

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, April 30, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan) introduced Bill No. 34, an Act to authorize The City of St. James-Assiniboia to pay a Pension to Mary Hoban.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to introduce and direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 90 students Grade 11 standing of the Miles MacDonnell Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. R. Stevens, Mr. L. Bugera, Mr. Kattermann and Mrs. Lowden. This school is located in my own constituency. We also have 26 students from Grade 6 from the George the Fifth School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Moroz. I have no designation as to what constituency they're in. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if he is now prepared to advise us what job opportunities there will be at Gillam this summer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately not yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the First Minister. In view of CFI being placed in receivership and the province being the largest creditor, will a financial statement be tabled in this House of that company?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: It must be the hour of the day. I didn't catch the full import of the honourable member's question if he'd care to repeat it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: The question was: In view of the CFI being placed in receivership and the province being the largest creditor, will a financial statement of Churchill Forest Industries be placed before this House?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll undertake to obtain legal advice on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Three weeks have now gone by since this question was first asked and I wonder whether the Minister could now tell us by what amount the Department of Health and Social Development is overspent on last year's estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health & Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like if it was possible to give an answer to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge but unfortunately we have not the figures available as of now and as soon as we do have I'll bring them to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Twelfth Annual Report of the Municipal Board for the year ending December 31st, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can the Minister give the House a report on the current situation regarding the hydro water regulation program on Lake Winnipeg? I know that the First Minister announced that the Manitoba Hydro Board has been granted an interim licence and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is asking for a report. I'm certain that he could get that by an Order for Return or an Address for Papers. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Excuse me, for the Minister of Finance. I wonder if the Minister of Finance can indicate whether he has any inter-departmental memorandums dealing with the cost implications of the proposed uni-city plan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there is any responsibility on the part of government to make any reports to the House in regard to any inter-departmental communications. I say that as a matter of principle and not in answer to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Does the Minister of Finance have any information on what the cost implications of the proposed one city plan would be?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: The Leader of the Opposition was on T.V. with me last Wednesday night when he raised this very question. I believe I answered him, at least to my satisfaction if not to his. The fact is that you cannot arrive at any estimate or guess of cost implications unless you accept a number of assumptions which are speculative and which do not contain information of the future of which I am not clairvoyant.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder whether the First Minister then could indicate whether there are any assumptions that the members opposite have made in determining the proposal for the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We don't deal with assumptions in the House. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I'm not after a report, I wanted to know if there is any work been started on the water control structures on Lake Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, preparations are in progress relative to Lake Winnipeg regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Statements were made outside the House of proposed compensation to be given to fishermen who are not able to fish because of mercury pollution. I wonder whether that communication has been made officially to the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to Ottawa to make a presentation to the Honourable Jack Davis we had a meeting with the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen at which the proposal which was going forth to Ottawa was fully discussed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder, by way of a supplementary question, could the Minister indicate the amount of money that was referred to in the newspaper was in fact discussed with the fishermen?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the proposal was discussed with them. I was not present during the entire discussion. What was made plain to them is that we were seeking to maintain the income that would have been lost by result of mercury pollution.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. The proposal of \$2 million is that based on statistical information that would indicate that that is the income that is desirable?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, last year the amount of money compensation which was arranged for by this government with the Federal Government and which was paid to all of the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) fishermen was based on an estimate of the amount of loss suffered by fishermen as a result of previous statistics. That amount was \$1,900,000 that was worked out with the fishermen.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder whether he can indicate was any of the fish processors that were declared redundant as a result . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has asked three questions on that particular topic.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order. This is another question not dealing with the fishermen. I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources can indicate whether any of the fish processing firms declared or made redundant as a result of the Fish Marketing Board have received any compensation from the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the province has not declared any of the fish processing firms redundant. Each of the firms that requested the province to make offers for the purchase of their assets, at current market value, not compensation, have received offers to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. Now, it may be that in certain isolated cases offers have not yet been submitted but for the most part they have all received offers for the purchase of their assets at existing market value.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister could indicate the formula on which the province made its offer?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, under the legislation of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act which was compiled by the previous administration, the province is obliged to purchase assets, not to pay compensation. We have valued those assets in the best way we know how of doing so through our Land Appraisal Branch. If that amount is not satisfactory, if we are paying too little than current market value, then the processor is in a position of selling it to someone who will pay more than what we are offering.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister in view of the answers that has been given would consider the possibility of an appeal to the County Court Judge for a final determination of what value should be in connection with the compensation, because the matter of fact there is no one who has accepted that compensation as far as I know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in a matter or case or circumstance of expropriation that course of action would be logical, but in the case, situation, circumstances my colleague is referring to, that procedure seems entirely unnecessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources in respect to this same matter under discussion. Is the onus on the processing plant to ask the government for an offer when their plants are declared redundant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, no plants have been declared redundant so the processor is in a position of doing exactly as he wishes. He can ask the government to submit an offer to him -- as a matter of fact I believe that all of them were written telling them that the government would be prepared to submit an offer to them if they wished us to do so and from then on it was up to the processor to decide whether he wanted the government to submit an offer or not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Finance who I know is always on top of his job. Can he confirm for the House that the Department of Health and Social Development is overspent by something the neighbourhood of \$30 million?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill . . . a supplementary? The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Could he confirm whether it's overspent by \$25 million?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question really becomes irrelevant at the moment. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I would wonder whether the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . Mines and Natural Resources could tell me whether there is government capital available for fish co-ops in the north for operating capital?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is capital made available in my estimates if you look at the Department of Agriculture estimates under "Cooperative Development," I think you will notice some half million dollars for that purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is either for the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the First Minister and it deals with the Transitional Assistance Board for the insurance agents. I wonder whether either one can confirm whether the guidelines for the Transitional Assistance Board will be more generous than the offers made to the fish processing firms?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the analogy or the comparison that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would like to draw is one that I wouldn't like to and so I just leave the matter there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. I wonder if he can indicate whether a copy of the Greater Winnipeg Act has been put into the hands of the various mayors and reeves of the affected areas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I caused to be distributed in this House a copy for each MLA. We provided the news media with a copy each. I have instructed, I believe that it has already been done, a copy has been sent to each of the municipal organizations in Greater Winnipeg, thirteen in number.

STATEMENT

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

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Tourism, Recreation, and Cultural Affairs) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to make a brief announcement in regards to the ceremonial guard at Lower Fort Garry. This has been of some concern to us for a while and I'm sure also to all of the members of this House. As you know, my department has been actively discussing with the Honourable Jean Chretien the question of retaining the ceremonial guard as a part of the tourist attraction at Lower Fort Garry. Members are, of course, aware that Lower Fort Garry as a national historic site is administered by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chretien was firm on the point that the Federal Government would not consider continuing the ceremonial guard at Lower Fort Garry. His reasons were twofold. No. 1: It was initiated in 1967 for Canada's Centennial Year on a one-year basis but was retained for a further three years to accommodate Manitoba's Centennial in 1970. No. 2: It is the Federal Government's intention to keep Lower Fort Garry as factual as possible for a historical point of view and it is their contention that since the Lower Fort Garry was never used in a military fashion retention of the ceremonial guard would not represent the facts.

Mr. Chretien indicated that the program being developed for Lower Fort Garry will emphasize the importance of the fur trade and life of early settlers. He gave assurance that the number of students employed in the program would not be reduced but will in fact be increased this coming summer. Mr. Chretien said consideration will be given to my suggestion last Wednesday that representation of the beginnings of the Northwest Mounted Police be included in the program as an authentic historical fact since first enlistments in that force took place at Lower Fort Garry in 1873.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye. (Absent) The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has two others. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, That an Humble Address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba, Government of Canada, and International Joint Commission with respect to the proposed Pembina Valley Dam between March 23, 1970, and April 26, 1971.

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I would like to have this stand until Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I can probably sympathize with the honourable member's request but wouldn't he like to know whether it is going to be received or not received by the Government, and if it is, why should there be debate? That's my question to the honourable member, so therefore I'll move the question and if the answer is in the negative, I can agree that there should be debate.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to accept this Order. I just want to indicate that I don't accept the implication of the word "proposed" Pembina Valley Dam, because I indicated last year the government's position with regard to that dam, but certainly we'll accept the Order, so I would think that that closes the matter. It needn't but it should.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, on a point of order.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe that the honourable member wishes to discuss this in debate and has asked for it to stand, that was his purpose, and the question, I assume, Mr. Speaker, has to now be made.

MR. SPEAKER: Our rules at the present time have not been clearly defined in this regard but I did make a statement the other day in this regard and I would ask the cooperation of all members that if we are going to expedite matters in this House that things that are acceptable will receive reply, do not necessarily require debate. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, I think it has been past practice that if an item is to be debated, this is one method of debate on the part of the Opposition, and the Opposition decide even though it is going to be accepted ask that it stand, they are entitled to have it stand and debate it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I confirm what my honourable friend has said. I would note that the new rule proposed by all sides of the House would be that it would not be debatable but that is the old rule.

MR. SPEAKER: I am at the will of the Assembly. Does the matter stand? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Pembina on a point of order.

MR. HENDERSON: On a point of order. Do I understand now that it is going to stand until Tuesday?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Government Bills. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you be good enough to call Bill No. 9 please.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have that matter stand. If any members care to speak on it, I'll be prepared on Monday but at the moment I'm not fully prepared.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Call Bill No. 15, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments that I would like to bring to the attention of the government and the members of this Assembly with regard to this Bill No. 15 on lotteries. And I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that everyone of us who sit in this Chamber have at some time or other been very active in lotteries of one form or another. I go back to my constituency from time to time and see what's going on and one of the first things that likely happens when I go into a village or a home, somebody hands me a ticket, because we are, you know, sitting ducks basically speaking, for the raffles that are held around this province. -- (Interjection) -- It is excellent duck country. I think that has been historically a pattern that has developed around our province and the edifices that have been placed in our various communities through the experience of lotteries is one that has great significance and has left many things of great interest in our province, so therefore I think that basically the lottery is

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd.) something that has become a part of our way of life, and whether or not the province should be going into the business of lotteries and using the Consolidated Fund and at the same time, the Attorney-General points out that while we may with this legislation impose some hardships on the local lotteries, because he leads me to believe that a lot of the lotteries in the country may experience some problems with this legislation, that of course concerned me. I think that, you know, should the province lay the groundwork for a regressive method of taxation, this I think is the quarrel that I have with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here in amazement with this bill wondering, thinking back in the debates of 1969 on the lotteries, the Minister of Finance - I know his position on lotteries. I know the First Minister's position on lotteries. I know the position of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources on lotteries and there are other members on the government bench who I know their position quite well, and that of course, makes me wonder if maybe we shouldn't have had a free vote on this particular piece of legislation, because this is a government bill and has been introduced by government in 1971 and I well know that there are many on the government benches that would not support this legislation. Now, who would have thought, as you check into Hansard, that the First Minister, and the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and others would now reverse their position from 1969 and now be part of a bill that is before the House. I become especially sensitive to some of the remarks that were made by those treasury ministers in that debate of '69. I recall the words of the Minister of Finance who said, if I remember it correctly, that lotteries were, in his opinion, a very regressive form of taxation. The Minister of Labour, if I remember his remarks correctly, said that he doesn't believe in lotteries, period, doesn't believe in lotteries, period. And I suppose, I checked some other remarks of the Minister of Finance and he said, "I reject any thought that moneys raised by lottery or any other forms of that type for the proper and normal provision of services to the people of Manitoba." This is my concern at the moment and maybe we will get the answers in the closing of the debate on second reading. So yes, we have a government even though that has happened, who are utilizing that method of taxation, the net proceeds of which this bill will be transferred to the revenue division of the Consolidated Fund and I have some grave reservations in this legislation that that is the right way for us to put this piece of legislation together.

I cannot honestly believe, and I support the Minister of Finance when he said that it is a regressive form of taxation and we should in some way put this fund, the moneys that will be accumulated from lotteries into a separate fund away from the Consolidated Fund of this Province. So I beg, and I ask the First Minister, I beg the Minister of Finance, I beg the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to stand up and support or let me know what their views are on this particular piece of legislation, or are they in favour of setting up a separate fund for the moneys that will come from lotteries and I hope in the course of this debate that they will do that. I hope they do; because if they don't then I become very suspicious of this type of legislation.

I wonder, you know, is it fair, Mr. Speaker, to the history of the great, you know the people, the hundred that we celebrated in '70, Manitoba's hundredth birthday in 1970, built this country, established a base on which we are operating and find us now that we are using lotteries as a means of providing moneys for the Consolidated Fund of this province. I feel that this bill needs a lot more debate from the government benches than it's had to date. In fact, I don't think anybody has spoke on it if my memory serves me accurately over there, and I think you should - I think every member over there should voice his sentiments on this legislation, because I feel that this bill needs much more debate than we have had at the present moment, and I want, especially those four Ministers on the Treasury Bench, I'd like to hear their comments and their views with regard to this legislation.

I'd very much like to hear the Minister of Finance explain the precedent which is being established by this bill, where funds from lotteries will be transferred to the Consolidated Fund. So I am looking forward with great anticipation to the Minister of Finance when he stands up and expresses his views on this legislation. I thought possibly the First Minister, I would like to hear his views with regard to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need to be in any hurry for this legislation. Lotteries are being conducted in this province at the present time. I think every municipality in the province has the privilege to grant licenses for lotteries. I was pleased to see in the last edition of the Thunderbird Quill that came out the other day, that the Indian Bands now are licensed to permit

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd.) lotteries, so nobody basically is being without the privilege of conducting a lottery in their community, but yet the Attorney-General has alarmed me in some ways when he asked the House to cooperate in dealing with this particular piece of legislation on an "urgent basis". I don't think the urgency is that great, Mr. Speaker, at this time. I think that we better take it very careful and I want to hear the Members opposite in their views with regard to this debate. I think if we spend another two, three weeks at this piece of legislation it would be much more helpful, so that I could, you know, understand where the government's position is and where's mine. I'm for lotteries but I can't support the money being put into the Consolidated Fund and I can't actually support -- I think that we should have some control on the number of lotteries that the province is going to conduct. He said what? - three or more, three or more. I say I can support two or even three, let's say three and no more. But again I would like to hear the Treasury Bench Ministers stand up and assist me with their views. I find it very difficult, Mr. Speaker, on those points to support this bill in its present form and no doubt when I hear the debate from the other members, the members of the government bench and hear their points maybe I will have a reason then to get answers to some of these questions that at the moment I haven't got the answers for.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, just so I'll get my view on the record, I'll make it short and simple. I'm agin it, but I'm going to vote fer it. If anybody is particularly interested in my rationale they can read Hansard for the session of '69.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister Without Portfolio have a point of order?

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister Without Portfolio) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak before the adjournment of the Leader of the Official Opposition. (Agreed)

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few comments because when the bill was introduced for the Centennial I was the member who introduced it on behalf of the Centennial Corporation and I just thought that I would like to counter some of the arguments that have been made by the members of the Official Opposition who apparently feel that there is some value in dragging out the debate on this piece of legislation, for what reasons, we have heard some illustrations but it seems to boil down to people do not apparently trust the government in handling a lottery or they have some moral qualms about it. And, Mr. Speaker, if you recall some of the comments made when the bill was first introduced, there was some pretty drastic warnings and suggestions made.

I recall that there was a - the wildest suggestion I can recall is my honourable friend, the Member for Arthur who in some way at that time I remember connected the Montreal lottery with the rioting in the streets in Montreal and was quite concerned that the institution of a lottery might lead to some dire consequences. Or the MLA for La Verendrye who said at that time that he felt this could lead to misery and further quotations of that order. There were suggestions that the Mafia might infiltrate the province, there were suggestions that this was not a serious event in keeping with the dignity and the joyousness of the Centennial. General concern, Mr. Speaker, that there could be a loss taken on the lottery. At that time I recall making an estimate that a provincially run and operated lottery could produce revenues of from several hundred thousand dollars to a million or two and that prediction certainly did in fact, hold true.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that there are forms of activities, I suppose, that the government raises revenues on that some people would think are questionable, such as revenues raised on racing, horse racing, and revenues acquired from the selling of alcohol and beer. I think that if members were to look at the bill that the Attorney-General has put forward it's a very modest measure and a very sensible one. First of all, it indicates that the government will operate a provincial lottery and I think that although there has been some talk about the fact that the proceeds from the lottery have not been earmarked, I think that that is a simple matter, something that the Attorney-General has in mind anyway and some measure that the Attorney-General or the government could easily come to terms with.

I don't believe that it's a new suggestion and I think that it is not a bad suggestion to

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) designate proceeds from a provincial lottery for say sports purposes, or hospitals or something else, Mr. Speaker; but even if that step were not taken and the government raised revenues from a provincial lottery, if that were the case, then I simply ask what is wrong with that? Because the proceeds from a lottery are not going to go into the coffers of the New Democratic Party, they are going to go into the General Fund and as a result of that, the proceeds could be spent on hospitals or roads or schools. So even if we take what is considered to be the worst concern of some of the members, some of whom supported the lottery, then I don't see in effect, what is wrong with that.

The other part of the bill, though, that I think has been overlooked and misunderstood is the fact that the Federal Government has passed legislation which allows groups and organizations to hold lotteries up to a certain amount and I think it is necessary and desirable for the Provincial Government to, in some way, regulate those lotteries. If there is no Board to determine whether there is too much competition in that area, or whether the lotteries are not soundly based or well administered or the people behind them aren't good citizens of the community, I think there could be trouble. I think there's already been difficulty, Mr. Speaker, on the part of some lotteries held in the City of Winnipeg and perhaps in other parts of the province where the income of the lottery, the proceeds from the lottery have not met the expenditures and therefore these organizations are in trouble in paying out the original prizes; and I think if we have a great deal of competition, which I think would be a natural thing, then some of these organizations that my honourable friends are concerned about, the community clubs and some of the business clubs and so on, they are going to find themselves in trouble and they are eventually going to come to the government and ask the government to bail them out, or they're going to declare bankruptcy, or they're going to plead with the government to bring about some measure of regulation to prevent too much competition and the bad consequences therefrom.

Mr. Speaker, there were members of the Opposition, as I mentioned, who supported the original lottery. If I could be permitted just to read directly from the October 8, '69 Hansard and read the Yeas as they were printed, the following members did support it: Mrs. Trueman, Mr. Craik, Mr. Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Mr. Molgat, Mr. Patrick and the Leader of the Official Opposition were all in favour, and I don't think it would be surprising if they again supported the bill and if some of the other members, who last time voted against the lottery this time went for it, because the second reading of the bill in 1969 saw 23 members in favour and 19 against - very narrow; and then on the third and final reading the vote was 33 to 14. -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend says let them speak for themselves, but I'm sure my honourable friend wouldn't really want to hear each and every member of the Assembly go through some lengthy comment as to -- (Interjection) -- Well, you may hear, you may very well hear from each member individually, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that when a party or a government discusses in caucus an important measure and takes a position, that the position is the position of the majority and that although on some issues some people are for and some against when a position is taken, it is the position that comes out of a measure of debate and a development of a consensus.

At the same time I might tell my honourable friend and occasional tennis partner once every 20 years, I might point out to him that it is a position, if he attends or reads about the proceedings of the New Democratic Party provincially, that it is a position of the New Democratic Party in Manitoba to support a government lottery. I don't know whether the Conservative Party has a position on this; I doubt it but perhaps their Leader will enlighten us when he speaks next day.

Mr. Speaker, I think I can conclude by saying that I think the reason that the government has brought forth this legislation is because of the tremendous success of the Centennial Sweepstakes. We've heard reports on it before but the hundreds of thousands of dollars that were earned, first and foremost by the organizations that participated in the selling of tickets -- and I would advise my honourable friends opposite that some of the clubs they're concerned about in rural Manitoba, some of the organizations could do no better than - not to have their own lottery, which they can have and will be given the right to have - but they should probably sell tickets on the lottery that will be administered by the Provincial Government because that's what was done before; there are no headaches connected with it; and the result is that all sorts of organizations made thousands of dollars profit without any of the headaches involved. So I think the reason is that the first lottery was a great success, that hundreds of thousands of dollars were

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) earned by the participating organizations, by the Centennial Centre and other arts developments, and also that the money that was spent on the lottery in terms of the employment and the printing costs and the staff and the personnel that ran it, these were all Manitobans and I think that therefore it is not surprising that the government has seen the value of holding a provincial lottery and that this Legislature should give its endorsement to one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the honourable member, if he'll permit me. I wonder how the honourable member would say that the moneys would be raised if a certain government lottery operated on a loss? Where would you get the money to pick up the loss?

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would think that if we look at the example before us, which is the lotteries held during the Centennial Year, they were enormously successful and I think that there's no reason to believe - I mean, some of my honourable friends, Mr. Speaker, predicted a loss on the first one; I say that the first one was a great financial success and that the lotteries should be run until such time as they are no longer profitable. That may occur some day in the future but there's certainly no indication of that at the present.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, I have a question for the Minister Without Portfolio; I'm not sure, are the administrative staff under his jurisdiction or under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance or the Attorney-General? The administrative staff involved in the lottery.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the responsibility for the lottery would now fall under the Attorney-General's department.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister Without Portfolio knows or could indicate the monthly cost of the administration? Based on figures that were shown it would appear to be about \$40,000 a month. Is that correct?

MR. DOERN: I'm unable to do that, Mr. Speaker, but I'm sure that the Attorney-General could handle that on a question period.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you please call Bill No. 18.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the steps of this Legislature we heard the Premier of this province make some indication to some of the farmers of this province that hundreds of millions of dollars literally should be pumped into the agricultural community of western Canada. Mr. Speaker, the First Minister is a very responsible man in this province. He is charged with the administration of the affairs of this province. He's in the position where he has to deal on many occasions in a joint manner with the government in Ottawa and I sometimes question whether statements such as this will lead to the best relations between the government of this province and the larger government of the federation of our country of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, on the 13th of March, as reported in the press, we had our Minister of Agriculture in this province make a statement to the effect that there would be approximately \$4 million of provincial money injected into the agricultural economy of this province. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to quote from the paper of the day where the Minister says he had been talking with the Federal Government for months and this is just another chapter in that dialogue. He said a four million provincewide program was an expensive way to buy votes in one constituency. He said the program only intended to indicate that the Manitoba Government was serious in proposing acreage payment plans it has been pressing Ottawa to implement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was on the 13th of March and on the 16th of March, also reported in one of the daily papers of this province there was this -- "Farm cash program was detailed. One hundred million dollars fund will give a \$1.40 to \$1.50 an acre to the farmers of western Canada." This was a program that was announced by the Federal Government and it says,

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) "The Federal Government will expand and intensify market development activity to assist in expanding export sales of prairie grains and oil seeds, Otto Lang, Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, tabled his revised proposals Monday in the Commons. Mr. Lang said the revised program incorporates a number of suggested changes made by farmers, their organizations and prairie provincial governments." (Prairie provincial governments).

Mr. Speaker, it would seem from this that the Minister of Agriculture of this province was fully cognizant of the program of the Federal Government. The Minister himself stated in his press release on - I believe it was the Friday - that he had been pressing Ottawa for months, the Minister of Agriculture of the Federal Government indicates that they were certainly in consultation with the Provincial Government, so it seemed to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture was fully aware of the federal program. He must have approved of it because he himself then brought out a similar acreage payment program. This seems rather strange, Mr. Speaker, because members of that side of the House have, to my knowledge, up until that time had never agreed with an acreage program. They had supported a two-price system and they had fought vehemently against an acreage type program.

Mr. Speaker, I've also noticed over the years that the federal party which is presently in power in Ottawa had also followed similar tactics in the past and had not really approved of an acreage type programs. It was the Conservative Party that had advocated and implemented acreage programs and here we now find that the federal government now in power supports that as well as the provincial government now in power supporting that philosophy.

But there's more to it, Mr. Speaker, than just a change in philosophy. Here we have our Federal Government in consultation with provincial governments supporting a program for the benefit of the western farmer and the Minister of this province being cognizant of that program and being cognizant of the fact that a provincial by-election had been called, and being cognizant of the fact that farmers in western Canada have accepted a Conservative philosophy of acreage payments, and here we have a by-election.

Mr. Speaker, being aware of the fact that the federal program was being announced very shortly, we have a Minister of Agriculture who, in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, deliberately forsook a confidence that he must have had with the federal people, and this concerns me, Mr. Speaker, because for the sake of immediate political gain our Minister of Agriculture may very well have jeopardized the future of agriculture in western Canada. To betray a trust, Mr. Speaker, does not lead to harmonious federal-provincial relationships. It may very well be, Mr. Speaker, that the short term gain that the Minister of Agriculture achieved in a political sense may come back to haunt him in the days ahead. Unfortunately, the person who is going to suffer, or who is liable to suffer, will not be the Minister of Agriculture, it will be the farmers of western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, when agriculture is in a serious economic situation it seems ludicrous to me that we would have a Minister of Agriculture playing political games with the lives of the farmers of this province. Mr. Speaker, if the Minister was sincere he wouldn't be setting this up just as a one-shot deal, he would be setting it up as an annual deal. We have yet to see what the other programs are for the Minister this coming session. We will certainly be looking to see what long-term programs he has, but I cannot, Mr. Speaker, condone this rather subversive method that the Minister of Agriculture has used. If the farmer is going to suffer as the result of this, Mr. Speaker, there is only one place that the blame can be laid, and that's on this present Minister of Agriculture.

There are other things though, Mr. Speaker, that are equally as disturbing. Having made the decision that he did, the Minister and his cohorts have found \$4 million, placed it in a special fund and they're going to distribute it to the farmers, and Mr. Speaker, the farmers need it. But where did the money come from? The Minister isn't telling us. I sincerely hope when you get up to close debate that you will tell us where it came from. What programs, Mr. Speaker, that were approved last year in this House were not proceeded with? What department was short-changed to provide this \$4 million? Mr. Speaker, these are questions that I sincerely hope the Minister will answer because the members on this side have the right to know; and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is not going to tell us, he's going to tell us that we can wait until next year when the public accounts are brought forward, but for one year we have to wait. I sincerely hope that is not the case.

We've been told, Mr. Speaker, that the cheques have been made out. They're ready to mail. When were they made out? We've also been told that the basis for payment is \$1.00 an

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) acre up to a maximum of \$100.00. To a market gardener with three acres this will amount to \$3.00, to one with four acres it will be \$4.00. I would like to ask the Minister to give us the rationale that he used for establishing his basis of \$1.00 per acre. I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that market gardeners are just as hard hit as the hog producers, as the egg producers, as the grain producers or the cattlemen, but the basis that the Minister is using for payment does not provide the equality of distribution that some may feel is necessary.

It wasn't too many days ago, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of my Party questioned the intellectual honesty of some of the members opposite, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, in this particular case I have to agree with my leader 100 percent. It's surprising also, Mr. Speaker, how easy it is for me to reach agreement with members on this side, not always but far easier than it is to reach agreement with some of those on the other side.

I don't intend to prolong this debate, Mr. Speaker, I think everything that we on this side want to say has been said and I can tell you this that while we intend to support the principle of payment to the farmers, I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we in no way condone the method that this government has used in making the monies available and we will not accept the procedure that has been used in this case as a precedent for future use. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that this is going to close the debate if anyone else is not aware of it. Members opposite have made a number of comments with respect to the proposition before them with respect to the methodology used in the program's implementation and the question of motive seems to be one that is in the mind of my honourable friends opposite. Well I suppose my honourable friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, have not been on that side of the House long enough and they can still recall some of the techniques perhaps that they would have considered and some of the motives that would have been important from their point of view. Perhaps they can't get away from that system of implementation of government programs and they can't accept the fact that no government in power would do things because it's the right thing to do but that it must have some ulterior motive behind whatever it is doing. This is an insult, Mr. Speaker, to the members of this Chamber to even imply that a much needed program being implemented by government is questionable because of political motivation. I think one has to agree that everyone is a political person in this Chamber and everyone has a philosophy of approach to providing services to people, and there are differences between those philosophies. Everyone has a different sense of urgency as to the magnitude of programs that must be brought about to deal with serious problems that arise from time to time. But to try to impute ulterior motives during a period where farm incomes have been the lowest in many many decades - in fact as low as they've been or they've never been as low since 1936 according to DBS figures - leads one to believe that either the members opposite were never sincere in things that they brought about for the benefit of the people of this province but were only playing a game to establish their credibility as political leaders in this province, or they have very little to attack this government with and therefore they must rake the bottom of the barrel, stir the garbage heap because that's the best they can find. This is the kind of static that we are getting from the opposition side. Now I don't include all members of the Opposition, some have been more fair.

The Member for Rhineland the other day questioned the about face on the part of this government on the proposition of acreage payments, reminding us as did other members before him, reminding us that we have been always in principle opposed to a system of acreage payments. Well I want to say to my honourable friends opposite that I don't take a great deal of pride in the present proposition. In fact it's disgraceful that we have to resort to these kinds of measures in order to bring about some relief to the farm community, indeed disgraceful. It is not a program that I would recommend to be continued. It is only a program that should be considered as an emergency measure, as a short-term measure to try to offset some of the adverse economic conditions that exist in the countryside for the time being; but that most seriously governments at the provincial and federal level must work out much better and permanent solutions to the economic problems in rural Canada and in this case rural Manitoba. So I don't agree with the principle of acreage payments as a solution to the problems of our rural people. And never have and never will do.

The solution to the problems of our rural people has to be in the area of pricing, the

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) area of returns on investment and labour and not in the area of discretion on the part of Legislatures and on the part of Parliament to determine whether there should be some sort of a welfare program from time to time in order to tide things over and in the process allow a lot of people to go into absolute bankruptcy. We have never had in this country a policy for rural Canada. We have never had an incomes policy nor a marketing policy. We have never had anything substantial by way of providing some stability for the agricultural industry. We have allowed the marketplace, be it at home or abroad, to play havoc with the incomes of our farm people and with their well-being. We have never seen fit to work out a formula by which basic incomes would have at least minimum guarantees through the support of the Government of Canada which is the only authority that has the fiscal capability and the constitutional responsibility to bring about.

I know that it tickles honourable friends opposite that the Province of Manitoba dared to break tradition in this area, that we would assume responsibility that rightfully belongs in Ottawa, and it tickles them a bit because they've never done it. They have never been involved in the kind of dialogue and measures of persuasion on the part of the government when they were in office with their federal counterparts as we have in the last 20 months. One of my criticisms as a member of this House in opposition was that the province had to play a very significant role in trying to influence federal policy in the area of agricultural development, that while it has many constraints in trying to bring about income stability from the point of view of provincial fiscal capability, but that it did have the absolute responsibility to try and influence policies at the federal level that would bring about a bit of equity and distribution of income to all sectors and in this case to our farm people. I made that point many many times over the years while in opposition in recognition of the fact that we have had a dilemma before us for a long time in the agricultural industry and in recognition of the fact that during those years in which I made those comments the members opposite were the government of the day in Manitoba and in Ottawa we had Mr. John Diefenbaker as a Prime Minister. Two Conservative governments which should have been able to sit down and work out a permanent solution, but no, they insisted on not dealing with the problem, but insisted that from time to time we will give some sort of an acreage payment, a handout in order that we might pacify our people in the countryside to get them over their problem for a short period of time or to bring about some alleviation. So it was an irresponsible approach on the part of both provincial and federal governments of past years in ignoring the basic needs of our industry and I have to agree with my colleague - he's not in the House at the present time, the Member for Crescentwood - I do agree I don't have to agree, that this is, as he put it, a half-assed program, if you don't mind my saying so, Mr. Chairman. Now perhaps that's unparliamentary but it has been said by my friend and colleague, the Member for Crescentwood, and I have to agree with him that this kind of a program is not a solution.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I wonder if the honourable minister would permit a question.

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. JORGENSEN: Now that the terminology that was used by the Member for Crescentwood and himself has been accepted in this House is it now going to become a precedent for future use in this Chamber?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that it would be perhaps just as well if members would not take advantage of that precedent, if in fact a precedent was set, on the understanding that perhaps special allowances can be made for a Minister of Agriculture in certain circumstances.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. While I appreciate the levity perhaps we should restrict ourselves in some areas so that the decorum of the House does not decline.

MR. USKIW: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just simply wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I was in agreement with my colleague from Crescentwood when he described the program as he saw it, and he's quite right. It is a program that does nothing about bringing about a long-term solution to the incomes of our rural people. And his argument is valid on this basis, Mr. Speaker, that is that every time you resort to ad hoc arrangements to tide things over there is always the sort of psychological thing that comes around with that kind of proposition, that well, since we have already gotten over the hump perhaps we can ignore the problem until we have to face it again and I, in that context, have to agree with him because

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) that is so true. It has been demonstrated to be true by the mere fact that government in Ottawa under the leadership of the Honourable John Diefenbaker operated in just that way, never faced up to the problem of bringing about a permanent solution but always brought about an ad hoc program at a given time in response to a crisis and the crisis kept recurring from time to time. Every few years we had a crisis and every few years we provided a few more welfare cheques without ever looking at the source of the problem.

The Member for Lakeside made, or before I get to the comments of the Member for Lakeside, I want to conclude my remarks on some of the points made by the Member for Rhineland. The Member for Rhineland indicated that there are many more programs required in this province, that this was a very, while helpful program, it was not going to do very much, but he talked about the need for marketing and the need to provide more services to our rural people.

I simply want to take a moment to remind my friends opposite that in the last twenty months, we have done many things in this area which have now been implemented and I want to make reference to the establishment of the marketing branch which is now operating and very actively trying to bring about increased markets and demands for commodities and surplus. I want to talk about the fact that we have brought about a very aggressive program in the livestock industry through the marketing branch of the Vets Services district program, the Vet Clinics, through the credit programs and the grants that are embodied in those programs and indeed we now are entering into another phase of trying to round this off with the bringing about of sewer and water services to the people of rural Manitoba. So we have been looking very, very seriously at the needs of our rural people from that point of view and I simply want to remind the Member for Rhineland that we are not sitting on our laurels and \$1.00 an acre is not going to be interpreted from our point of view as sort of the end all, and the fact that we won't have to do anything else after we make this payment. That is not the approach that we are taking. We will continue to innovate and change programs and develop new ones that are required to meet the changing needs of our rural people.

The Member for Lakeside made a great deal of fuss about the urgency of this legislation and about the fact that the Legislature should have been called much earlier in order to bring about the much needed relief. Other members have made the same point, Mr. Speaker, and I want to simply indicate to my friends opposite that again they are suffering from a bit of a hangover because maybe in the operation of government as they thought, they had no compassion, no feeling for members on the other side. No concern whatsoever, but I want to say that it's a credit to the Premier of this province that one of the criteria of deciding the timing of the session was the fact that the Conservative Party of Manitoba were holding a leadership convention. Perhaps my honourable friends don't appreciate that kind of sincerity. Unlike the situation which occurred two years ago when this particular party was in the midst of a convention and my honourable friends opposite decided to attempt to scuttle the possibility of bringing our present Premier back to Manitoba by calling an election prior to our leadership convention. Dirty pool of its worst kind, Mr. Speaker!

My honourable friends opposite just cannot accept a sincere approach and a desire to recognize the importance of the Opposition and the fact that it would have been proper to await the opening of the Legislature for the new leader that was going to be elected at the Conservative Convention and that was very high in the minds of the Premier of Manitoba when he decided on the timing of the session of the Legislature.

Also, it was not within our control, Mr. Speaker, it was not within our control to determine when the Opposition members opposite, who were looking for greener pastures, would tender their resignations, formal. That had a lot of bearing on the whole question and of course so did the by-elections.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would tell me what bill the Minister is talking about?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the evidence I have put before you is not difficult to recognize and to establish, that members opposite indeed have very little to gripe about, members opposite are grasping at straws in trying to be critical of the administration of government in Manitoba. Recognizing that legislation is progressive, that programs are somewhat even to their liking, but not wanting to give credit where credit is due.

(MR. USKIW cont'd.)

Now the Member for Arthur the other day made mention of the contradiction of government principle here again in reference to the acreage payment idea, he suggested that the province could perhaps implement a two-price system. Well surely my honourable friend opposite isn't suggesting that the province can have the fiscal capacity to lock itself into a permanent arrangement wherein it would provide subsidies in production of agricultural products across Manitoba. Surely he wasn't serious when he suggested that, because that is clearly the responsibility of government at the federal level and no province can afford to be put in that position.

The Member for Arthur made a lot of mention of the fact that he didn't believe that we were sincere in what we were doing, that we were motivated by the needs of the times, that we were motivated by political consideration because of the by-elections that were created not by our choosing, but by the choosing of members opposite who decided to vacate their seats in the search for better opportunities elsewhere.

I want to, in reply to the Member for Arthur, suggest to him that I am quite prepared to table, for his benefit, two letters which were sent to the Honourable Minister H. A. Olson on August 7th and one on August 10th and if the members opposite wish, I would even read them both to indicate that we have been very much involved -- my honourable friends want me to read them, Mr. Chairman, and I want to take a moment to read the first one dated August 7th, 1970. I quote, Mr. Speaker, "August 7, 1970. On June 25th, our Premier wrote to the Prime Minister informing him of the serious situation which had developed for many farmers in our province as a result of unduly wet weather conditions. Many farmers, particularly in the Eastern part of the province, found it impossible to prepare their land for seeding due to the excess moisture. In his letter the Premier asked for an indication as to whether or not the Government of Canada would be in a position to consider any form of assistance for farmers under these circumstances. You will recall that I discussed this matter with you on the telephone a short time ago."

On July 31st a reply was received from the Prime Minister outlining the existing programs which are available under crop insurance, PFAA and Operation LIFT. While these farmers who were eligible to receive benefits under these programs no doubt received some measure of relief from their difficulties, there are many farmers however, who would not qualify for any benefits from these programs.

"As you are aware, we have experienced for the past crop year, one of the lowest delivery quotas on record. This factor as well has meant that receipts from sale of grains have been considerably limited and farmers' cash position continues to be of a serious nature. While I appreciate that payments made under operation LIFT are not as yet final, I have seen estimates in the neighbourhood of \$75 million being predicted as the federal payment to farmers for wheat acreage reduction. This amount is considerably less than if there had been total response to your program. Under these circumstances I would like to suggest that some form of additional injection of cash into farmers' hands in Western Canada would make a definite contribution at this time towards alleviating cash shortages prior to harvest and would not be inconsistent with the amounts which the Federal Government had originally earmarked for assistance to Western agriculture in 1970.

"It is not my intention to be specific at this time as to the form of this cash injection. However, a straight acreage payment would perhaps be the most readily acceptable for such a short term measure. An indication of whether or not the Federal Government would be prepared to consider such an interim measure would be appreciated."

That was August 7th, Mr. Speaker. On August 10th, I mailed the following letter. -- (Interjection) -- The same year, yes, and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

"This letter is a follow-up to my letter to you dated August 7th, 1970 inquiring about the possibility of a further injection of cash into the Western farmers' hands due to the unusually low delivery quotas and lower than estimated participation in operation LIFT program. Since time is of the essence, it seems necessary to me that we pursue this matter expeditiously as an early decision is essential if some relief to the present cash shortage is to be brought about. If you are favourably inclined to using the balance of funds initially estimated for the operation LIFT program in some form of cash payment to western payments, I would appreciate being advised as soon as possible. It is important to have an indication of your stand on this matter, so that the Province of Manitoba may consider the possibility of providing a provincial input

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) jointly with a federal cash input to Manitoba farmers.

"I fully realize that a formula would have to be worked out and it would be important to have a discussion with you to arrive at a suitable formula. Just as an example: If you decided on a \$2.00 per acre cash payment, the Province of Manitoba could consider adding to that another \$1.00 and approximate acreage of 200 acres or somewhere in thereabouts." (That was the example of formula suggested, Mr. Speaker.) "Since this matter is of urgent concern to me at this time, I would greatly appreciate hearing from you in the next few days."

I don't hesitate at all to leave this for the members of the House to peruse and to comment on during the estimates, the Member of Arthur having expressed doubt as to whether that was indeed the case. So again I say, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the Government of Manitoba has been very much aware of the problems of our farm people, very much concerned to the point where they did break tradition and where they did bring about the kind of pressure, the kind of pressure that had to be brought about on the Federal Government in Ottawa to try and bring about some measure of relief.

Now it's true, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada did not respond positively to either of those two letters. They were very much involved in the consideration of other programs which have been announced since that time and that is, one of them known as The Grain Stabilization Program or the Gross Receipts Stabilization Program and it is in that context that they have decided to tie in some form of an acreage payment.

My honourable friend from Birtle-Russell questioned my sincerity or indeed, integrity in the fact that he suggested that I had some knowledge of federal acreage payments that were going to be made and that therefore I was jumping the gun in order that I would gain some political mileage.

Well, I want to say to my honourable friends opposite that all of the knowledge that I had about federal intent was based on the Grain Stabilization Program that was being prepared by Mr. Lang and any payments that were going to be made, if made would be contingent on the acceptance of that proposal and I was not going to, at that point, Mr. Chairman, relent on the pressures that we have been bringing about to bring about some cash assistance regardless of the stabilization plan which is really going to start coming into effect on August 1 of this year. I was not prepared to wait for the passage of that particular piece of legislation and subsequent consideration on the part of Ottawa before I had continued to make good, to make good Manitoba's proposition with, or without, with or without federal support and that is why we are here today discussing Bill 18.

I want to take a moment to take issue with the Leader of the Opposition who made a lot of comment about why we are not giving the same consideration to the fishermen of this province. He tried to paint a picture of concern on the one hand for our farm people, lack of concern for our fishermen. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that the Federal Government has never said to the Province of Manitoba that they do not have a responsibility with the fishermen and that they are not prepared to do anything. The Minister of Mines and Resources has indicated to the members opposite that he is fully confident that the Government of Canada will be acting as they ought to act in this area of responsibility and that they will indeed bring about relief to the fishermen and that it would be premature for Manitoba to take an absolute position at this time.

So I simply want to reject out of hand the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in trying to draw a parallel as between these two programs and trying to point out the contradictions which do not exist, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for La Verendrye the other day made a number of comments. I want to thank him for his support but I want to also indicate for the benefit of members opposite and the Member from La Verendrye that we are going to use the permit book system to make payments. We did get the cooperation from the Canadian Wheat Board for which I thank them very much, in providing us with their computer tape.

We are able to computerize this program as a result and payments can be made very quickly upon the passage of this bill. Those people that do not have permit books however, will make application to rural municipal offices or ag rep offices within the next few weeks and they will also be eligible for payments up to the same maximum, providing they are farmers. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Will the farmer MLA in the Legislature be eligible for payment of this money?

MR. USKIW: I don't know what the Legislative Assembly Act provides. I'm not really excited about it one way or the other.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point, I would be interested to know because I think on past occasions we've had programs of a similar nature where . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: By leave, if I might have leave, I could offer an opinion in trying to answer the question. I believe that the position of an MLA of this House who is eligible otherwise to receive this payment, would be exactly the same as a federal member of Parliament was at the time of the payment by the federal Crown of the acreage payments back in the early 60s. I just don't think there is any problem at all.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, on a question.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister of Agriculture was posed and I ask him again. Where did the money come from?

MR. USKIW: I want to indicate to members opposite that there has been no curtailment of any program to make funds available for this one.

I might compliment the good management of our Minister of Finance to assure that we were handling the affairs of government most expeditiously and efficiently and that the economy of Manitoba was able to provide.

Mr. Speaker, on that point, I indicate to members opposite that had there been no money available, the measure still would have been undertaken.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply, with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The estimates of the Attorney-General's Department. Resolution No. 21. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few more comments to what I said last night, before the Minister replies.

One has to do with the estates of the mentally disordered persons; it used to be called the mentally incompetent but the name has been changed. Are the number of cases constant or is there a change and to what extent? The other question is in connection with that: What are the charges made against estates of this type? Is it worked on a percentage basis or is it just on actual costs. Supposing a person whose estate is left once a person passes, are the moneys that are still in there then paid out to the next of kin or how does the government work it, or do they retain the total amount?

Then there is one other matter that I just want to briefly touch on. This has to do with the CFI's placement into receivership. Under what legislation was this done? It seems to me that the department in doing so, in taking this action, furthered its own ends, no doubt. I take it that the government, because this large amount was involved that they were there to protect the moneys that were advanced to this organization from funds that will and are being backed by the people of this province.

A further question in this connection: Will a company, a Crown corporation be set up to run the industry in the future or is the government taking over title as well of these companies, lock, stock and barrel so that they'll just be continuing under the names of the former companies? These are a few questions that I would add to what I said last night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General.

HON. A.H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General): Are there any more questions, Mr. Chairman?

MR. McKELLAR: In case I don't happen to be in, I'd just like to mention a particular

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) case of myself. I was involved as a witness in a court case and called into Winnipeg. This particular person hit me out here at Oak Bluff, a lady. I was called in in the month of October, 1969. I was told I was going to receive payment for my trip in and I've never received it but that's not the point. Is it usually the custom to call people in from that distance for accidents like that when they're charged before the courts? I was just wondering how they handle it. I'm not worried about the money. It's just a point - I was just wondering because it takes a day of a person's time. Although I would imagine the evidence given by the particular witness would have an effect on the decision of the judge at that particular time. I know that party only got a minor \$10.00 charge for coming on my side of the road and just about killing me. But I was just anxious to know.

Now under Land Acquisition - I wasn't aware this was transferred; it used to be under Public Works. Is that not true? Public Works Department? And the Land Value Appraisal Commission. This department, are they still buying land for all parks in the province? Are they handling it for every government purchase with the exception of Hydro and Telephone or do they purchase for Hydro and Telephone, too, right-of-way? I'm just not familiar with their . . . I think that's all I have to say at this time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I'll try and deal with the questions and constructive criticisms and comments perhaps in reverse order. The Honourable Member from Souris-Killarney I think did get response in respect to his questions about the Land Acquisition Branch. The Land Acquisition Land Branch does act as an agency for all government departments but the Hydro and Telephone have their own separate land programs, yes.

In respect to the policy in respect to witnesses being called even at some distance to testify in cases, the policy hasn't been changed at all, Mr. Chairman, and has existed and I suppose exists elsewhere throughout Canada. It's a matter of discretion on the part of the Crown as to whether or not a particular case warrants the kind of expense that's involved, but generally speaking, if there is a substantial violation, it is just not a petty trespass or a minor disorder, the Crown generally endeavours to obtain the best evidence to put before the Court, and even though it's a great inconvenience to many citizens to testify in Court, we ask that in the name of justice and fair play that people will make these sacrifices. The witness fee payable is pretty nominal. I'd hoped that perhaps we might this fiscal year make some change in that but I wasn't successful in persuading that priority. As I indicated earlier, the juror fees have gone up a third. I regret the fact that from time to time I hear of witnesses who haven't received their witness fee; nominal as it is they should receive it. There's been some failure on the part of someone that that has occurred and I'll be happy to look into that; because even though it may mean nothing to the honourable member in a monetary sense, it means a great deal to me that witnesses aren't receiving the response that they should after they have gone to the trouble of attending court.

In respect to the questions raised by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. Well, in respect to the whole question of The Pas complex and the various companies there including Churchill Forest Industries, it would certainly be premature for me to speculate as to what will eventually occur. If the litigation is successful, the litigation launched by the Development Corporation, then the Receiver would continue to operate. Whether or not it would be converted, would be put up for sale and sold to the highest bidder, reserve bid and so on, is all conjecture at this stage. The Crown of course could put in a reserve bid and it could become a Crown corporation or it could be sold to the highest bidder; I don't know. It would be purely speculative at this stage to consider.

In respect to under what legislative authority these proceedings were taken. There's no particular legislative authority; it's the common law of contract and the action was based upon the contracts themselves, the contracts between the companies and the lending institution, in this case, the Manitoba Development Corporation which provides the vehicle for the litigation.

In respect to the . . .

MR. FROESE: Then at the present time it's not a takeover, it's just at the . . .

MR. MACKLING: You're quite correct. There has been references made to government takeover or Development Corporation takeover; that's not the case at all. It's litigation taken properly pursuant to the contractual obligations between the parties and a receiver was appointed in accordance with the contractual arrangements between the parties. That is, one party could go to court and say, There has been default, I want a receiver appointed because my interests

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) are in jeopardy.

In respect to the Department of the Estates of Mentally Disordered Persons, again I say that there has been no change in policy of that department. I'm certainly not aware of any changes - there may be some small slight administrative changes that have occurred but I'm not aware of them. As to the basis on which the charges are made, I can't give the honourable member particulars but I'll be happy to supply those and get details. My understanding is they are based on the reasonable cost. That is, it's not a profit-making enterprise. It's run as a service to the people that are involved. But I'll certainly check into that and if I can, will give the honourable gentleman details either during the currency of my estimates if that's possible, or if not I will provide them later.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland also had other questions about the department. In reverse order I'll attempt again. He wanted confirmation as to the cost of the services of the RCM Police to various communities. They are again provided by specific contract, and generally speaking, the cost of the RCM Police constable is one-half under the formula that we have, one-half of the actual cost. We have, the Province of Manitoba, previous to our administration, had established a contract with the Federal Government for the supply of RCMP constables and regional offices and so on and pursuant to that formula there's an escalating scale percentage-wise of the cost to the provincial administration of the salary of an RCM Policeman and that is approximately 50 percent at the present time. Now the cost - and I hesitate to use exact figures - is in the neighbourhood of \$7,500.00. The actual cost and the actual salary that's paid in the actual costs are much in excess of that and would be around twice as much or perhaps a little bit more. That is the cost that is charged to the town, municipality or city that enters into an agreement with the province for the utilization of RCM Policemen. -- (Interjection) -- I couldn't give you the total right now; it has been subject to change. These services are offered to as many towns as wish to take advantage of them and I think I indicated in the last session that there had been a number of towns that had taken up this arrangement and I believe that that's an ongoing process. I couldn't give you the exact figures now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would ask members to direct their questions to the Chair so that their mikes are open and that everyone in the House can hear their question. The Attorney-General please.

MR. MACKLING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Attorney-General would accept a question at this particular time on his present trend of thought with regard to salaries to the RCMP?

MR. MACKLING: I didn't get the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BILTON: I haven't put it yet but it is this: Mr. Minister, \$7,500 you were saying to the town, approximately; I accept that. In the rural parts of the province, does the province pick up the whole tab or is it charged back to the municipalities? I don't think it is, is it?

MR. MACKLING: Well, I was about to deal with that. I'm glad that you've highlighted in any event. The province supplies policing, Mr. Chairman, to all communities that are under 500 in number, 500 population in number; between 500 and 1500, there is an obligation for the community to provide police services to their community. They can however, obtain through a contract with the province the use of the RCM Policeman that in turn the province has contracted to pay and whose services would be obtained from the federal Crown.

MR. BILTON: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I could take it a point further? I'm thinking of, as I explained yesterday with regard to the heavy cost for police work in the Town of Swan River, some 4,000 people; the whole constituency comprises some 16,000 people and there are some seven men that police the other 12,000. What I'm trying to find out is, does the province pick up the tab for that area outside of Swan River, the total tab? If they do I wondered if the Minister would give some consideration to a little relief to a community such as ours which augment those men doing the rural work?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, in answer to that, the province does pay the cost for policing the province generally where there are no communities that require to have their own police services. In the case of the detachment at Swan River I don't know the exact details of that detachment but obviously the police personnel that are employed by the province to serve an area outside of Swan River, the rural parts of Swan River, are located in Swan River because that's the most convenient growth centre or large centre in which they should

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) live and have their office. And to that extent the Town of Swan River gets some added benefit inasmuch as the policemen are located there though they serve the outside area and are paid for by the province so that there is an advantage to any community where a regional office of the RCMP is thus located to serve an outer area. So that advantage exists there now. I think that this is one of the things that a number of communities would like to have is to have -- (Interjection) -- Well, I don't agree. In any event concluding my review of the remarks of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, Mr. Chairman, he also raised the question that I've been dealing with with the Honourable Member from Swan River and he would like more information about legal aid and I think that during the course of this session I will be able to discuss further the question of legal aid and I'm hopeful that that will be the case and otherwise I won't take up too much time during the presentation of my estimates.

The formula in connection with the handling by the Law Society of the monies which government supplies to them is fairly clear and consistent but it's considered by most people to be highly inadequate, that is it doesn't provide remuneration for counsel in respect to any matters dealing with civil problems or litigation of any kind. It only deals with some criminal matters and the menu -- if I can use that word -- of criminal matters is not as complete as it ought to be. The Law Society has a roster of lawyers who are prepared to act on legal aid matters and it's a fairly extensive one. It's interesting to note however that the roster in connection with civil litigation has been decreasing so that members of the legal profession have indicated they're not prepared to act further or to continue to act in any large number without charge for their services in respect to what are considered by in common parlance to be legal indigents, people who can't afford to provide legal assistance and it's not just the people who are on social assistance or who have no funds at all that are a problem; there are many people who are working but have marginal incomes that need assistance as well and that whole question was studied by the fact-finding committee and their report went into the various techniques and systems that have been tried and some of which are working elsewhere and have made specific recommendations which I hope to be able to deal with in the very near future.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I interject for one moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Is the report that he is just mentioning, is that available that we could discuss it?

MR. MACKLING: Limited numbers of the report are available and I think that if any honourable member wishes to enquire at my office I will endeavour to supply him with a copy.

One of the other questions the Honourable Member from Rhineland raised was the whole question of soft drugs. There was some particularization in connection with the use of a particular drug called "marijuana" at some gatherings of people, particularly rock festivals, and he was concerned as to what measures we were taking to supervise or to insure that this practice isn't ongoing, isn't permitted and sanctioned by society. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that there is a very real problem in connection not only with marijuana and cannabis, hashish and the other soft drugs but all forms of drugs that have a debilitating, intoxicating and hallucinogenic effect upon people and there is a growing use of chemical comforts in our society and it's disturbing to note the greater incidence particularly of these drugs and its use by very young people and I know there is great soul searching going on in the minds and in the hearts of people from one end of this country to the other as to what the answers are to the problems that are associated with drug abuse.

There is a genuine and honest debate as to whether or not soft drugs are addictive. There are authorities who have spent a good deal of time and effort in arguing one way or the other. I think it's true to say that honourable members of this House suffer under the same concern for whether or not one position is correct or the other, as many people throughout this country. I'm satisfied in my own mind that soft drugs, drugs like marijuana, do not appear to be addictive in the sense that heroin or opium or any of the other hard drugs are and yet there is no question but the use of soft drugs can well lead to a psychological propensity, an acceptance or a tolerance of the use of drugs which borders on becoming addictive.

So where you draw the line is pretty difficult and I'm not at all convinced that scientific studies have yet demonstrated to everyone's satisfaction that there are no persistent lingering and dangerous effects to the continued use of soft drugs. I think the scientific evidence is pretty clear that the very limited experimental use of the soft drug does not produce addictive

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) results in the human anatomy but protracted use is opened -- in my opinion it's opened a question that they do not provide a propensity to addiction or to reliance on this sort of chemical comfort and there are some authorities who very seriously question whether or not there is not actual physical harm occasioned to the body.

Now so far as the policing of drugs are concerned the RCM Police have been subjected to a good deal of criticism about the work of undercover agents who are obliged to make inquiries in a very careful way in order to determine what people in society have chosen to embark on this rotten trade in drugs that victimizes young people particularly. It's not a field that the RCMP are proud to be involved in. I have had a number of discussions with responsible people, the top people in the RCM Police both in Manitoba and in Canada and it's not an easy task that they have and they're subjected to a good deal of criticism and a good deal of criticism that is completely irresponsible and unjustified. It's a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the only way you can determine whether or not someone is trafficking and is breaking the law in respect to the sale and promotion of drugs is to -- not to wear a uniform and present yourself and say now I'm going to caution you that if you are you better not tell me because you're subject to arrest. They can't telegraph that they're making investigations; they have to do it in a way which obviously isn't going to destroy any probability of getting evidence as to people who are trafficking and I know that there are people who say that there are procedures of entrapment used and I've been concerned about that and I've been assured not once, Mr. Chairman, but on a number of occasions when I've inquired that entrapment procedures are not used by the RCM Police. By entrapment I mean someone is asked to obtain the drug for the undercover agent and thereby becomes caught up and is charged himself. That is, the person who really acts as an agent for the policeman is charged with trafficking and that is not the case.

I could spend a good deal of time on that, Mr. Chairman, but I want to assure honourable members of the House that the RCM Police act fairly, responsibly in connection with that area. I might say that the prosecution of narcotics doesn't fall under the Attorney-General's Department, the federal Crown maintains a separate branch to deal with the prosecution of narcotics, excise and customs, bankruptcy and I could go on.

The Honourable Member from Rhineland was concerned about wire tapping and that is a very topical question; it has been for some time. You recall that in the last session of the House we introduced legislation to prohibit -- not prohibit, I'm sorry -- to make it an offense such that a person has a civil remedy for interference with your private communication. But it is not a criminal offense in Canada to engage in wire tapping and I don't know why there is so much foot dragging and slow moving on the part of the federal Crown to make it an offense to wire tap because I think that it's proven to be a very dangerous weapon in the hands of irresponsible people and there's no question that wire tapping devices are available, Mr. Chairman, and are used and have been used.

Now there's currently a good deal of controversy as to whether or not telephones of Members of Parliament or MLA's and so on have been tapped. I was concerned about the security in this building some time ago and I was satisfied then and I am now that there had likely been -- (Interjection) -- I'll answer your question in a second, the honourable member there -- there had likely been interception of communication which was of a very confidential nature within my department, confidential because it dealt with a question of whether or not there were certain -- well, whether or not it dealt with a matter of organized crime in Manitoba and I am of the firm belief that that communication had been intercepted in some way or fashion and I caused an inquiry to be made so that the telephone system in this building was checked and I was satisfied that there were no wire taps in existence. But you know there's such sophisticated equipment today that just looking at the telephone equipment may not at all be the answer because the tapping or interception can take place at some distance and it can take place on the communications equipment at some distance from the actual machine.

Now I believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to introduce as quickly as is possible legislation to provide that wire tapping of any kind is an offense and is punishable by law so that if there are communications intercepted of Members of Parliament or Members of the Legislative Assemblies or elsewhere that there can be a right of action and that can be stopped. The Honourable Member from Rhineland -- (Interjection) -- Yes. You can ask a question.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, just on this point while the Minister is giving us assurances about wire tapping, can he give assurance to all the members of this House that no one

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) or no member of this House or Leader of the Party has wire taps in his home or in the office?

MR. MACKLING: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, that I can't give that sort of assurance because I haven't asked for that sort of an electronic sweep of everyone in this House and all of the offices. If the members feel that that sort of assurance should be given and that sort of survey should be made I'll be happy to entertain it. It is a very expensive procedure inasmuch as the people who are involved are experts and one questions whether or not you can do much if it isn't regulated by law first and that's why I think that the Federal Government should pass the legislation and then you would have a right of criminal action against anyone. Right now we have a right, by the statute we passed at the last session, to bring an action for civil damages but your measure of civil damages may be very very difficult to prove in Court and so the criminal remedy is the one that should be available right away.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, Attorney-General, Sir, I'm sure you can give the assurance that the RCMP are not tapping, you know, anyone's phone.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would be shocked if I were to discover that the RCMP were engaging in any wire taps. I haven't placed that question to the RCMP. I certainly will do so if there is any at all suspicion that the RCM Police in this province would in any way engage in that sort of activity. I reject that they would because they are a most responsible and effective police.

There is a couple of other questions that the Honourable Member from Rhineland raised and he was rather prolific in his questions and I hope that I'm not taking too much time in answering them -- and I respect him for them. Most of them were very good questions. The question about the Land Titles Office and the change from old system to new system. I haven't got a report on what changes, if any, have taken place as a result of the tariffs that we passed last year where we kind of gave an advantage to those who had old system property; we reduced the fees for conversion to new system as an inducement to bring more of the remaining land that continued to be held under the old deed system, under the Torrens title system and I will be giving a report on that and I'll either have an opportunity to provide it to the House or to the honourable member.

I think I'll move on to -- the Honourable Member for Churchill gave, I thought, a very constructive suggestion that consideration ought to be given to the location of detention facilities in Churchill rather than engaging in the very expensive and wasteful business of transferring prisoners on long distances when the sentences are of a relatively short period of time and that is something that certainly ought to be considered. It's, Mr. Chairman, not my department that is responsible for the custodial facilities. We are responsible through the RCM Police for the overnight detention of prisoners until they are before the court, but other than that the jurisdiction of my department does not extend. But I'm certain that the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Welfare - pardon me, Social Development - I believe he was in the House last night when you spoke and certainly I will have conversations with him and you might as well about that suggestion which I thought was a good one. I don't know what the expense would involve and you'd have to look at it from a cost-benefit point of view; and certainly one of the benefits is not moving the people from visitors and normal relationships. All factors would have to be weighed but I like the idea, personally and we'll discuss that question.

The Honourable Member from Swan River - no, I suppose I'm up to the Honourable Member from Morris now - I'm sorry. I had Swan River marked in here and that's where these "alleged offences" had occurred, or something, and I was going to launch into my friend, the Honourable Member from Swan River.

I think the Honourable Member from Morris' allegations were responded to me last night. I will not go into further detail now. I didn't have the file and the particulars; I relied on memory last night and I wanted to make sure that my memory was correct. I believe that that is so. In the event there is any difference, I will certainly advise. If the honourable member doesn't feel that I've answered his questions I'm certain that I'll hear from him further.

The Honourable Member from Brandon West -- (Interjection) -- I'm getting some advice from across the Chamber which I cannot hear. Well he did have some constructive observations which I thought perhaps I might make some reference to, Mr. Chairman. I thought that I did indicate my response to some of the other matters he raised which I don't put in the same category.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.)

He was concerned about the number of drug addicts in society and I think I touched on that question although not in the framework in which the honourable member dealt. There's no question but those persons who have fallen victim to an addiction particularly for hard drugs, would find it very expensive to continue their habit and there is no doubt there is a relationship between the incidence of violent crime and the number of drug addicts that are in society. I agree with the observations which the honourable member quoted from Chief Norman Stewart of the City of Winnipeg Police that there has been a higher incidence of violent crime and the association of that with the cases of addiction of hard drugs cannot be questioned. The answer to it is certainly no letup in connection with the inquiry and prosecution of those who indulge in the trafficking of hard drugs and a continued surveillance and maintenance of high standards of police activity.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the City of Winnipeg Police on the high calibre of that force and other forces throughout Metropolitan Winnipeg and Manitoba. I've alluded to the RCM Police and I believe that they function admirably, but it is not to say that I don't think that higher standards are not necessary and that vigilance must not be made to improve, and later on in this session, Mr. Chairman, I hope to be introducing some legislation dealing with the establishment of a police commission for Manitoba which will provide among other things, for a right of appeal for police officers, from disciplinary measures taken against them and also a right of appeal for those people who believe themselves to have been subjected to discriminatory practice or unfair treatment at the hands of police, a right of appeal from the police authority from whom any preliminary decision might be obtained.

I think the honourable member had some questions about legal aid and I hope that in my answers to the Honourable Member from Rhineland I have indicated some of the answers.

The Honourable Member from Swan River was concerned - again, it's a similar concern that the Honourable Member for Churchill has as to the cost of transportation of prisoners in some cases for detention and again that's a matter that I think you have to look at from a cost-benefit point of view and I for one have a very open mind about reviewing program in that connection.

The jail facilities that we maintain in individual communities are very limited. They are as I indicate, merely lockups for overnight detention or detention pending trial. I am concerned with the adequacy of some of these lockups. I've had occasion to inspect some. I would have liked to have had the opportunity to inspect more of them if not all, because I was particularly concerned shortly after being in office that one or more people having relatively recently taken their own lives in lockup facilities and instructions did go out from our department to insure that there would be a very careful watch made in respect to persons who are in detention, particularly under circumstances where it is obvious that they are suffering from a delusion or an incapacity and I believe that that further scrutiny has been both responsible and has eliminated some of the threat that otherwise might exist to persons in those circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I think I would be remiss if I didn't make comment now particularly about one matter that the Honourable Member for Brandon West raised, and that was in connection with my alleged interference with a matter dealing with Mr. Nicholas Ternette whose name I use, because it has been already used in the Legislature. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that this incident occurred at one of the large gatherings of people, called a Rock Festival, in Greater Winnipeg and the preliminary report that I had from my Director of Prosecutions indicated a high incidence of soft drug usage within the Rock Festival itself - difficult to establish, difficult to prove - but nevertheless believed to be very much present. The fact that a group of young people had gathered before the gate and had been admonished and cajoled by a young man to resist moving, an altercation occurred, witnesses came to my department, a witness that the Director of Prosecutions interviewed and it appeared from his report that there was some very real substance to a suggestion that the complaint that this young man had made that he had been abused by the police was very real on the basis of the report that I had. In conjunction with that there was no physical violence in the sense that there was no attempt to strike or otherwise impede the police. The young man was taken away, he suffered some injury, the report of the Police Commissioner says these injuries resulted from his falling and I cannot do anything but accept that they have weighed all the evidence, heard the witnesses and have come to that conclusion. Why he should fall while escorted by two you know, fairly substantial policemen, I know not, but in any event, he did suffer some injuries which were confirmed.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.)

The suggestion had been and witnesses had indicated prior to my consideration of the matter, or reflection on it, that he had been subjected to abuse. The fact is that he was charged with obstruction, the obstruction was more apparent than real. I was in Halifax when a reporter from the media telephoned me and I gave what I admit to be very spontaneous and off the cuff statements in respect to basis or criteria for a stay in prosecution and though the comments that I made were not full and reasoned and made after due consideration, I admit that they may be interpreted to be not completely fair or reasonable in the context in which they were made. But, Mr. Chairman, what we must be very cognizant of in our society is that people do protest from time to time and the police commission indicated that they certainly accept the right of people to demonstrate and protest and I'm very pleased, Mr. Chairman, that we have had a large number of occasions when there have been very explosive situations and our police have acted reasonably, properly and have demonstrated a maturity and an attitude that cannot but reflect the highest credit on our police not only in Greater Winnipeg but in Manitoba. The fact of the matter in this case was this altercation occurred, it was to my way of thinking, a very small incident. The young man had suffered some injury obviously, the obstruction did not create any real problem, there was going to be a major confrontation no doubt in connection with the allegations that he had been beaten or subjected to harrassment by the police. Viewing all of the facts, the facts that there was some question as to whether or not there had been any real in fact, inconvenience or obstruction to the police, the fact that there hadn't been any violent effort on his part, that there had not been any abusive language and so on in his part that was of the nature that would occasion violence, there was no response on the part of the crowd to his admonitions that he made, all things considered, every facet, it seemed to me clear that this was not a case where the Crown should be prosecuting this young man.

Under no circumstances, under no circumstances was there any consideration as to whether this young man was a Conservative, a Liberal, a New Democrat or anything else. I didn't -- (Interjection) -- well I'm coming on, I didn't know this young man personally, I didn't know this young man personally and I still don't. One has to view every case on the basis of the merits and not on the basis of political affiliation and I'm satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that there was no irregularity, no impropriety on my part. The only regret that I have, Mr. Chairman, is as to the spontaneous remarks I made when questioned by the reporter while I was in Halifax.

I think I'll let it go at that, Mr. Chairman. I see that members are becoming restive, calling 12:30 and you are anxious.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee Rise.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might raise a point of order at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder whoever the acting House Leader is whether they would agree, by leave, to proceed with the consideration of the Attorney-General's estimates this afternoon in lieu of private members' hours until their completion, it might not take that long. On the understanding of course that the minutes or the hours that are taken to conclude the consideration of his estimates are not chalked up against our time on consideration of estimates. If that is agreeable to the Acting House Leader -- perhaps I could just say that you can take it under consideration now and perhaps let us know when the House reconvenes at 2:30. That would be fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is 12:30 now; I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 p. m.