any cold rational way, it is repugnant in the eye, should be repugnant in the eyes of men and in the eyes of God. I could go on at length but I would rather not take up any more of the honourable members' time on that question.

Also the Honourable Member from Rhineland was concerned about some tardiness in payments of the Land Acquisition Branch and I have taken note of that. I can't really -- if that be the case, I can't see any justification for it and it will be certainly reviewed.

He was concerned about some applications -- and I must hurry on here. If there are some particular items that I don't deal with, it's not because I don't realize that they are sincerely advanced, but because of the length of time I might otherwise take in answering them. . . . concerned about the number of cases -- the extent of the involvement of the Administrator of Estates, and I do have some statistics I can give the Honourable gentlemen. Estates under administration in the fiscal year 1971-72 were 1593, and the value of those estates was \$5,167,000; 1593 and \$5,167,000 is the total value. -- (Interjection) -- I am sorry I will have to give details of that on another date. My statistics don't go that far.

In respect to his concern, the Member from Rhineland's concern, about the right of an individual private member to call upon legislative counsel for assistance in drafting resolutions, bills -- that has always been the right of honourable members of this House, and that has not been changed.

In respect to his concern about the application of proceeds of lotteries, I think my colleague the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs has indicated that there will be statements elaborating on the division of those monies.

His concern with the disposition of certain items in the Liquor Control Commission report dealing with leasehold improvements and furnishings, I am advised that these cover largely the equipping of leasehold premises, liquor stores and facilities, with shelving, counters and all sorts of necessary equipment which is written off in a relatively short period of time. In this case, probably a year because they are in a position to do that. They have

MR. MACKLING cont'd) the financial ability to do that. The value of all the fixed assets I couldn't determine immediately. It would be something of a guesstimate on the basis of an appraisal. The land and buildings which the Liquor Control Commission own, I am sure have considerable value but I am not in a position to give the totality of that value.

His concern about the increase in the monies paid for excise and custom duties is a direct result of the larger amount of purchases in turn based upon the growing volume of sales.

The question about the size of the inventory: that reflects the nature of the demands that's made upon the Commission to satisfy the demands that are made through the collective system for purchases of various products.

I won't comment on his concerns about profit margins, or values, because I think there has been sufficient discussion about that.

Again in respect to his concern about the write-off of the cost of automobiles, there are many many mileage miles driven by inspectors of the Liquor Control Commission and officers of the Commission pursuant to their duties. And when they buy automobiles, again they write them off in a short period. There is no time payment. They don't pay extensive interest on the purchase of automobiles, they are paid off very quickly.

I think that I can move then to the comments of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, and I think I have indicated my appreciation for his remarks, Mr. Chairman, and will move on to the contribution of the Honourable Member from Fort Garry.

I will reserve much of my comment about his remarks until I have seen his specific proposals, which I understand that he intends to advance in respect to the cost of law enforcement. He did indicate however, that, you know, this item is a formidable one and I frankly admit that the costs involved of providing law enforcement are increasing. One of the reasons again for the development of the Police Commission is to provide a vehicle for development of ideas and systems which I believe will be able to provide greater specialization within the provision of police forces. I think that many police in society today would agree that it would be in their interest if they weren't saddled with the task of ticketing motorists for moving vehicle offences and offences of a like nature, whereas their real concern ought to be in the administration of the criminal code and other more important public laws.

I must say though that the provisions of the RCMP pursuant to the police contract, is an on-going thing. It's a contract that we inherited from the previous administration and he was concerned about how the negotiation on this contract - I want to assure the honourable member that the contract is up for renewal in 1975. I hope to be in Ottawa renewing the negotiation on behalf of the Province of Manitoba as Attorney-General in 1975 and negotiating too with a friendly government, a government of the Dominion of Canada which hopefully will reflect a New Democratic philosophy as well.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, permit just one brief interjection, Mr. Chairman - - (Interjection) - - just in case . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Just in case the Attorney-General's wish doesn't come true, would he leave us his notes?

MR. MACKLING: I'd be delighted. Much of what the Honourable Member from Fort Garry said reflected the concerns which he indicated about the costs in the area of law enforcement and I will forego any further comments on that item until that particular resolution is before us.

I'll pass over some of the comments which I have already touched on. The Member from St. Vital, the Member from Brandon West. The Member from Brandon West, however, wanted a resident Queen's Bench judge, as I understood it, and one of the assurances that I have had from Chief Justice George Tritschler the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, is that there has not been, and will not be, any delay in the holding of trials, Queen's Bench Court trials in any area of the Province of Manitoba. When the requirement is there, a Judge will be there, and there have been no problems that I am aware of, of delay or frustration of the hearing of cases that come before the Court of Queen's Bench by virtue of the fact that there is not a Court of Queen's Bench judge available.

Now he was concerned about the provisions of magistrates and I indicated I am certainly giving every consideration to that problem. One of the problems, of course, is that every time we increase services in respect to the administration of justice, our budget goes up, and that's something that your colleagues decry. And when we provide a new family court judge

MR. MACKLING cont'd) in the Brandon area, that has cost because we have to have support staff. But your honourable colleagues will continue to criticize this escalation in cost. And you want further magistrate input in the Brandon area, I tend to agree with you, but your colleagues will criticize both of us apparently. If it were possible to have someone as eminent an attorney as my friend Frank Meighen to act voluntarily as a magistrate, that is without pay, why it would be an easy solution to the problem.

The Honourable Member from Pembina was concerned about spending, and I think that seemed to be the undercurrent in the opposition, and yet he was concerned about more policing in local towns. Now we can't have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. We can't be putting more monies in . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would remind the Honourable Minister he has five minutes.

MR. MACKLING: Thank you. We can't be providing more police and cutting our budget. The suggestion was that we have passed on a bill, that is true, that's a bill that we received from Ottawa and we merely passed it on to those communities who have police pursuant to an extension contract.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside was concerned about the vendor operation. We haven't changed that. There have been some increase in vendors where there were communities that were considered to be in need and were too distant from larger centres. He was concerned about the possibility of change; that's something we certainly can look at, and have looked at from time to time.

The Member from Souris-Killarney was concerned about retroactive effective legislation - I can only assure him that the Parliament of Canada, the Government of Canada placed us in a position that in respect to succession duty and gift tax where we had no options but to await the formality of the decisions made in Ottawa before we could move.

The Member from Rock Lake had some concerns in respect to the operations of the Liquor Control Commission, which I've touched on.

The Member from La Verendrye was concerned about time lag and frustration in respect to applications for appeal in respect to driver's licence suspension. He has a valid concern. His remarks were constructive and I, for one, will certainly endeavour to look at the suggestions that were made to see whether or not they can be given any practical application or no.

The Member from Emerson I think I've dealt with at some length in his absence today. He was elsewhere but I trust he will read in Hansard the rather lengthy dissertation that I made in respect to the principles of the Bracken Liquor Control Commission Inquiry Report.

The Member from Roblin had some very interesting comments to make. He went however, Mr. Chairman, full circle. He wanted more police but at less cost, and I found grave difficulty in trying to satisfy the arguments he made from both sides.

I believe that I've adequately responded to the Member from Morris and I hope that he will read my comments in Hansard because he wasn't in the House most of the time.

The Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek had some concerns as well in respect to the application of the administration of the Liquor Control Commission, and I trust he will read Hansard, and then perhaps some of the honourable members might wish to read the report of the Inquiry Commission and refresh their understandings of the nature of the legislation and the administration of the Liquor Control Commission.

The Honourable Member from Thompson indicated his very sincere concern in respect to many of the grave problems that face our society, particularly in respect to the administration of justice as it's affected by the ever greater incidence of drug consumption. I want to assure all honourable members of this House that I for one feel the gravity of the impending crisis that affects our society by the ever greater incidence of drugs within it. It's shocking, Mr. Chairman, to understand that in our society, particularly in our society to the south of us, young men are being returned to civilian life from a very sad, a very terrible, a very ghastly war in a far away place. Many of these young men forced to go there thoroughly disillusioned about the effort that was being made in that area, coming back, Mr. Chairman, addicted to heroin, addicted to heroin and a very conservative estimate, Mr. Chairman, is that a minimum of 500 personnel per month who have been returned from Vietnam are addicts of hard line heroin. When you consider the tremendous numbers of hard drug users in our society and their desperate need for funds with which to buy the product which they have to have, we face a very grave crisis in respect to drugs. I share the concerns of my honourable colleagues and only wish to assure you, Mr. Chairman, and honourable members that we have not lost sight of this problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to direct a question to the Minister. When he made reference to new vendor outlets as far as liquor's concerned, could he tell us how these new outlets have been established, on what basis, and why it is that in some places in the province there have been two established within six miles and in other areas they are 20 miles apart or more - on what basis?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I've indicated that there has been an increase in the number of vendors but the policy has not been changed. Where there is a community that is of considerable distance from an available liquor vendor, or liquor store, then if the volume indicates the necessity, and the distance from the outlet indicates a need, then consideration is given to the establishment of liquor vendors. But it is something that is under consideration from time to time. The number of outlets is something that we have to look at pretty closely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30 and in accordance with our House ... --(Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: ... takes off on drugs; the Honourable member for Thompson took up 40 minutes; the Attorney-General took two 40 minutes speeches, and I still haven't got the answer for my question. And he's very skillfully avoided, skated all around the area that ...

MR. PAULLEY: ... the honourable member ... be silent at this stage. We have not adopted the new rules as of yet. I'm sure that the Honourable the Attorney-General will be answering the questions and as you said, Mr. Chairman, it is the hour of 4:30. Our rules do say that you should leave the Chair at 4:30, and the Chair be occupied by the Honourable the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Attorney-General on a point of order.

MR. MACKLING: If the honourable members wish me to answer inside of a couple of minutes I will endeavour to do so. If they want to grant leave, fine. If not, I will undertake during the course of the resolution dealing with law enforcement to answer the question of the honourable member which I think directly deals with that resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order. The time being 4:30 and in accordance with our House rules, Private Members' hour, the last hour of the day. Is it the will of the Committee that we rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: According to our rules, now we are under Private Members' hour. On Fridays we have Private Members' Resolutions.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Roblin that

WHEREAS agricultural land is a means of production and as such should not be liable to levels of taxation greater than that imposed on other means of production, and

WHEREAS the benefits conferred by educational services bear no significant relationship to the productive capabilities of agricultural land;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Assembly consider the advisability of exempting farm land from the burden of education taxes.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether what I am going to say is absolutely in accordance with the rules or not, but I do want to raise the question as to the terminology of the resolved part and in doing so, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that we should not allow the consideration of the resolution but it seems to me that the resolution should read: "Resolved that the government consider the advisability" because measures dealing with taxation matters have to be introduced by the government and not the Assembly. The Assembly could adopt this

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) resolution. It may be, Mr. Speaker, merely a technical point, and for that reason I'm not suggesting any delay in proceeding with the resolution but I believe it has been customary in this House on resolutions of this nature for the resolved portion of the resolution to say "Resolved that the Government give consideration to the advisability" rather than the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker: speaking to the point of order raised by the House Leader, I would concur that certainly the traditional terminology of resolutions calling for the expenditure of monies require the words suggested by the House Leader, the Minister of Labour, and is the term "consider the advisability of". The resolution being put forward by my colleague, the Honourable Member from Emerson does not, I think, and I appreciate there may be a fine point of technicality, necessarily or does not stipulate the calling for the expenditure of any monies on behalf of the government, and I would therefore suggest to the Honourable House Leader that the technicality while noted, I believe is just as strong in favor of the Member for Emerson in the manner the resolution is worded. He is not calling for the expenditure of money by the government by way of this resolution. It may well represent for the government to sort out its options as to how it chooses to spend, or how it chooses to direct the collection of revenues that obviously would have to be, or the change of revenues that would have to be collected in lieu of this, but the resolution does not specifically suggest or command or ask that the government spend monies or revenues, and therefore I suggest that the resolution as worded is correct.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabour the matter at all. I thought it would only be proper for me really as a courtesy to my honourable friends to point this out and yes, I do try and be courteous despite some other suggestions that I should not be by my honourable friends opposite, but I do, Mr. Speaker, attempt, notwithstanding other failings, to be courteous. But the only point that I really want to raise on this: that if the Assembly adopts the motion as presented by the Honourable Member for Emerson, it really doesn't mean a continental. And if it was that the government considered the advisability then really it means something. I stop there and I ask my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside to consider the point that I'm raising because I'm not raising it in order to prevent debate on the resolution as it stands.

MR. SPEAKER: In respect to the point raised by the Honourable Minister of Labour I should like to indicate that motions or resolutions to this House are those that are valid that ask the House to make a decision. Whether it's in principle or in action is really not one that the Chair has to take issue with, consequently I say that the motion is in order.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My purpose in bringing this resolution before the House is really twofold. Firstly, I would like draw to the attention of the House a serious and increasingly serious problem of inequality in the education tax structure in Manitoba. I would like the members of the House, and I'm sorry that the Minister of Education is not present because this makes reference closely to his department, but I would like the members of the House to consider this matter seriously because I can see some rather serious repercussions which might well occur in a very short time unless this problem is not dealt with in a satisfactory way and soon.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I don't pretend that this particular resolution is the total answer to the problem but it might well be at least in part an answer to the problem that exists. Therefore I suggest that the honourable members through their contributions can very much assist the government in studying the matter closely, consider a variety of possible solutions, and come up with something that will be an answer to the very serious problem.

I was quoted a few days ago as having said in the House that school divisions are grossly overspending. Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say that, I did not really think I gave that impression because I am not under that impression at all. However, it would be true to say that some school divisions are grossly overspending their resources, or their source of revenue. This is the very point that I want to come to.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, as you look through the school divisions of Manitoba, you'll find some that are spending a certain amount of money per pupil in order to provide the educational necessities of that particular division, and you'll also find that some are spending somewhat more than other school divisions. The natural thing to do in a case like that, I suppose, is to look at what the financial structure might be and almost invariably, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) you'll find that those school divisions that are spending the least per pupil are also paying the highest mill rate in these school divisions. The real problem is that those school divisions who do not have the financial resources are cutting back as much as they can on their expenditures, consequently providing an inferior kind of education. If we can equate of course education in terms of expenditures and I think we can, coupled with that they are caught paying a heavy burden of special levy.

The proposal I am making, Mr. Speaker, represents somewhat close to \$15,000,000 - this kind of reduction, the kind I am proposing in this resolution represents approximately \$15,000,000 loss of revenue to both school divisions and to the government of Manitoba. If this \$15,000,000 is to be lost in revenue, it must be made up somewhere else and I think it's only responsible, Mr. Speaker, in proposing this kind of resolution to make suggestions to the government as to where this kind of money could come from.

May I suggest that if the people of Manitoba had a choice, if they had a choice between spending this kind of \$15,000,000 for the reduction of property taxes on agricultural land rather than spend that \$15,000,000 in the Department of Health and Social Services, I would suggest to you that the people of Manitoba would gladly make that choice. And it's significant to note, Mr. Speaker, that \$15,000,000 represents approximately one half of the increase in that particular department this year and less than one half of the increase in that same department last year. Now I would suppose that it would seem only reasonable that maybe if those areas of expenditures are warranted, that we channel a little bit out of that one, a fraction out of that one into education, with a view of reducing the tax on the farm land and remove the serious problem that exists, at least in part.

Now there is another way that I suppose this could be obtained and it would be a partial measure, yet a satisfactory thing I would suggest - that is if we saw to it that at least we could remove that portion of property tax on farm land that is being levied by special levy. It is not the general levy that hurts the farm land taxpayer, it is not at all, because that general levy is somewhere around 7 or 8 mills. Where we find a crippling tax burden is when we have areas that have to pay 35, 40 and up to 77 mills. That is the crippling tax burden I am speaking of. In order to transfer some of the monies received from the higher assessed areas to the lower assessed areas we would have to levy a general mill rate of from two to three mills across the province in order to pay this kind of \$15,000,000 based on the present structure of course, of 75-25 sharing. I am not suggesting that all the money in that case would be coming from the property tax levied because naturally some would come from the provincial treasury on the basis of 25-75.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that we have in the past recognized that those who benefit most from the prepared student, the man or lady who goes into the work market, are those who are going to employ those very people and we have recognized that in providing the differential, a differential of at least 24 mills and I understand that now it can exceed 24 mills between residential and farm land and business. When we remove the efficiency of the Foundation Program, by forcing people to finance by special levy, this differential does not exist any more and consequently the problem becomes more serious with a multiplying factor as the special levies are caused to increase.

I remind the Members of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that we once passed a resolution, a resolution proposed by our friends from the Liberal Party that laid down as an objective that we were going to increase the provincial contribution to the Foundation Program and that we were going to try to eliminate financing of education on property taxes.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, because of maybe excessive expenditures elsewhere we have seen unfit to make even reasonable contributions to the Department of Education, to the Foundation Program more specifically. We increased the grants last year on a per pupil basis of \$18.00 that is the first significant, if we can say it's significant, change in the financing of education since really 1966 but that, Mr. Speaker, that \$18 as I have mentioned before, represents less than one year's increase in cost of education per pupil and therefore the \$18 is really not significant, it is simply an attempt.

Mr. Speaker, just one more comment I would like to leave. I would venture to say that the Assessment Branch under the direction of the Minister of Municipal Affairs has had probably more difficulty or more complaints this year than it has in the past as it refers especially to rural areas. The reason why the people of the rural areas that are unfortunate enough to have a school division that has a low assessment per pupil, are dissatisfied, is that

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) they can see the inequity in the system and they start first of all by blaming the school division for lavish expenditures because somebody's got to be to blame. You've got municipalities that are accusing school boards of being lavish in their expenditures and that is not so. They are not lavish, and then if that is not really the problem it must be the assessor that is not assessing correctly therefore they are attacking that branch as well; and the real problem is not the school board's management, it is not necessarily the Assessment Branch that is unfair or unjust, it is the system under which we are now taxing people to support our education costs. I would be very interested, Mr. Speaker, in hearing the comments that certainly other members would like to make in this regard. We don't propose that this is the solution necessarily; we are searching for the best possible solution but we would like this resolution to be treated seriously.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in support of this resolution I would like to add a few words. The resolution of course is quite costly but certainly quite simple as far as the intent of the resolution is concerned, simply to exempt farm lands from educational taxes.

The first thing that seems to enter my mind is well, number one: how is it going to then affect the taxpayer and perhaps even to a larger degree, how is it going to affect the municipalities involved? Well, in the case of the Town of Steinbach, I guess some people would desire to have more land . . . around it while others imagine it would apply more to the R. M. of Hanover than perhaps to the Town of Steinbach. But speaking of the R. M. of Hanover I think that's a good point to bring up. The taxes down there or the assessment in the R. M. of Hanover are much higher than for example in the R. M. of La Broquerie; and still it doesn't really matter because of your assessment your taxes are more than likely even higher in the R. M. of La Broquerie than they would be in the R. M. of Hanover. This of course is part of the resolution and part of the intent to try and get to the over-all principle of the students in a municipality like La Broquerie should have the same opportunity of the students for example in the R. M. of Hanover and of course we could refer this to many other municipalities.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, the time has come where there isn't that much to say about the exemption of farm lands from educational taxes. I think a lot has been said; I don't intend to be lengthy. I'm glad to see my friends over there have had resolutions not too many years ago and of course we have a direct resolution from my friends over here and as I think as the last speaker just mentioned we had a resolution some time ago and we seem to be in agreement now. We seem to have come to the point where we all agree perhaps the time has come where we must do a little bit more about it. I can't forget about -- three, four years ago the now Minister of Youth and Universities I guess it is called, who of course had it on his mind very often -- Municipal Affairs having been the Mayor of West Kildonan prior -- say to this Assembly, lay down the area of responsibility, define the areas of responsibility between municipalities and the province, and I agree with him. This has to be done and this is one of the ways the only way that we can achieve what the resolution calls for and naturally being the wish of the taxpayer that pays taxes on land.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, and I firmly believe this that a property tax should pay for the service of property not education, and to all of us education is not property. Health is not property; welfare is not property; but I would have to admit and a big problem possibly in the Department of Highways -- our roads naturally are, our police protection, our fire protection, many other things I would consider as properties. And these areas I don't think any municipality they will accept that responsibility if they can be charged to property; these kind of taxes and I don't think any municipality will mind. So why are we returning money from municipalities to education. The time has come where this should be changed and we all know, Mr. Speaker, that municipalities today are forced into economy measures by their closeness and intimacy with the taxpayers and they feel that they must refrain from imposing what taxpayers may consider confiscation or confiscatory taxation. The result of course is that budgets for services that fall into the category that I mentioned a little while ago are direct municipal responsibility, they have to be taken care of; and the point I'm trying to make here is that municipalities are very mindful of the fact that monies requested for education are perhaps the first claim on the civic treasury to be paid over whether collected or not. This is one of the first responsibilities of a municipality, and I think I could add that these monies required for services under direct control of the elected municipal council can only be used after the school board's requisition has been met. I agree with the honourable member that presented this resolution. We run into difficulties with expenditures of school boards and the like but somewhere this adds to part of the dilemma but it is still the principle or the main result still falls back on the municipality and of course back on the taxpayer.

I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, that if we take and agree with the principle that education must be removed from property, in fact I think that the Saskatchewan -- (Interjection) -- I would shift some of it to the Public Works Department and cut down a little bit down there and of course there are other ways of shifting some of it. However, I think the Saskatchewan government has just recently passed legislation that a tax is going to be applied where a farmer has a choice over a period of five years and naturally sales, the amount of cash or the amount of net production by this farmer will be considered; and I think this is perhaps something that we will have to consider over here because it's also been recommended by a union of municipalities and I'm sure that I can see a policing problem, I can see a few things that might enter

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) into it but if we want to be fair to our Department of Education or to the people paying the tax on education I think something like this will have to be done. And I still for one find it hard to realize although I think perhaps one fair way would be to take your income tax returns - I don't see any way much more fair than that - naturally everybody's honest about income tax papers and this as far as I can see is perhaps the only way it can be done.

So, Mr. Speaker, I did not wish to be lengthy. I must say though the responsibility of making ends meet on a municipal basis still falls back to the taxpayer and I want to suggest to this government, because they are in power presently, they will have to find some solutions or they'll find themselves perhaps owning, perhaps administering the municipalities, the school boards and perhaps even many more - the park boards, the police boards and other departments. So with that, Mr. Speaker, we heartily concur with this resolution.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I realize the Honourable Member for Emerson was quite serious in making this proposal and I'll treat it as a serious proposal.

I realize that he is very concerned with the problems of his farmer constituents in Emerson and I'm sure they will appreciate the concern that he has shown for them. However I find there are a number of things wrong with the resolution and I would like to deal with these in detail.

The first Whereas claims that "agricultural land is not liable or should not be liable to levels of taxation greater than that imposed on other means of production." This really isn't quite an accurate statement, in fact under the foundation program there is at present a 25 1/2 mill differential. The agricultural lands of the province is classified with residential land and it pays 25 1/2 mills less in the foundation levy than do other businesses in the province. Not only are the other businesses paying this differential of 25 1/2 mills but of course they're also paying an addition business tax which goes to the municipality for municipal expenses and of course the farmer is not subject to this business tax. The resolution of course would deal only with the problems of the farmer and the assessors are certainly finding that not only farmers are of the opinion that they are suffering from the taxation system but small businessmen also feel the same way. In the villages like Vita, Sprague, St. Pierre, St. Malo, -- Sprague, Tolstol, these small businessmen are also feeling the pinch and this resolution, really does nothing to deal with their problem.

The second Whereas I find totally unacceptable in principle and this states that the "benefits conferred by educational services bear no significant relationship to the productive capacities of agricultural land." The member of course is going to relieve farm lands of the property tax by transferring the burden to the Provincial Treasury. This is an interesting proposal; it's rather odd that the previous government never considered it. --(Interjection)-- They seem to have not considered a great many proposals that are now being put forward by the members on the opposition benches.

There's another implication of this proposal which is a fundamental reason why I would oppose the resolution and that is that this resolution would benefit most, not the low income farmer, the farmer who is really scraping to make a living but it would benefit most the hobby farmer, the Member of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange for example who's running a cattle farm perhaps out in the Interlake which may be worth a total value of \$500,000. That man, the hobby farmer would save a great deal of money under this proposal. --(Interjection)-- The corporate farmer would save a great deal of money under this resolution and of course it would give that corporate farm additional funds with which to purchase additional land. The members oppositely usually pretend that they're really concerned about the family farmer but this resolution would have the effect of giving the corporate farm additional funds to further extend its control over the agricultural area. The wealthy farmers, the farmers who have, let's see -- four sections of land or more sections of land than that -- would also tend to benefit the most from this proposal. You know, it's rather odd that the proposals that we usually get from that particular group usually benefit those who have most in our society. I guess they believe in that old adage that "to them that have should be given".

Another fundamental objection to this resolution is that it's a bandaid approach, and of course from that party I guess one should expect one should expect such bandaid proposals. This resolution will benefit only one group, only one occupational group in our society and it will benefit the wealthiest members of that group the most. --(Interjection)-- There is

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) great dissatisfaction of course among farmers about assessment but the attempt to cure, the attempt to cure the economic problems of the farmer can't be done through tinkering with the assessment system. The real solution to the farm problems lies in dealing with the problem of prices being too low. Now, this government, this government has adopted as one of its main thrusts the shift from flat taxes to ability-to-pay taxes. This has been a fundamental direction of this government over the past two and a half years - a shift from the flat poll tax like the Medicare premium to ability-to-pay tax. This government believes in an equitable society and one of the main means by which we are attempting to achieve this is through a shift towards an equitable system of taxation.

The Conservatives were in power for what -- eleven years? --(Interjection)-- Much too long, very much too long. Over a decade and in that decade in office they made no fundamental structural change in the taxation system of this province. No fundamental structural change in over a decade in office. --(Interjection)-- Our government has been in office only two and a half years and we'll be in office an awful lot longer --(Interjection)-- only two and a half years and in that two and a half years we have made three shifts towards the ability-to-pay principle within the taxation system. In 1969 we reduced Medicare premiums by 90 per cent and we increased income taxes. That group over there would never have had the guts to do that and they never did.

A MEMBER: They took it out of the middleman's pockets.

MR. JOHANNSON: That group would never have had the guts to do it and they never showed the guts to do it when they were in office.

The second shift was to increase the provincial share of the Foundation Program to 75 percent and this was a significant shift.

The third shift took place in the last session of this House. The government shifted \$50 or 50 percent of the education tax whichever was the lesser from property tax to the ability-to-pay principle and this was given as a credit on the property tax. The Throne Speech has announced a fourth shift which will take place this session, a fourth shift that will bring about a further move towards the ability-to-pay principle. --(Interjection)-- Two and a half years in office and our government has done all of this.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this government has the guts to do something like that and I would say that that group over there suffered a failure of both head and heart when it was in office and you know, Mr. Speaker, what you have when a man suffers a failure of head and heart - you have a corpse, a corpse. And, Mr. Speaker, I hardly think that the people of Manitoba can consider that to be a credible alternative to this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, late on a Friday afternoon, isn't that the most refreshing exhortize of Socialism that I've ever heard in my life. Going home, heading my way out at 5:30 this afternoon to Roblin constituency and go out to tell the people of Roblin: this is the kind of people that's running this government and deriding our tax destiny for the future. A most shaking experience, a most shaking experience, Mr. Speaker. Here we have an example, Mr. Speaker, of an excellent resolution to deal with a very very serious matter in rural Manitoba. The agricultural economy of this province has never been in the state it's in today and we stand up and get a reply to a problem in rural Manitoba such as the Honourable Member for St. Matthew's give us right now. I think it's most disgusting, most disgusting, and to give us this old tax shift again which we've heard over and over and over again. How crazy can these people be? Dealing with a serious matter and throw that junk across here, Mr. Speaker, I just can't take it and there's no way I can take it back to the people of my constituency because what we're dealing with in this resolution is not going to solve the problem.

Here we have, Mr. Speaker, the number one industry in this province is agriculture. Everybody knows that. And this man stands up as we ask this afternoon for some relief from the taxation which is killing that industry; everybody in this Chamber knows the problems of agriculture and everybody knows that we've got to help these farmers, we've got to take some of their taxes off their backs. And get a speech like we got from the Honourable Member from St. Matthews and for me to go back to the people of Roblin constituency on a simple little resolution and give them the wisdom of that member -- I'm sure they'll take off for - I don't know where, maybe the north, they can't go to Saskatchewan now because it's worse over there - and you can't go east on account of the lakes so they'll have to go north.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, in all sincerity I thought, you know, that the honourable member would deal with this resolution in the way it was intended. I think it's an

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) excellent resolution, I think the matter is serious, most serious; it's certainly most serious in my constituency because you go and talk to anybody in Roblin constituency, the problems of taxation on farm property is one that's just got everybody excited and bogged down and we get a Socialistic blast from the Honourable Member from St. Matthews which is not going to solve nothing; it's going to create more problems than he ever thought about with the wisdom that we got across here this afternoon with his wisdom.

But I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have some wisdom for this government if they'd only listen to us, but unfortunately they never will. They'll never listen to us. I spoke up here the other night. They had nobody to speak in reply to the Speech from the Throne; not one member up there was prepared to stand up that night and they all had their books packed up -- so here at a late great hour I stand up to fill in so that at least we were doing our duty in this Legislature and we're here to look after the people's rights and stay here and deal with the matters. And here there wasn't one of those back benchers up there wanted to stand up there and defend that Speech from the Throne.

And here today on a simple resolution, Mr. Speaker, that deals with a very important matter we get a speech like we got from the Honourable Member from St. Matthews. I don't know where he dreams, it must be over there someplace close to that refrigeration system because that's not realistic in my world, the wisdom that he brought across this afternoon.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at it. What is this going to cost the people of Manitoba to shift this \$15 million of taxation that's involved in this program. That's all we're asking for. \$15 million shift taken off farm property . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if it is in order for a member to rise in his place and ask that a certain thing be done which has already been announced as government intention in the Throne Speech? Specifically, Mr. Speaker, specifically the suggestion of the resolution and of the speaker that \$15 million of tax relief be provided with respect to school costs on property tax - that has been announced in the Throne Speech and I believe there is a rule that covers that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside on the same point?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe following the point of order raised by the First Minister, if, Sir, it's in your judgment that this resolution falls under the general rule of anticipation of legislation or so forth, if that's the First Minister's position then I suppose the resolution should have been ruled out of order insofar as its acceptance and its appearance on the Order Paper in the first instance but, Sir, having allowed the resolution to stand and having allowed one, two or three members to speak on both sides of the House, I find it hardly appropriate for the First Minister at this late stage of the progress of this resolution to raise his particular point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: My point of order is that while the resolution is worded so generally as to be difficult to classify as being in the nature of anticipation of an announcement to the Throne Speech, nevertheless the remarks of the Honourable Member for Grandview are certainly -- Roblin, are specific enough and do really relate directly to one of the announced intentions contained in the Throne Speech and as such is anticipation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would have to then further indicate to the First Minister that while I am prepared to perhaps consider that that Throne Speech was, particularly this year, precise to the finest of detail as to exactly what this government had in mind insofar as proposed legislation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member direct himself to the point of order and not to the Throne Speech.

MR. ENNS: Right, Mr. Speaker. I'll attempt to do that. Insofar as that while a suggestion has been made and I have to refer to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, because that is the point of order on which the First Minister is raising or basing his point of order; that the resolution calls for a specific relief in a specific area, mainly the elimination of taxation off of farm lands as such. A reference that the First Minister refers to speaks in general and broad terms of a shifting of taxation of education tax or the burden of education tax off of property owners in a much broader and general way. I think the whole gist and the context of this particular resolution is to recognize the very singular crisis that agriculture faces, namely the high cost of production versus the low prices for goods and for this specific reason,

(MR. ENNS cont'd) it's the intent of the resolution to suggest the reduction and the elimination of taxation for the purposes, not like what the Member for Wellington or St. Matthews suggested, to -- particularly aim at a certain group of people, a certain group of farmers, but it has to do with the production of farm goods and farm commodities as they relate to the present price.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is debating the question and not the point of order any more. I should like to say that there is some validity to what the Honourable First Minister has stated but the resolution is in a broad vein and I cannot find within the Throne Speech the exact reference to any \$15 million so therefore I must allow the debate to continue and try to see whether the Honourable Member for Roblin will narrow his comments to the resolution.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, I thank you, Mr. Speaker. We, of this group, are much more specific in what we'll do, and we'll put it down in black and white to this government. No, I'm telling you, if we were the government of this province we would shift that \$15 million - just like that. And it would be in the Speech Throne in black and white not vague like that piece of paper. And, Mr. Speaker, and of course I know the Honourable First Minister - his good wife comes from my constituency and him and I kibitz back and forth - but I wonder why he didn't challenge the Honourable Member from Emerson when he raised the \$15 million figure, because I'm only reiterating what the Honourable Member for Emerson has already said, but we have had a caucus meeting and we are agreed that we'll shift this \$15 million. We're not as vague as that group over there, Mr. Speaker, we know where we're going, and we know how we will guide this province, and we are prepared to shift that \$15 million. And I'll tell you how we'll do it --(Interjection)-- . . . Well, just look around the department. . . . the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, he mentioned the Honourable Member of Public Works, maybe a few bucks there; move over into the Attorney-General's department, I've already given him some evidence last night but he wouldn't reply to me today where we can save a million bucks there. We'll soon find the \$15 million and we haven't even got into Health and Welfare yet. There's all kind of fat cats over there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I should like to indicate to the honourable member that I must allow a lot of latitude in debate but the question before us is the advisability of considering a proposition and not of finding money, so would the honourable member content himself to debating the issue - the resolution.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I basically didn't want to say that but the First Minister is the one who got me on the issue and specifically asked me how I could shift that \$15 million. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to show the First Minister and his government how we of the Conservative Party are prepared to stand up, and we'll show them in great detail, and no doubt as the debate continues in this House on the various resolutions, we will show you in much more detail where we can shift.

But, Mr. Speaker, taxes, and this of course is on the tip of everybody's tongue every day. Taxes to most of us are that part of income which in most cases we never see - we earn it, but we never see it, and much less get a chance to spend it. --(Interjection)-- That's the wisdom of myself if you permit me that pleasure. I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for St. Matthews never even thought of that. He never even thought, you know, of that particular aspect. But the powers that be, the powers that be in this province today, this government, are not looking at that type of philosophy or wisdom at all, and they're arranging the tax shift of this province so that they're going to take all the money from everybody and they're playing this socialistic dream from the cradle to the grave. This again is what's scaring farmers in the country today. This wisdom is starting to infiltrate out into our farm communities and that's why the resolution is on the Order Paper. But, Mr. Speaker, whether or not we realize that sad truth, it's for everyone of us today, young and old, farmer, businessman, storekeeper, and everybody, employers, that this is only the beginning of the taxation story that's facing the people of this country Canada today. And it's a very serious matter. We've got these huge government spending programs that demands more and more tax dollars out of the people's pockets, and where can we pay for all these goods and services that governments are demanding today? And unfortunately in the whole shift the farmers got left by the wayside; the farmers got left by the wayside. He's got nobody to stand up and defend him today in this great government because he's a minority, and I was always of the opinion that the NDP were for the little guy, for the small guy, the down-and-out guy, the guy that's

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)got a problem. But, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this resolution this afternoon the Honourable Member for St. Matthews he's got no answers to save the farm people in this province with his wisdom, and I'm sure if he had the benefit of the wisdom of his party he would have give us some insight as to how we can solve this problem. He says, "tax shift. Take these fat cats, these fat farmers from Roblin constituency, let's take them for more and bleed them more and more and more." That's the wisdom and that's how this government is going to move this province in this fourth tax shift that he's said that is coming on at the present time. And no doubt there are some - or are there any farmers over in the NDP -- yes, yes there are. There's one, there's one farmer over there. I'm sure the Member for Ste. Rose knows what I'm taling about but I don't see --(Interjection)-- No doubt he will stand up and support this resolution in debate and I'm sure the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose will speak on it, and I'm sure he wants to support us in this resolution because he knows what I'm talking about. He knows what I'm talking about and no doubt we will have the benefit of his wisdom.

But, Mr. Speaker, the taxes, the taxes that are levied on farm land, or business, or industry for instance today, are somehow inevitably reflected in the price of goods and service, and I think everybody will agree with that. And although we may think otherwise, I don't think -- there's nothing that we can do, there's nothing we can -- then we must assume our responsibilities for our full share of the tax dollars and I don't think there's anybody that quarrels with it. But the farm people today have somehow got left by the wayside and they're not trying to evade -- I'm sure every farmer in this province wants to pay all the taxes that he possibly can pay. He wants to pay his full cost for the goods and the services; he want to pay for all the things that are around him, but he's so boxed in today because he happens to own a little farm land. This is the reason this resolution is on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, asking for simple relief; a matter of \$15.00 - \$15 million to try and alleviate this problem of school taxes on farm land. --(Interjection)--

Well no doubt in the debate the Minister of Agriculture will give us the benefit of his wisdom. I regret that the Minister of Education is not here today because I think of all people over there that can understand this problem, the Minister of Education is one that can deal with it and has in speeches in this House made a very sensible realistic approach to the problem. But the basic problem which the farmers of the province are facing today and are experiencing because he happens to own a little property, and he happens to own a little land, he's faced with the cost of education across this province and his own little general area. And I just happen to have a couple of the tax notices from my jurisdiction. The tax, 60 mills - 60 mills and this is in our Rural Municipality of . . . , mostly sub-marginal, not the best farming land, but facing us a 60 mill tax bill. A 60 mill tax bill - he has still only sold four bushels of grain, he's sold no oats, or little barley, and you see where the whole shift has moved over and these people are in a most untenable position today. --(Interjection)-- And I regret that the Honourable Member from St. Matthews didn't understand what we were talking about in this resolution, which again, Mr. Speaker, I say is a good resolution, and I regret that his approach to it was not a serious one and he didn't deal with it in the manner which I expected that he should. It's an excellent resolution, Mr. Speaker, and we could deal on the various matters of taxation all afternoon - the various philosophies and the various views. But in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister, who well understands this problem, that I think that this is a wonderful resolution, I'm in complete support of it, and if he wants our help on how to meet these taxes, meet us privately some night and we will assist him, because agriculture, agricultural land is a means of production in this province. Agricultural land is a means of production and as such, it should not be liable for the levels of taxation that are greater than those that are imposed on other means of production in our society.

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

MR. PETER ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Point Douglas . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Under our rules at the present time there is no adjournment of a motion.

MR. ADAM: I'll call it 5:30 then, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If that is the desire of the members. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think really, I wasn't positive myself as to the no adjournment motion whether it was actually in effect or not and I suggest to my honourable

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) friend, the Member for Ste. Rose, that it might be an adjournment but if it's in conflict, then I think that his last proposition was, seeing as it is almost 5:30, that we call it 5:30, Sir, but there's another rule of the House. There is another -- and may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, by agreement that we allow the resolution to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. I'm sure honourable gentlemen would agree to that.

But there is another, there is another undertaking, I believe, that was agreed upon, Mr. Speaker, that the House Leader on Friday afternoon just prior to adjournment would try to give an indication of the procedures to be followed by the House in the succeeding week. And if I'm correct I would like to indicate what we hope will be done next week. And that would be to try and clean up the Rules Committee Report so that we can establish as quickly as possible new rules of operation of the House, and I hope my honourable friend from Rhineland is taking note of what I am saying. It would be our intention to on Monday, as quickly as possible, go into Committee of the Whole to consider the report of the Rules Committee and then continue on into Supply.

Further, Mr. Speaker, as honourable members, I'm sure are all aware, next Friday is Good Friday, a very important observation to be observed by many people and of course we will not be meeting next Friday. I have been asked as to whether or not there would be an inclination not to meet on Easter Monday, that is the Monday following Easter Sunday. I am inclined to suggest to the House that we agree that we will not meet on Easter Monday and if this is acceptable, if this is agreeable, then we would meet until the hour of 10:00 o'clock on Thursday of next week and then adjourn, Sir, until Tuesday, the following week at 2:30.

If that is agreeable, Mr. Speaker, then may I suggest that this will be the procedure as close as I can give the information today for the succeeding week and then, partially at least, for the week following.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I declare the House adjourned and the House will stand adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.