

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 29, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to introduce our guests. In my loge on my right we have with us this afternoon Mr. Speaker Murray of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia. On behalf of the Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here this afternoon. We also have 90 Grade 11 students of Sisler High School. They are under the direction of Mr. Shaw and Mr. Brown. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister for Mines and Natural Resources. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you this afternoon.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for my colleague the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, last year when this proposal was put before us by the government the original plan was to have only some of the northern members on the Task Force. It was at that time that I moved an amendment which I think the government for accepting and I think that in retrospect all of us can agree that it was the right course to broaden the committee because the problem we've always had with the north and certainly the problem that the northern people have always felt is that they really were not understood by people in the south.

Now that the committee has made its report I want to compliment the members of the committee for the time and effort that they put into it. I know the countless hours that went into their work and I think that it has served a very useful purpose in convincing people in northern Manitoba about the real interest of the province in their welfare and in their future. Now that we have the report before us I think that the task of government is the difficult one, the implementation, because the needs of the north are great. The money demands are going to be heavy hence the priorities have to be judged most carefully. I think in this regard that the committee can perform a most useful function in continuing the assessment of the work that needs to be done. The work itself obviously will have to be conducted by government departments and I think there is some advantage in having a committee that is not wholly government, represents other sides of this House, to continue an assessment and a survey of what is being done. On that basis I believe that the committee should be reappointed and that the work ought to continue. I don't know whether the committee will need to do as much travelling as it has in the past; I think in the course of its survey and analysis they will have to conduct some such travels. I know that there is some fear in the minds of some people that it can become a political committee. It's been suggested by some that it is a means of campaigning for the members in the northern areas, and I would hope that that would not be the course for this committee, but that in fact it be as I had wanted it to be a non-partisan committee concerned with northern development.

It might well be that the government would consider the appointment of further members from southern Manitoba because again if we are going to achieve the understanding between both ends of the province, and I'm sure my honourable friends in government have frequently heard it said when they are outside of the City of Winnipeg that in the minds of people in other parts of the province the Government of Manitoba's thinking ends at the perimeter route. I must say that I heard that more frequently when my honourable friends on the right were in office, but that was certainly the view of many people outside of Greater Winnipeg, that this was a government of Greater Winnipeg. I don't think that is good. So if we are going to change this attitude and convince Manitobans in all parts of the province that really the welfare of one end or the other is the general welfare of all of us, then we have to have committee representative of the various areas.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend the committee for its work; I think it has produced basically a good report. I cannot speak in detail about every part of it; I'm sure that regardless of the report just the very fact that the work was done and that someone has gone up to listen to the problems of the north, is in itself of great value. I would urge the reappointment of the committee as somewhat of a watchdog on the operations now that will be turned over to the government, an assessment of priorities and a continuing liaison between the rest of the province and northern Manitoba.

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: The point that the honourable member made which sounded very meritorious and interesting was that perhaps there should be more members of this Assembly involved for this particular northern study; and since I'm sure that the honourable member would appreciate that there is a problem in making a committee too large if it has to do some travelling, would he be prepared to suggest that perhaps the best procedure would be to have this Northern Task Force Committee which is smaller in number report to some appropriate standing committee of the House which would include more members from the southern part of the province?

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, I think some such measure could be considered, Mr. Speaker. I do think though that the composition of the present Task Force should not be strictly northern members, that the present composition should be maintained. Possibly the other parties in the House who do not have members in that area would want to rotate their own members on the committee so as to broaden - and then if that was part of another committee I think that could work. Maybe the Economic Development Committee would be a proper one.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, excuse me for nearly missing the notice but if no one else wishes to speak at this time I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that debate be adjourned.

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks) introduced Bill No. 57, an Act to amend The Public Schools Finance Board Act; and Bill No. 59, an Act to amend The School Attendance Act.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface) introduced Bill No. 63, an Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.

HON. AL MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James) introduced Bill No. 67, The Privacy Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I rise on . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I repeat, the Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. CRAIK: Pardon me.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege . . .

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): If I may on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My colleague has I think given due notice of something that has to take place before the Orders of the Day, and if before the Orders of the Day are entered into and before the question period and I think if -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's a question of privilege at all being raised or it wasn't mentioned that it was being raised. Mr. Speaker, on the point of order if I may. I believe if the Minister of Transportation speaks now it would rule out of order something that my colleague, I think, has taken the proper procedure in wanting to present to the Legislature.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I believe that the -- I anticipate that there is a motion to adjourn the House, but it doesn't preclude the Speaker from recognizing any particular member

(MR. GREEN cont'd) and I question whether a motion to adjourn the House can't be made after any particular member in the House has been recognized to do any thing. So I think it's just an accident of recognition here and it certainly won't be out of order if the Member for St. Vital is recognized next -- Member for Riel. So on the point of order I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that the Member for Riel gives notice merely makes it appropriate for him to stand and get the Speaker's attention to make whatever motion he wishes but doesn't give him precedence over any other person receiving the eye of the Speaker.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied as long as that is your interpretation of Rule 26 subsection . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to first of all apologize for not being in the House yesterday. I had to be other places which I felt were slightly more important than being in the House. There was a question raised on Friday about certain things that were stated by myself subject to misinterpretation and in view of the consternation it caused on the other side of the House and to avoid the same type of display today, I would like to, Sir, with your permission, withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for his retraction and may I also at this time assure the House that what transpired on Monday before Orders of the Day was not in any way intended to cast undue or unnecessary reflection on the conduct of any honourable member of the House. If any honourable member should feel so aggrieved I hope the House would appreciate that my main concern is to maintain proper decorum of the House at all times and if on occasion there should be any signs of erosion thereof that it then becomes my prime objective to restore its dignity and propriety of which we are proud.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say for my party that we are grateful to the Honourable Minister of Transport for the gesture that he has just made. We recognize that he is a man of conviction and spirit and oftentimes in the heat of debate one finds it difficult to achieve just the correct phraseology and we're all subject to human frailties when it comes to language in emotional circumstances. I think it took some courage and some gallantry on the part of the Minister of Transport to make the gesture that he did and our party thanks him for it, Sir.

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

MATTERS OF URGENCY AND GRIEVANCES

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of definite public importance, I would ask the leave to the House to do so. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that the House do now adjourn to consider a matter of definite public importance brought about by the government's casual and pragmatic manipulation of the thousands of Manitoba citizens affected by the government's approach to possible changes in the automobile insurance industry. More specifically, for not making public in a more expedient manner the contents of Bill No. 56 which has been given first reading in this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to thank the Honourable Member for Riel for complying with our Rule 26 (2) insofar as proper notice and terms of time is concerned. I have perused the contents of the proposed motion and . . .

MR. WEIR: . . . you're about to make a ruling and before you do, Sir, may I just speak to the point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order with reference to my honourable friends' remarks. I remember on numerous occasions being on that side of the House and the reason for the rule as it is now established, and which I disagreed with at that time and disagree with today, is that this would prevent arguments on the question of urgency before the Speaker makes his ruling - that the notice was given, the Speaker makes his ruling and it's not debatable.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I don't agree that that was the reason at all. Mr. Speaker, the reason was, in speaking to the point of order, that the Speaker was asked to make a snap decision with no opportunity of having perused it and if there is an argument that it must take place before the Speaker reads the motion or presents his ruling. Mr. Speaker, that's my interpretation of the rules on this as on any other decision that the

(MR. WEIR cont'd) Speaker makes. If you make a ruling that is against either - well against any party in the House then the only alternative that there is left under any other circumstances is to challenge the ruling.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Premier remarked from his seat and I was pleased to hear it; that is logical but it's not the rule. I argued on many occasions when I sat on that side of the House that the Speaker should be entitled to hear argument as to the question of urgency, and only that question, before he makes the ruling and I was continually being shouted down by members of the government side. Now I hope that we can change the rule to have it make more sense but I think that the rules as established by the administration must be followed.

MR. SPEAKER: My sympathies do lie with the comments made by honourable members but my interpretation of the rules as they stand is that by reason of the fact that I am given one hour's notice that I am compelled to give my ruling thereon at this time. I shall therefore proceed. I have perused the contents of the proposed motion and the relevant rules. May I refer honourable members to our Rule 26 subsection 6, subsection (d), which reads in part as follows, and I quote: "The right to move the adjournment of the House for the purposes mentioned in Sub-rule 1 is subject to the following restrictions: (d) the motion shall not anticipate a matter that has previously been appointed for consideration by the House." I feel that the proposed motion of the honourable member is in contradiction of the aforementioned rule and therefore I must rule it out of order.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, regretfully, I must challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. I'm sorry. Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, Yeas and Nays, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Beard, Borowski, Boyce, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Ferguson, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Molgat, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 27; Nays, 24.

MR. SPEAKER declared the Speaker's ruling sustained.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, O.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he could indicate to the House how many new jobs have been formed in Manitoba in the last quarter?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows, this is a detailed statistical question. The source of data is the Federal Bureau of Statistics, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, therefore I suggest the Honourable Member file an Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question then for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he could inform the House how many people left Manitoba in the last quarter?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, my statement to the last question stands. I wish he would file an Order for Return.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is he in a position today to tell us when the Auto Insurance Bill will be tabled in the House?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): The answer which I gave yesterday to the honourable member if he would like to recheck Hansard and read it, would be the same answer which I would provide to him today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Transport. After a visit to Gladstone yesterday, has the Minister any proposals to alleviate the flooding in the town?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, our department has been working night and day, in fact one of our boys collapsed from exhaustion yesterday. We're getting good cooperation from everybody and I'm happy to say that the water started receding yesterday and I expect unless some rain comes or snow that the critical stage will have passed by tonight. Insofar as preventing future floods, I don't know what you can do about it unless we can legislate the weather.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the members of the House up-to-date on the flood situation in the province. At Carman the waters of the Boyne River which rises in the farm lands in the escarpment to the west started rising about two days ago. It became apparent that there might be some flooding in the community and area surrounding Carman. The river passes through the business section of that community. Mayor Sven Jensen of Carman requested sandbags and 30,000 were sent to the community with residents using them in order to provide protection. Later yesterday, it was realized that the available manpower was not sufficient and Mayor Jensen requested Armed Forces personnel. I authorized their use, and about 49 men from Winnipeg went to the community where they have worked throughout the night. We also forwarded 50,000 sandbags.

There was a rise in the river overnight, about two feet. Those of you familiar with this particular river and the manner in which it passes through the central part of the community will realize the problems in diking the river itself. As a result diking was carried out on public and private buildings wherever possible including the hospital. The Manitoba Telephone System was put out of order shortly after midnight, but service has been restored with the use of temporary equipment. About 80 percent of the community has been affected by the water to some degree. It is now stabilized and should decline in about 24 hours. At noon today, about 100 men from the Armed Forces Base at Portage la Prairie relieved the Armed Forces personnel who had been working overnight. Personnel from all government departments are in the area. Emergency Measures Organization established a headquarters there last night which provided radio contact with Winnipeg during the period when the telephone system was not operating. Senior personnel from my department are in the community now in order to assess the situation. I understand the Minister of Transportation spent a good part of the night in the community and I am planning to visit there later on myself today.

Earlier in the day the Minister of Transportation visited and checked the flood situation at Gretna, Gladstone, Westbourne, Letellier, Emerson and Morris. In fact the Minister spent until 3:00 a.m. today filling sandbags at Carman.

In the Gladstone-Westbourne area, the water is continuing to recede at Gladstone with the high water now at Woodside about 8 miles east of Gladstone and rising at Westbourne about 20 miles east of Gladstone. Late last night bulldozers were used in order to cut through Provincial Trunk Highway 34, south of Gladstone, in order to allow more water to flow easterly. Provincial government personnel were in the area and have answered all requests from municipal authorities for assistance. Boats have been provided for farmers requesting them for feeding livestock in the rural municipality of Westbourne, and municipal officials there say no additional people are required and there is no need for social services as these situations have been taken care of by the rural municipalities themselves. Sandbag and boat patrols are continuing.

The rainfall of the past two days has resulted in higher river levels predicted for the Red River immediately south of Winnipeg. The former predicted rains was to 760 feet above sea level with the new prediction ranging from 760 to 762 feet. The Municipalities of Fort Garry and Ritchot have requested assistance and 45 Armed Forces personnel are working in Fort Garry in the Turnbull Drive area and 40 personnel in the Rural Municipality of Ritchot.

I might say that municipal authorities in all areas have remained in control with the assistance of the provincial government departments and agencies as outlined in the Manitoba Flood Fighting Plan which was prepared after the 1966 flooding in our province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reply to the Minister's statement in connection with the situation concerning floods in Manitoba. It strikes me that although the Flood Forecasting Committee that has been set up to forecast floods in this

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) province, although they are reasonably accurate along the stretch of the Red River in their forecasting and perhaps to a lesser extent along the Assiniboine, it seems to me that the services of this Committee should be extended to enable them to forecast floods in such areas as Carman and along some of the other rivers within the province. The occasion of flood in Gladstone, Gretna and Carman came as a complete surprise to the people in those areas, and they had little or no opportunity to prepare for the onslaught of the water. I have some experience in how suddenly water can hit a community under those circumstances, and I would hope that the Minister responsible, and I believe in this case it's the Minister of Mines and Resources, would take it upon himself to ensure that more adequate flood forecasting work be done to ensure that communities along these Manitoba rivers be given a greater warning of flood threats in their areas. It will enable flood fighters to do a more adequate job of preparing and evacuating people who are in danger.

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

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. When did he make the statements that are reported in a paper today under the heading "Pawley heard at protest?"

MR. PAWLEY: I would think that the honourable member would have had the courtesy to have provided me with the copy of the print that he's referring to, so that I know what he is referring to. I'm very surprised that he should have taken this type of approach to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Do I take it from his comments that soldiers would be available to help in the clean-up process following the flooding, if they're requested - in the Town of Gladstone?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I don't believe the Minister heard the question. Would the honourable member care to repeat it please.

MR. FERGUSON: If requested, would the Minister supply soldiers to the Town of Gladstone to help in the clean-up process; if they request it.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, I would have to look into the matter. I'm certain if it was requested that it might very well be that we'd be able to accommodate, but I'd have to look into that area.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. Did the orderly demonstration that took place today on the Legislative grounds do anything to make the government reconsider certain aspects of the auto insurance proposal?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, this government is always considering issues and policy implications, so this is no exception. Whether it will have the effect of causing us to reconsider to the extent that we will actually change the basic provisions of the legislation, the answer is in the negative. The answer is in the negative, at least not to this point in time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Resources and ask him if the situation now at Carman could have any impact on the greater flood threat in Morris. As perhaps the Minister knows, the Boyne River empties into the Morris River through the Norquay Channel and I was wondering if the flood forecasters could give some indication of how that would affect the communities downstream.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am not able to say myself how it would affect them. I'll certainly bring the honourable member's question to the attention of the flood forecaster so that any pre-information could be given if it's available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if he can inform the House whether there has been any discussion between his department and himself and Federal Manpower about the jobs that will be lost as a result of the automobile insurance scheme that will be proposed and the dislocation that will occur. Has there been any discussion in terms of the new job opportunities that must be created for these people?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that question I would simply accept as notice. As he knows, this entire matter is being looked into. To the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek - he now has seen fit to give me a copy of the statement he referred to. It is a release of a few remarks that I had hoped, and trusted, and expected, that I would be permitted to make at 1:30 this afternoon. I wasn't, unfortunately, given the opportunity to make those remarks, but I had

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) fully expected that I would have had that opportunity to have done so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if he can indicate whether there has been any discussion with the automobile insurance industry and any determination, identification by his department, of the number of people who will be affected as a result of the proposed insurance scheme to be introduced by the government?

MR. PAWLEY: This is a question which I will take as notice. I think when this entire matter is being debated in the House I will be quite prepared to outline in detail some of the questions that the honourable member obviously is concerned about.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. All I'm asking is a yes or no - has there been discussion within your department and the industry in order to determine the identification?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I may reply to the honourable member. He surely knows that the industry was requested to make certain submissions which they did in the form of briefs, at which point they were entirely free to make reference to the exact subject matter which my honourable friend is questioning about.

MR. PAWLEY: Let me tell the honourable member he is quite aware there have been many discussions. Indeed discussions have also taken the form of public discussion, which is not, unfortunately, the case that existed in the type of relationship that the previous government had with . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Point of order Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, is the member not entitled to raise a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the guests in the gallery that they are certainly most welcome at all times but the rule of the House is that those present in the gallery may observe the proceedings in silence. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable First Minister neither answered the question that was put to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and I'll again put the question. With respect to identifying the number of people who will be affected as a result of the proposed automobile insurance plan, just an answer yes or no, has there been specific discussion with the industry on the number. I recognize there were briefs but the briefs never dealt with the numbers of people that will be affected by the basic proposal to be put forward by the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question perhaps to the First Minister. Can the First Minister assure the House that none of the members serving on the committee investigating the automobile insurance scheme will in fact be hired by some future automobile corporation? I'm asking the question because obviously it would be indeed an interest of conflict there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the question is in order. However, I don't mind answering. The answer is that you are to assume nothing, neither that they will or will not be on this administrative board, should there be one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I address a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Does the Minister of Agriculture support the Canadian Grains Council in its operation and intended purpose?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I don't think that that is a proper question before the Orders of the Day.

MR. WATT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I direct a supplementary question then to the Minister, which I think is a proper question if I may again express an opinion which my honourable friend has just . . . Does he then support the actions of the President, Mr. Atkinson of the National Farmers Union in the withdrawal of his support and the organization support from the Canada Grain Council?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what my honourable friend is referring to. If he would submit me with some data on it, I would be prepared to answer.

MR. WATT: I'm referring to the withdrawal of the Farm Union from the National Grain Council.

MR. USKIW: That's a matter for the two organizations to resolve amongst themselves, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Have you talked to the Superintendent of Insurance, Mr. Fred Swaine, in the last 30 days.

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

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. SCHREYER: If honourable members are expecting an answer surely they are jesting, because that question clearly is not the kind of question that is in order. Whether or not a Minister has been in communication with any member of his staff is not a question that is proper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, does the Superintendent of Insurance approve of your insurance bill that you are about to bring in?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. McKELLAR: I want an answer.

A MEMBER: You don't have to get one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if he could advise the people of Manitoba as to the reasons for the delay of the introduction of the second reading of the bill in question?

MR. PAWLEY: The reasons if there is any delay have been clearly outlined in the past. The honourable member has heard those reasons given. He knows those reasons now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I asked the same question yesterday and I did not get an answer. Where will I get the information from? I simply don't have it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Approximately an hour and a half ago he told the assembled group that there would be a saving of 15 percent as a result of the government insurance plan. I wonder if he can indicate if compensation is paid by the government to the people who in fact lose their jobs and their assets, whether the saving to the people of Manitoba will still be 15 percent?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that we were satisfied, on the basis of studies made we were satisfied that the saving through a universal public auto insurance plan would be at least 15 to 20 percent cheaper than is the case at the present, or than would be the case under the existing system of automobile insurance. I also invited the assembled group to have their representatives, whomever they choose, however they choose, to make submission to us with respect to the question of dislocation and adequate or appropriate compensation and that we would be prepared to consider those submissions.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. My first question was not answered. I'm simply asking the Premier whether he can still make the statement of 15 to 20 percent in the event compensation is paid to the people?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's only when we receive submissions from a representative group that we would be able to calculate how closely, calculate with any precision; however, in the meantime it is possible for me to say that certainly one has an approximate idea as to what the cost would be - what the saving would be if a public auto insurance plan were implemented. There is experience and data on record. It has been analyzed by the committee and it has been made available in the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the First Minister when he can on a matter of that kind estimate so approximately, could he estimate approximately when we'll get the bill? Will it be sometime this afternoon?

MR. SCHREYER: Approximately next week - early next week, Mr. Speaker, approximately.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister can tell the House on what basis would he give us his argument that there would be 15 percent reduction? I don't believe this is what the report states, because there is no . . .

MR. SCHREYER: On the basis of data that has been collected by the committee and the experience -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney is asking these questions in wonderment because I don't suppose he's made a very thorough study of it, has he?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I want you to ask the First Minister to retract . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a question?

MR. McKELLAR: I've been in business 22 years and I know a lot more about insurance than he does. I'll prove it to you, too.

A MEMBER: Watch your blood pressure, Earl.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. If it's not proper then maybe the First Minister could answer this. Has the government given consideration, or will it give consideration to compensating agents whose insurance agencies may become redundant through the imposition of a government insurance plan?

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. He's indicated some things are in order and some aren't. Does he consider it to be in order for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to make a statement to the news media claiming statements that he has made to a rally of several thousand people when he in fact did not make the statements?

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to ensure that I heard him correctly because I don't think Hansard may have caught it. But in reply to the question of the Member for Rhineland regarding payments in cases that insurance agents were redundant - did I hear the Minister correctly to say "they are redundant now?"

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Minister didn't say anything from his place, standing on his feet, therefore for the record nothing has been said.

MR. MOLGAT: Did the Minister make the statement sitting in his seat, Mr. Speaker?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, as he well knows, will have plenty of opportunities to hear how I feel about this subject.

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether the government has changed its intention and will now compensate the fish processing companies who have been put out of business by the Fish Marketing Board?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the member has been advised that the government has taken the position, as he well knows, that no companies have been made redundant by the process of the Fish Marketing Board. There's been no declarations of redundancy.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Is it not a fact that the discretion of declaring a company redundant is that of the government and of the Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member is asking an argumentative question. The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to table the annual report of the President of the University of Manitoba, the most recent report; as well, the annual report of the Public Schools Finance Board for the year ending December 31, 1969.

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

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs would announce to the House today the name of the Saskatchewan lawyer that's drafting this legislation?

MR. SCHREYER: I wonder if I may advise the honourable member that it is not unusual at all to have lawyers from many different parts of the country work on legislation. I can recall that legislation drafted in the Federal jurisdiction, there are legal draftsmen, lawyers, working from just about any province in the country and therefore the honourable member's question is not only improper, it's irrelevant.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: I would like to ask a question following my honourable colleague's question. Does this lawyer hold an NDP card?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't honestly say if he does, but I do believe that there were many appointees made by the previous administration to different boards and commissions, the members appointed being those who did have liaison connection, etc. with the Conservative Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. To the First Minister a supplementary question. Does he believe that his principle of open government has in fact been achieved by not telling us the information he obviously has and knows and will not give to the House?

MR. SCHREYER: Which information? I don't mind, Mr. Speaker, giving information by way of answers to questions properly put and properly framed.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is it true that at the Minister's suggestion he wishes the officials of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities - to have that group consider having rural municipality offices collect National Farmer Union dues along with the taxes?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, maybe the honourable member would like to go into a little bit more detail as to the source of his information and as to just where the proposal was made?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: By way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Minister has put a number of suggestions forward to a group of officials of the rural municipalities and this is one of the suggestions that he would like them to consider, namely that R.M. offices across Manitoba collect National Farmer Union dues.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the Minister an opportunity to answer.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the honourable member that there is what is called a Municipal Advisory Committee that meets with myself from time to time. This is in the process of attempt to arrive at free and open discussion as to possible future legislation that might be adopted insofar as the Province of Manitoba is concerned in municipal affairs. Among many suggestions that I made was changes that have been made in Saskatchewan legislation, the Municipal Affairs Act. -- (Interjection) -- Well the honourable member is the Leader of the Liberal Party and I'm referring to legislation that's been passed recently in that province by his colleagues in Saskatchewan.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like an answer if the Minister wouldn't mind.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, that was discussed along with many other things with a number of gentlemen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Could the Minister inform the House as to whether or not this particular suggestion was received with any enthusiasm?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder whether he can indicate to the House whether any of the members of the Auto Insurance Committee are still on the government payroll?

A MEMBER: They're all on, they're all on. -- (Interjection) -- No, they're all on the payroll.

MR. SPIVAK: Well a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, certainly I am. There's your answer.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then I'll frame the question in a direct manner. I wonder whether you could indicate whether Mr. Blackburn is still on the government payroll?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, of course, the honourable member knows this.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister then could indicate whether it's appropriate if Mr. Blackburn is on the government payroll for him to have appeared with the Minister on the Byline program in the city?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the First Minister in his newly found expansive mood and wonder if he would now answer the question posed to him by the Honourable Member for Wolseley last Monday and last Wednesday concerning the citizenship status of Mr. Scott.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The only reason I did not give the answer in the past day or two is because I had been given to understand that the information was given to the honourable member privately. However, in case it hasn't let me advise the honourable member that the gentleman in question is not a Canadian citizen. He has lived in Canada for nine years but it's only as of last week that I discovered that he is not a Canadian citizen, at least, not as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Does this mean that in order to comply with the terms of reference for membership on the Centennial Board that the government will request Mr. Scott to resign?

MR. SCHREYER: I don't think that would be necessary, Mr. Speaker, because the gentleman in question has submitted his resignation. His reasons for so doing are included in the letter. I can advise the honourable member, who has such a consuming interest in the matter, that he has resigned.

MR. SHERMAN: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I have a consuming interest in the matter because it's a board that's concerned with the expenditure of Manitoba public monies. My question, Mr. Speaker, is: "Will scrutiny of appointees' backgrounds for the sake of Canadian citizenship be applied to future appointments to the Board? -- (Interjection) -- I said Canadian citizenship. I think the Minister of Finance is suffering from a hearing impairment, Mr. Speaker. I said Canadian citizenship.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member's question I can tell him that the governing statute and regulations such as they are will be perused and the law will be respected.

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

MR. GORDON BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could tell us whether they've decided to establish a port authority at Churchill?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there has been discussion of that very matter again just prior to the meeting of the Hudson's Bay Route Association Convention and also discussion with one of the principal ship owners that is trading or shipping out of Hudson's Bay, out of Port Churchill, and we hope to come to a decision on the matter before the next meeting of prairie premiers.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the government reached a decision as to assistance to farmers who have land in the Libau and Poplar Park area?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would assume that the honourable member is referring to whether or not there is a change of policy with respect to land acquisition around Lake Winnipeg. I want to report that the matter of policy is still in the developmental stage and a statement will be made when a decision is reached.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate when the decision will be reached?

MR. USKIW: Soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question on the same subject. Is the Minister prepared to give assistance to farmers in that area who suffer flooding by way of either culverts or other works of that nature which may be necessary?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that I know what the honourable member is referring to. Essentially my understanding is that there is a current problem in a given situation which has to do with municipal responsibility. Now if that is the case I think the matter should rest there.

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

MR. WATT: A supplementary question again directed to the Minister of Agriculture on the same subject. Are these still the same farmers that we're discussing now that were discussed when I was the Minister on that side and when you as an opposition member demanded that I do something about the Libau farmers?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think honourable members opposite ought to respect the fact that there is a major study being taken, and has been undertaken in the last three months. We have had extensive study done by the Department of Mines and Resources, the Water Control Branch, my department and Municipal Affairs and we are in the process of trying to determine new government policy. Until there is new government policy, existing policy exists. Now I know, Mr. Speaker, that the existing policy is not good enough, and that's the reason we are here. Mr. Chairman, there will be an improvement.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question to the Minister. Is the Minister telling us in fact that he's lost all the answers that he had when he was on this side of the House?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie seems to imply that there were certain answers to all problems which I had been proposing from time to time. I want to say to my honourable friends that I took great issue with the government which are the members opposite, the government that was in power then and which are now opposite to the government today, I took issue with the fact that they had been niggardly in their approach to the whole question of land acquisition. Mr. Speaker, I still say that that was the case and that is going to be changed.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I think when we discussed his estimates he was going to give us a report of the Potato Marketing Commission. Will the report be coming forward yet?

MR. USKIW: If it's available, Mr. Speaker, I will table it in the House.

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

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Transportation. I understand that the Manitoba veterinarians are requesting that a special licence plate, or with a special prefix DFM, are asking his department if they could perhaps expect the 1971 automobiles would carry this prefix. Does he know if this wish might be granted?

MR. BOROWSKI: I certainly do, Mr. Speaker. I've had similar requests and I replied telling them that the contract for licences was given out, oh several months ago and they are in the process of being manufactured, therefore it was too late to consider their request. They, I hope, come back in five years when these licence plates expire.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Industry and Commerce would have an answer in respect to what activity is taking place at Fort Churchill? I asked him last week if he would look into it. -- (Interjection) -- Well there apparently is some type of activity taking place in that area in which the empty buildings are being rented and he undertook to find out what type of industry was coming in.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the member qualified his question because it was a rather general opener, "What activity is going on in Churchill?" The question, if it relates to Manitoba Government buildings is a question that most properly may be answered by the Minister of Government Services, but we are endeavouring to get the information for the honourable member and we will supply it to him as soon as it is available. There are many things going on in the Port of Churchill and I am pleased to inform my friend that the Department of Industry and Commerce is actively working to promote the economic welfare of that part of the province.

MR. BEARD: A subsequent question. Could the Minister tell me what the many activities are that are going on at Churchill?

MR. EVANS: In due course, Mr. Speaker, in due course.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Will we be getting a report from the Freshwater Fish Marketing Commission at this session?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would presume that the Board might be sending me the information but the Board doesn't report directly to me. Manitoba has a member on the Board but it reports to the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister then could tell us whether it would be the intention to ask the representative of the Fish Marketing Board to appear before the Standing Committee on Economic Development so that the whole question of the fish industry can be discussed intelligently by this House?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member put his question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the committee I presume could do as the Task Force did. They had a lot of people appear before it. I wouldn't presume to say who should appear, who should not appear.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I appreciate that the board is a federal board but because of the primary interest of Manitoba, is it in order for the Minister to ask that a report be made to us as well.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that a report will be forthcoming some time but I don't know the dates of their fiscal year or matters of that kind. When it comes in I'll try to remember to have it circulated amongst members.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading government bills. Bill No. 15. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you'd call Bill No. 38.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say on this bill. I think it was very timely to combine all these different acts into one act, namely The Water Control and Conservation Branch Act. In my opinion I think this is a course that should have been taken for some time and I'm glad to see that some action is taken in this respect. It seems with our farmers clearing more land than ever before and perhaps some of the lands being higher assessed and therefore their taxes being higher, it seems to be a matter of more concern in the line of drainage and what have you than ever before. I'm sure that this bill while it may be overemphasizing on authority or power to certain persons or to the Minister, I think it is a situation that exists and I think we can live with in this respect. I hope that the intention of the bill I'm sure is the -- some of the problems that arise with our flooding conditions that seem to have been coming up more often than ever before the last five or ten years and I'm sure that some of this authority and perhaps even the permission to penalize in places is quite in order.

I was also glad to see that the time has finally arrived where the Minister in fact would now have the authority of entering into agreements with the Federal Government or another province, and for that matter, also the United States or another state. I think this is also timely because there are problems existing, I don't think one has to be sarcastic and name any, but there are problems and I believe this bill will go a long way to help the situation. So I would basically just like to go on record that I think the bill is timely and can easily accept it.

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Riel, that debate on this bill be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 31, an Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I have given notice to the House some time ago during debate in estimates that there will be legislation brought in and indeed some debate was given to this matter in the estimates on the item dealing with veterinary clinics. This is simply the enabling legislation to provide for the establishment of veterinary clinics and to outline the kind of plans, assistance plans that we have in mind under this legislation to try and improve the veterinary

(MR. USKIW cont'd) services for the farmers of Manitoba.

I want to briefly outline to the members the three options that are made possible by this legislation. One is known as the cash assistance plan. It retains much of the independence of the private practice as possible. The district and veterinarians enter into a formal agreement on the cash assistance and fee schedule required to live and practice veterinary medicine within the area. The aggregate grant of the municipalities is matched by the province up to \$5,000.00. This is one form that can be taken providing the veterinarian and the district to enter into this kind of an arrangement.

The second alternative, Mr. Speaker, is one where there is a provision for a clinic, where the entire capital cost of the clinic is assumed by the province, the administration cost is shared as between the province and the district, and that's up to a maximum of \$5,000 as well.

The third option is known as the Manitoba municipal plan and that is designed of course to provide for maximum service to the rural people. It removes a considerable restriction resulting from the regular fee schedule as we know it today. It replaces the fee schedule with a system of a salary to the veterinarian on a weekly or hourly basis. Municipal grants of course would be higher in this instance, about double in most cases it is assumed. Cost to the individual livestock owner would be lower under this scheme, so consequently the program under this concept would be extended to more people. The province assumes the entire capital cost of the clinical facility under this scheme. The veterinarian is employed for a regular working period by the veterinary district by the Board, and they negotiate his salary. The financial support is the same pretty well throughout the three proposals, this one is very much the same as the other two.

This, briefly, Mr. Speaker, outlines the options that are available to the farm people. I'm sure that I don't have to explain to members opposite that it is an important piece of legislation, recognizing of course the fact that we have to improve the health of animals, recognizing that we have problems in the countryside, that is shortage of veterinary services and hopefully that this measure will substantially reduce the difficulty that we are now experiencing. One of the other major provisions of this particular piece of legislation is the possibility under the new Act to have towns and villages become part of the district in the agreement, so that in essence, a city or town or village could participate in the forming of a district and indeed in the sharing of the costs of administration. I think that is important. Under the old Act it was really an arrangement between municipalities and did not have a provision to include towns and villages, so this is an improvement in that particular area.

That pretty well sums up, Mr. Speaker, the main of this Bill. I would hope that members opposite would raise points that I haven't covered, but essentially this follows through with the budgetary item in the estimates allowing for some \$150,000 to be expended this year in the development of clinical facilities and assistance grants, moved substantially upwards from 1,800 to 5,000 dollars per district.

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

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: . . . the supply motion to be called now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MATTERS OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a personal grievance emanating from a matter of urgent public importance which results from a situation that I feel involves the flouting, or at least the violation of the due process of legislative criticism and is related specifically, Sir, to the matter of the survival of the private automobile insurance industry in the province at the present time. My grievance is grounded to a certain extent in recent declamatory statements by the First Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Did I hear the honourable member correctly, that he is suggesting a violation of the legal process or he's . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I said that my grievance arises out of what I see as a flouting, it's not a violation, of the due process of legislative criticism and examination in this province. It arises out of a situation with respect to the private automobile insurance industry in this province and the survival of that industry and the recent declamatory statements made by the First Minister. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the latest statements by the First Minister leave no room for negotiation in this matter, and the fate that the motion to adjourn the House advanced by my colleague the Honourable Member for Riel met a few moments ago underscores my fear that the opposition in this case is being denied the opportunity to bring to bear the kind of scrutiny and examination of a very controversial legislative issue that is its just desert and right under centuries of parliamentary precedent. My colleague from Riel moved, and if anyone in the Chamber needs any reminder, Mr. Speaker, that the House adjourn because of the government's failure to make public the contents of Bill 56 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the honourable member that he may be reflecting on the decision of the House.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I apologize if I appear to be questioning a ruling, a decision of the House and a ruling made by Your Honour, but what I'm trying to do is establish my grievance and link it to the point raised by my colleague the Member for Riel with respect to the contents of Bill 56 which had not been available to us and which in our efforts to obtain same have resulted in continual frustration. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, examine the ramifications of this proposed legislation and perform our proper service as representatives of a wide spectrum of constituencies in this province and as members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition if we have no facts and figures in front of us upon which to work.

Mr. Speaker, the debate on the question of automobile insurance and the existence or the demise of the private automobile insurance industry has been taken out of this Chamber by the government and is being fought through the media and through the medium of public meetings, and in some cases private meetings, leaving no access to the facts of the case to the opposition and leaving no role at this juncture for the opposition to play. There are countless examples, Mr. Speaker, of instances in which members of this administration have taken this debate out of this Legislature, or at least in refusing to allow it to go on in this Legislature have taken this debate to meeting rooms and to media rooms around the Metropolitan area, indeed if not throughout Manitoba, and I question the ethics of that kind of a process and procedure when the lifeblood not only of an industry but of many families dependent upon that industry and peripherally involved in that industry are at stake.

I have in front of me one very vivid example of the type of thing I'm talking about, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry the Attorney-General is not in his Chair, but in the April 28th edition of the St. James-Assiniboia News there is a flamboyant column by the Attorney-General entitled "As I see it". I have it in my hand and I'm not in any way opposed to tabling it if it's the wish of the House, but I'd like to quote from part of that column at the moment to put on the record the position that I think is an unethical one and has been taken by the Attorney-General in this instance.

The lead on his column says that "the wholly negative reactions of certain sections of the private insurance industry to the report of the Manitoba Auto Insurance Committee were very much predictable." And I'm quoting from the Attorney-General, Sir. "After all, if anyone has a varied interest in the status quo they do, and you really can't blame them for being upset." He then goes on to say, and again I quote, "I am sure a continuing and determined effort on the part of the insurance industry to undermine support for a public auto insurance plan." The particular sentence to which I've referred perhaps would make better sense, Mr. Speaker, if I added the preamble phrase in which the Attorney-General said "You can expect over the next few weeks, I am sure, a continuing and determined effort on the part of the insurance industry to undermine support for a public auto insurance plan. The vested interests will use every method available to them, including gross misstatements of facts, to convince you not to support the proposed legislation. I urge you to ignore them." Those are excerpts from a column, the general essence of which throughout its remainder carries the same thrust and the same arguments and the same emphasis and doesn't vary in the position that is illustrated in the few remarks which I've quoted directly from the column in the newspaper in question.

Now I question the ethics of this kind of legislative thrust and parry, Mr. Speaker. We have not had a chance in this House to examine the proposed legislation and therefore to make

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) our case and state our case not only for our Party, our supporters, but for all those people in this province who have a justifiable and legitimate philosophical opposition to the kind of legislation that's been proposed, yet the Attorney-General and the First Minister and other members of the administration seem to feel that it's perfectly all right for them to go about this community, and indeed this province, and exercise what influence their office gives them to divest themselves of all kinds of declamatory statements in meetings and through the media endorsing and emphasizing their particular position on this question and creating a situation which makes it extremely difficult for the voice of reasonable and valid criticism and opposition to be heard - to be heard.

There are countless examples, and this one of the Attorney-General's is only one of many, Mr. Speaker, and I reiterate that this whole debate is being taken out of this Chamber and is being conducted arbitrarily by the government through the media of its choice. I don't necessarily mean the print and broadcast media. I don't necessarily mean the print and broadcast media, I mean forms of their contrivance and construction in the form of meetings; I mean their general access to the information upon which the legislation is going to be based which gives them a tactical advantage and argument which is denied the opposition and denied all those people who are opposed in principle and in philosophy to the kind of legislation that is presently envisaged. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, where is the ethics of this kind of parliamentary procedure, of this kind of parliamentary confrontation and of parliamentary contest. It puts us, this whole approach on the part of the government, Mr. Speaker, in an intolerable position.

The government implied through the use of the media and through the use of the platform that it has control of this situation and no opposition is to be countenanced, no opposition is even to be recognized as valid and reasonable. I suggest to you, Sir, that this is a violation of this House and a denial of the rights of parliament and a denial of the rights of the opposition. I suggest further that in his latest statement that the Premier of this province is playing confrontation politics, and if he thinks that those of us who believe in competition and enterprise are afraid of such a confrontation, then he may find, Sir, that he has to think again. In the case of the industry under review and under question, there are not only 1,381 agents whose livelihoods are involved but there are all the people who work for them and there are all the people who through the multiplier effect of our social structures have a great stake in the welfare and the livelihoods of those specific individuals. There are, in fact, 4,200 or more individual jobs involved.

Mr. Speaker, the present position of the government and the First Minister is a breach of faith on their part and on his part with an industry and with the people of Manitoba in general. It's a direct repudiation, a direct breach of a promise he has made to Manitobans over and over again in the past ten months, and made again as recently as within the past ten days. That promise was that any government sponsored automobile insurance plan introduced by his administration would be competitive with private industry and co-existent with private industry. It now appears that an undertaking by the First Minister - and I'm sorry that the pressure of office or other duties have taken him out of the Chamber because I don't like to make these remarks in his absence . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to -- I would like my honourable friend, if he would permit - he is alleging to quote the First Minister - could he tell us the source of his quotations? Mr. Speaker, I am asking the honourable member, who sat down permitting me to ask him, to refer to the source of the quotation that he's making. I don't need any gratuitous comments by the Member for River Heights.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if it's necessary in the view of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who obviously for some reason must have missed some of the chapters of this debate, to provide the chapter and verse reference to the First Minister's position that I've referred to, then we'll get it for him. But I don't think anybody else in this Chamber or in this Gallery or in this House needs that kind of documentation. He has said it and he has said it over and over again that this would be a competitive industry . . .

MR. GREEN: Nobody said so.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . this would be a competitive situation. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that it now appears that a statement and an undertaking by the First Minister of this Province and his administration is not worth the paper it's written on.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on the question of . . .

MR. SHERMAN: So much, so much.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege, and that is the member has just said that an undertaking given by the First Minister is not worth the paper it's written on and I ask him to produce -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I ask him to produce such an undertaking.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to invade your prerogatives, but that's no question of privilege. That's my opinion.

MR. GREEN: But the undertaking you referred to . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Well we'll produce it if you need it that badly, but you've read it and you've heard it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

A MEMBER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Minister was on his feet first. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The Member for Fort Garry has alleged or imputed that the First Minister has lied, and I suggest to him that he either prove the charge or he withdraw it immediately.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, on that same -- on a question of privilege, not only did the Honourable Member from Fort Garry - not only did the Honourable Member from Fort Garry question the integrity of the Premier, but of all of the administration, in saying that none of the undertakings that we have given was worth the paper it was written on, and that I ask him to withdraw; withdraw.

.Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. Order. I'm wondering if the Honourable Member for Fort Garry could rephrase his thoughts if he wishes in a manner more acceptable to the House.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney-General would like my position on the point at issue, I not only question the integrity of the First Minister, I say that an industry and a community and virtually a province questions the integrity of this administration.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable member has entered into the debate, has expressed his opinion, and he is entitled to do so. The Honourable House Leader on many occasions has tried to inform the House that there is an appropriate time, if there is a dispute in debate, to answer. The questions of privilege are not questions of privilege and should not have been allowed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. My recollection is that I had allowed the Honourable Member for Fort Garry to continue his debate.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But we recognize now, Mr. Speaker, that in some of the tactics that have been employed over the last little while, there is probably a grand jigsaw pattern puzzle falling into place and that all the declamatory statements about "no election in this province for four years unless defeat meets us in the House", all those statements that really appeared to be sincere - still may be, in the view of the First Minister himself, sincere - now come under very critical question and deserve very intensive scrutiny by our party and by the people of Manitoba, for the prospect definitely exists now in what has taken place with respect to this particular issue, in respect to what has taken place with the new restructuring of the Law Amendments Committee, that perhaps this government, perhaps this government would like to make an election issue out of automobile insurance. Perhaps all the time all these declamatory statements about no election for four years were carefully contrived and constructed to create an image of credibility, carefully constructed to create an image of credibility which really has no moral substance and really has no existence. In fact, Mr. Speaker, when the First Minister is threatening a situation in an industry here, which seems to be on the basis of statements made in the past in direct contravention to the kind of policy originally proposed, it seems to me that he is really threatening the people of Manitoba to run the risk of another election; he's really threatening this party to push him to an election. And he has made the statements that I've referred to on three or four occasions in the past, that there would be no election unless his government were defeated in the House, but he knows full well that in choosing the kind of issue that he has chosen and in electing to ram it at this Legislature and at the people of Manitoba, he's got hold of an issue on which the Progressive Conservative Party cannot equivocate, on which the Progressive Conservative Party must take a declamatory and an unequivocal stand based on its principles and its philosophy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjections) -- therefore, Mr. Speaker, what happened, Mr. Speaker, is that this administration, through its First Minister, really bludgeons the people of Manitoba into an election situation which, since its ascendancy into office ten months ago, it has strenuously insisted was not in the best interests of the one million residents of this province. That's very nice, Mr. Speaker, that's very nice and you know what, Mr. Speaker? It's also as cynical as hell. It's just as cynical as hell. What has happened to the White Knight? I'm sorry that the First Minister isn't in his chair. I've already apologized to honourable members opposite for that.

MR. BOROWSKI: You never apologize for anything.

MR. SHERMAN: But what has happened now to the young Lochinvar, who was going to introduce a new era, you know, the new ethic, a new morality to Manitoba politics? What has happened, Mr. Speaker? One of two things has happened. Either, Mr. Speaker, he's consumed by ambitions of national leadership, in which case, the Province of Manitoba is callously reduced to nothing more or less than a means to one person's ends, or, and I fear this more, he has become truly the captive of the radical left wing of his party, in which case he is lost. . . .

-- (Interjections) --

MR. SPEAKER: I'm at a loss -- I'm having some difficulty in following the honourable member's thinking. Is this part of the honourable member's grievance?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I'm going on a personal grievance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: No. I was just wondering how the comments just made are related to the honourable member's grievance.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the point at issue is that the contents of Bill 56 are not available, are not available to the opposition in this Legislature, and the fight supporting

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.). . . . and pushing and campaigning for Bill 56 is being carried by this government outside this House. And the Leader of this government -- and I say the Leader of this government, Sir, and his colleagues have adopted this position for either one of two reasons, in my view. One of them is the one I mentioned, either that it fits into a long range pattern for a leap to national leadership; or two, the First Minister has become the captive of the left wing of his party, and I say in that case not only is he lost and not only is his party lost, but the great danger is that in the course of the next few months Manitoba itself may be lost.

Mr. Speaker, the appearance of the Report of the Committee on Automobile Insurance last week marked the beginning of the true revelation to Manitobans of the colours of this government. In fact, the whole course of events surrounding the appearance of that report and ensuing from it in the last five or six days, reveals that, as I said a few moments ago, we are into a state and a situation of confrontation politics in the province now. It appears that through the report and the work being done in terms of drafting the legislation in question that we have visible now the tip of the iceberg, Mr. Speaker, and we ask ourselves, and representatives and members of the industry to which I refer ask themselves, and indeed I suggest Manitobans the length and breadth of the province tonight ask themselves: what formidable rumblings lie below? What comes next after the automobile insurance industry? All types of insurance companies? What comes after that -- the banks? What comes after that -- the trust companies? What comes after that -- the great trading exchanges? What comes after that -- and I've already had an answer on two or three different occasions from the Honourable Member from Crescentwood -- the newspapers? And what comes after that -- the radio and television stations? And what comes after that -- the department stores? And what comes after that -- the essence of freedom itself?

MR. BILL URUSKI (St. George): Would the member permit a question?

MR. SHERMAN: This is the question, Mr. Speaker. It's not a question of 1,381 automobile insurance agents. It's not even just a question of the 4,200 jobs related to them and their careers. It's the question -- (Interjection) -- It was 4,200 15 minutes ago, if the Member for Winnipeg Centre cares to check the record. I said 4,200 jobs related to 1,381 individual agents. This is the question. It's the broader question of what comes next; what is in store for the whole fabric of society in this province. This is what the fight is about, and the fight is about the degree to which this opposition is being denied its proper legislative and parliamentary rights to see the proposed legislation and have a chance to act on it and have a chance to bring reasonable, valid opposition and criticism to the debate. We cannot do it, we cannot do it, Mr. Speaker, because this government, which knows the facts and the figures involved in the legislation, has set about preparing the way, through its accesses to avenues of information and influence, preparing the way for a fait accompli before the bill ever comes into this House. What's more, it cuts the ground of opposition tactics out from under us because we can't punch at shadows and at curtains, but they know what's in the legislation and they steadfastly, through all kinds of devious answers by individual Ministers, like the Minister of Municipal Affairs in response to questions raised by the Member from Emerson, have steadfastly defended this curtain of secrecy, this cloak of secrecy and of ignorance about the contents of that legislation, and denied the opposition its due legislative process.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, a point of privilege. A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. At no time have I defended my ignorance about proposed legislation. I know what the proposed legislation is to be. I'm not ignorant of that proposed legislation. I would ask the honourable member to clarify his remarks.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that in the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs he has just underscored my point. He's just underscored; he's just said what I said, only in his own words, that he knows what's in the bill but we don't. That's just exactly what I've said.

MR. PAWLEY: It's not what you said.

MR. SHERMAN: Now if the Minister needs further clarification than that, then he and I will go outside in the coffee shop and I'll clarify.

Mr. Speaker, the present position of the government where this proposed legislation is concerned, I say to you, Sir, is a tyranny. It is a tyranny of the worst sort because the families involved, not only directly in that industry but indirectly, are held in a state of suspended animation, are held in a state of suspended anxiety, a state of suspended anxiety as to their future, as to the value of their businesses, as to the equity, as to the investment in terms of energy, time and finance that they have put into their businesses over the years, and all the

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.). . . . government can do, all the government can do, Mr. Speaker, is jeer and laugh about the situation.

An industry is being strangled and it's not just that industry; it's not just that industry, it's all those related to that industry, and the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, who is a very slick, a very slick, legalistic, provocative debater -- and everybody knows that; he's slick and he's a little bit slippery in argument; he's honed that debating style of his over the years in different confrontations, in different debates, on different levels of society. He's got it down to a science now where by straight verbal footwork and by straight resort to legalistic terminology, he attempts to smokescreen the valid criticisms raised from this side of the House and steamroller the opposition with his phraseology and thus try to sell arguments that he accepted philosophically a long, long time ago, but which I suggest to you are not in the best interests of the people of the society of Manitoba in general, and we're not buying it. And the Minister of Mines and Resources can laugh all he wants to. He's obviously amused at the plight of an industry and all those people dependent upon it. He finds it extremely amusing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, where's the bill? This is what we ask. This is what we want to know, and this is what this province wants to know. Why should an entire community, an entire economic and social sector of the province, be condemned to waiting endlessly, as they have been now for close to a year, not knowing the value of their assets or even indeed if they have any valuable assets from one day to the next; not knowing what they can rely on in terms of the livelihood, the method of livelihood that they've trained themselves for and committed themselves to over the years; not knowing what they can rely on in terms of a future in that livelihood, tomorrow or next week or the next. And those questions cannot be answered and the philosophical position cannot be debated properly, constructively and legitimately by us on this side of the House unless this government restores the process of parliamentary debate to the place it belongs -- to Parliament, to the Legislature, instead of doing it in front of a dinner at the St. James-Assiniboia hotel, and over a hotline show, and leaks through some column in a suburban newspaper under the by-line of the Attorney-General. All this kind of subverted argument and propaganda and promotion of an idea which they seem enamoured of, I say to you is unethical and is a violation of the due parliamentary process of debate. We want this bill in the House and we want it this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. URUSKI: Would the member permit a question?

MR. SHERMAN: Because it's the Honourable Member for St. George, yes.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you. Is it not a fact that you have been and are employed by an insurance company in Winnipeg since your election to this House?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, that is a fact, Mr. Speaker. I have been employed by a life insurance company for the last eight months but my basic career, before I went into politics, is in the field of journalism. I'm not a career insurance man.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the honourable member permit me to ask a question? I believe -- I came in during the process of your remarks -- that you made a comment to the effect that the contents of the bill should have been disclosed to the group assembled outside?

MR. SHERMAN: I said assembled inside. This is where those things should be put.

MR. PAWLEY: Oh, I'm glad to hear that, because the inference that I drew was that you wanted some sort of public announcement. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to get into the debate because the build-up that my honourable friend gave me in his closing remarks can hardly be justified by anything that I can say, and I am quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that I am not able to steamroller the opposition or to employ some type of sleight of hand or footwork in order to make their position seem the worse and my position to seem the better. May I say, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is wondering what secrets are employed in any debating skill that I am able to achieve, then I will tell him that it's a very simple secret. Tell the truth, and mean what you say. And once you do that, there is no problem. That's the only debating skill, Mr. Speaker, that anybody needs, and I suggest to you that if anybody employs it that he will have no difficulty in making his position felt. It might not succeed; it might not overcome a contrary position, and there are differences of opinion, Mr. Speaker, which I know can never be overcome, but if one is to try to make his position, then I say: tell the truth and mean what you say -- and I think that your position will come through. And if my honourable friend is attributing some magic to me, then I

(MR. GREEN cont'd.). . . . only hope that I can live up to those qualifications, nothing more and nothing less.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend's - the thrust of his remarks this afternoon, which he closes by saying, "Put the bill on the table this afternoon", - the thrust of his remarks is to the effect that we have in some way employed a different procedure, a procedure unknown to this House in dealing with legislation. Now I would like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we've been in office for only a short period of time. I've been in the House for three years, some of the other gentlemen have been here longer; but I am quite certain in saying that what we have done will in no way impair any debate from taking place in this House in a meaningful way. We have, as a matter of fact, gone a little bit further than is ordinary. If anybody would have asked the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, who is nodding his head up and down, if anybody would have asked him why a New Democratic Party government should not be elected on June 25th, he would mention various things. But one of the things that he would say is that if those (and I'll say "blanks") - ever got in, that you can rest assured that after they got in, there will be a public automobile insurance program in the Province of Manitoba. That's the reason, they would say, don't vote for this party. Now they say that this party is in some way reneging on its position to the people of the Province of Manitoba because we are proposing to do exactly what every member on that side of the House would have predicted that we would have done and would have told people not to vote for us for doing it. Now this, Mr. Speaker, is, by some sleight of hand - and I'll attribute that to my honourable friends - this by some sleight of hand becomes duplicity and the failure to fulfill undertaking.

Now what did the government do that was a little bit different? We formed a committee, and I would ask my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry to note that the committee was formed with its first frame of reference to examine into the possibility and feasibility of implementing a public automobile insurance program in the Province of Manitoba. There was no difficulty. Mr. Speaker, the fact is. . . .

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the honourable member a question.

MR. GREEN: No, I won't answer your question, and I have the floor.

MR. MCKELLAR: Why?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I ask you, in accordance with the rules, to ask the honourable member to take his seat. The honourable member is dissatisfied with our committee. He says that everybody knew what that committee would say, Mr. Speaker, and the insurers knew what that committee would say, and I think the Member for Fort Garry said something similar. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that we weren't the first to set up a committee to investigate automobile insurance; we weren't the first to say there was a problem. I sat for three years on a committee established by the former administration, the Automobile Insurance Committee. We sat for three years, and I can assure the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that not one single person in the automobile insurance industry was the least bit worried about an insurance committee sitting for three years because they knew that that committee wouldn't do a blasted thing. They were perfectly sure -- and that committee sat for three years considering -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, you'll answer. I appreciate you'll -- yes, you were there. You were sitting on the committee. I remember. But, Mr. Speaker, the important thing is that this did not create a ripple of consternation amongst anybody in the automobile insurance industry even though. . . .

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. GREEN: No, I won't answer the honourable member's question. I tell him so in advance. I ask him, therefore, not to get up and interrupt me again. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that there wasn't a ripple of consternation. Now isn't that a bit of sleight of hand? We have a problem involving automobile insurance; the government of the day knows that there is a problem; they say that they are setting up a committee to consider this problem which is affecting 900,000 people in the Province of Manitoba; that committee sits for three years and nobody could care less. The automobile insurance knew with certainty - they didn't have to worry about whether it would do one thing or another thing, they knew with certainty, and I think that that's what my honourable friend would like. He would like that they would know with certainty that this government wouldn't do a blasted thing. Well this government is not the previous government. This government. . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Just that you do what you said you were going to do.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, as I've indicated earlier, he could

(MR. GREEN cont'd.). . . . look through the election platforms of this party, of which my friend the Minister of Labour led for eight or nine years, he could look through the previous CCF which was led by the member Mr. Stinson, he could go through every single one of those election programs, and the automobile industry knew with a certainty that if this party gets in - and the Member for Souris-Lansdowne would use it as his major argument - they would have a public automobile insurance program in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the Minister permit one question?

MR. GREEN: No. I indicated to you, I indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the committee's frame of reference was to examine - and I'm paraphrasing the words - the possibilities of implementing a public automobile insurance program in the Province of Manitoba. And they examined it, they examined it and they came to the conclusion, the same conclusion by the way that many other committees have come to which were not oriented. You know, Mr. Justice Wootton of the Court of Appeal in the Province of British Columbia -- (Interjection) -- He's no Bolshevik. He was given the entire weight of the administration of the Province of British Columbia to assist this committee, and they came to these conclusions: That the industry is presently not competitive. Secondly, not only is it not competitive but that it shouldn't be competitive. Thirdly, and in this I will employ a euphemism, that you can't believe a word that the insurance industry tells you before these committees. Fourthly -- (Interjections) --

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I ask the honourable member to retract that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, he can read. . . .

MR. McKELLAR: I want the honourable member to retract that.

MR. GREEN: He can read the Wootton Committee Report.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. Order. Order, please.

MR. McKELLAR: That's a lie if there ever was one.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will not -- I will not. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: I will not ask the honourable member to withdraw the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Firstly, I would ask the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney to retract the unparliamentary. . . .

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't ask. . . .

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, as long as the honourable member is going to lie, I'm going to stand up here and. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect and in fairness to all of the members of the House, and so as not to create an incident, I wish that you not ask the honourable member to withdraw the statement. I wish, Mr. Speaker -- I know that I have no control over you, but I urge you to let it stand on the record that Mr. McKellar called me a liar because I said that the Wootton Commission said that you can't believe what the insurance industry says before the committee.

MR. McKELLAR: He didn't say that.

MR. GREEN: And I will permit that to remain on the record.

MR. McKELLAR: He never said that.

MR. GREEN: That's exactly what I said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do not believe that under any circumstances ought unparliamentary language be allowed in the Chamber.

MR. McKELLAR: What am I apologizing for, Mr. Speaker? Could you just illustrate?

A MEMBER: Accusing the honourable member of lying.

MR. McKELLAR: Accusing the honourable member of lying? Well I never -- I read the Wootton Commission and I didn't read it that way, so if you want to call it that way I say you're not telling the truth.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, can we leave it at that? Can we leave it at that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: May I -- may I. . . .

MR. McKELLAR: Well if it'll help the honourable member, I'll retract.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I believe there is a rule that when the Speaker is on his feet that the House remain silent. I would appreciate the observation of that rule.

MR. McKELLAR: I'll retract it.

MR. SPEAKER: I would appreciate the observation of the rule that I have just mentioned. May I direct the attention of the Honourable Minister -- I believe that the grievance which was raised, I was somewhat concerned whether -- I felt that perhaps it was in violation of Beauchesne and I read 234 Citation 1, but perhaps, as I interpreted the honourable member's closing remarks, that he was simply asking for the presentation of the bill now, which I suppose could be interpreted not to deal with a matter specifically as such insofar as the subject matter is concerned which may appear on the Order Paper now. I would therefore ask the Honourable Minister, if he has a grievance and if he wishes to participate in this debate, not to make specific reference to the merits of the automobile insurance plan such as he has in mind, but rather to matters that are permissible at this time.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to follow your admonition. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's grievance relates primarily -- and I tried to deal with the thrust of it -- to the fact that he is suggesting that somehow we have sidetracked parliament, and I have indicated and I started to say when we got shouts from the other side, that we appointed a committee, and if we could just hold still for a minute and let me get to the next paragraph we might be able to get on with it; that the first thing we did was we appointed a committee; we got a report from the committee; the Minister of Municipal Affairs introduced the bill on first reading and we are now waiting for second reading. There can be no damage to any situation and I note that the Member for Fort Garry indicated that he was concerned with the survival of the private automobile insurance industry in the Province of Manitoba.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that he didn't say that he was concerned with the people of Manitoba getting the most economical, the fairest and the most efficient type of automobile insurance. He was concerned with the survival of the industry, not the distribution of the insurance. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, he knows as well as I do -- he knows as well as I do and I say that he is the one who is being to any extent misleading when he says that somehow we are able to do this without having the legislation first of all brought into this Chamber, then given an opportunity for 56 people to debate it; following that to go to Law Amendments Committee or to a Committee of the House, not necessarily Law Amendments, at that stage to be again debated and amended until the committee concludes its work; then to be brought back into this House, debated again on third reading; then to go to Committee of the Whole, debated again in the Committee of the Whole, then to be finally passed again with the opportunity for all these debates to take place. And, Mr. Speaker, we have no intention, nor should it be suggested by the honourable members, that we can do anything but this. But I concede that we have added a feature. I didn't realize it until the honourable member suggested it, that we have added a feature. We have decided to carry this concern and carry the problem to all of the people in the Province of Manitoba as much as we can; that we have decided that this should be debated amongst the people themselves; that the members for the Conservative Party could go out and debate it for the people themselves; that we go down to the groups, to the community clubs, and as I was asked, to the Agricultural Society, and try to put the position, not alone, not alone, Mr. Speaker....

MR. SHERMAN: What's this place for?

MR. GREEN: We will be here. There is not one thing that we have done which will prevent us from doing it here.

MR. SHERMAN: Read that.... Ask the Attorney-General.

MR. GREEN: But, Mr. Speaker, we have added something, and what we have added is in truth, real, meaningful, not chaff, but meaningful, participatory democracy, and my honourable friend calls it tyranny.

MR. SHERMAN: Closure.

MR. GREEN: He takes a true situation -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that in the constituency of St. Johns....

MR. SHERMAN: Certainly is tyranny.

MR. GREEN: that this is what my honourable friend is objecting to, and let me be explicit about it -- that in the constituency of St. Johns they had a meeting on the corner of Cathedral Avenue and Main Street at their headquarters, and at their meeting they had somebody from the New Democratic Party -- I don't know who it was -- somebody from the New Democratic Party, and Mr. Tatlock, representing the private insurance industry, to talk to the people about automobile insurance. That's tyranny. In the constituency of Crescentwood they have scheduled a meeting at which somebody will speak -- I take it for granted it might be the Member for Crescentwood -- he's shaking his head -- and they will have a representative of

(MR. GREEN cont'd.). . . . the insurance industry and, you know, I think they'll even invite one of you if you indicated a willingness to come, and they will discuss the insurance problem. And that's tyranny. That's tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, does my honourable friend say that that meeting that took place outside of this Legislative Assembly today, that attempt -- and I have full respect for it. I really admire the kind of people who will come out and walk with a sign and state their position on a public issue and appear before the Legislative Building. I really admire it; I think it's a great thing; but I don't think that it in any way impairs upon the debate that will subsequently take place in this House, and I hope that when my honourable friend gets an opportunity -- which I hope he will -- of voting this right to walk in the streets when one has a grievance to anybody, wherever he is, and to try to impress people of the meaningfulness of your position by holding a sign and saying, "Please support me; don't support the government", or "Please support me; don't support my employer", or "Please support my industry; don't support my employees", I hope when he gets the opportunity of voting whether that should be permitted or not permitted, he votes for it because he may have that opportunity. But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- I don't have to worry?

MR. SHERMAN: You don't have to worry.

MR. GREEN: I'm pleased to hear it, because the fact is you may get that opportunity, but you'll call it tyranny. You'll call it tyranny. But, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend who really makes the thrust of his position an ethical one -- and this is what surprised me a great deal because I think that if ethics were on any side they're on the side of employing every legitimate means, including elected representatives, including other interested people, including forums, including public meetings, including coffee klatsches, including any type of gathering whatsoever at which people can learn and dialogue, that that is an essential, irreplaceable part of the democratic process. It's as important as the proceedings that are taking place in this House today.

MR. SHERMAN: Nobody denies it but what about this part of the democratic process?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend says that it's not, he says that it's not, and I agree. . .

MR. SHERMAN: There's one part missing and that's this part.

MR. GREEN: These are the points at which we have differences.

MR. McKENZIE: Put the bill on the table.

MR. GREEN: These are the points -- the bill will -- my honourable friend the Member for Roblin, even with his limited knowledge of parliamentary procedure, knows that we can't pass any laws before taking the steps that I issued earlier, and those steps will be taken and you can get up and you can speak to your heart's content in defence of the survival of the private automobile insurance industry in the Province of Manitoba. Nobody will prevent that. Nobody would try to prevent that. And I can see that there is a difference of opinion between what is true democratic process according to my view. I've stated it; as inadequate as it's my power to do, I've stated it, and my honourable friend has stated his, and there is a difference of opinion. There's a difference of opinion as to what constitutes ethics, as to whether this is the right way or something else is the right way. And he suggests some duplicity, he suggests some equivocation and he complains that they are going to be in a position in an election that they won't be able to equivocate. They will have to state themselves squarely down the line, which I believe is what we have always done.

But then, Mr. Speaker, and I hope my honourable friend will correct me if I'm wrong -- and I ask him to interrupt me in this case if I am going in a direction which is incorrect -- I remember my honourable friend had a problem and his idea of ethics is a little different than mine. He had a problem involving leadership of his national party, and as to when moves should be made and as to how moves should be made. And I remember that he was not a supporter of the honourable gentleman who sat in this Chamber yesterday. -- (Interjection) -- well, we're talking about ethics and he's talking about my ethics, and Mr. Speaker, I know that this might not be very -- but I want to demonstrate the difference in ethics. And there was a letter published in one of the newspapers, a letter that apparently the honourable member sent to some of his key constituents, in which he said that "we have to lay low; we cannot move in for the kill", and I believe that those were the words that were used in that letter -- (Interjection) --

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, he is ignoring your wishes and I wish he would. . . .

MR. GREEN: "We have to lay low, we cannot move in for the kill..." -- (Interjections) --

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, he is ignoring your wishes, which he promised to... By the Lord Harry... You promised to obey the Speaker; obey him.

MR. GREEN: ... not going to shout me down. -- (Interjections) -- No, Sir... -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I can very well recall that letter.

MR. SHERMAN: That's the typical debate from the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: That's right. That's a notion of ethics that my honourable friend is trying to sell these members of the House, and I can tell you something. They won't buy it. Because we didn't operate that way, and none of us have operated that way, and we won't adopt my honourable friend's idea of ethics, that we have to lay low; now is not the appropriate time; we can't yet move in for the kill. This is the letter that he sent his constituents, and these are his ethics.

MR. SHERMAN: ... you managed the First Minister's leadership campaign and....

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, neither the First Minister nor myself nor anybody in our party employed any such means of dealing with our question; neither did the former leader of the party. When I was going to run for the leadership of the party, the first person who knew about it, other than my constituency president, was the Minister of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe that there was some debate related to leadership contests on both sides of the House, but I think that the time has come when -- (Interjection) -- Order, please. Order. I believe that we can get back to the issue that the Honourable Minister had commenced debating.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, my honourable friend referred -- I'm talking about ethical, and he bases his whole position - he must have used that a hundred times - he bases his entire position on the fact that this government was unethically removing something from this Chamber, which he knows is impossible; which he knows there was no suggestion to do; which he knows he can't do, and we wouldn't do if we could. And I'm dealing now with his question of ethics. He takes a letter that was written in a newspaper by the member the Attorney-General, who states his position forthrightly, and this position he calls it unethical. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Riel writes letters to the newspaper. The Member for Swan River, who apparently can't stand it, he's got a newspaper of his own or a newspaper which he is involved in, and surely, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend doesn't expect that we, being a party which essentially is trying to implement the people's will - which is a very difficult thing sometimes - he is not suggesting that it is unethical for us to consort with the people, in doing this. And he calls that tyranny. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's tyranny, then we plead guilty. We plead guilty.

He referred, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to say, to take their admonition; I had some note on the 4,000 jobs which he talks about. I have things to say about that. I have things to say about the efficiency of the bill of what the government is proposing. There'll be a full opportunity for 57 people to discuss it. I get up at this point, Mr. Speaker, mainly to deal with the problem as to whether something, as has been suggested in a personal grievance by the Member for Fort Garry, that this government has done is unethical. And what we have done is added - and you know, it's quite accidental; I think it must come naturally to us - we have added the dimension of public participation to the agency of the democratic process. And if that's unethical, Mr. Speaker, then we have to say, yes, that's what we've done.

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

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if the Honourable Minister will submit to a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. GIRARD: Could he explain to the people of Manitoba why the delay in the introduction of the Bill?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer that question. May I say that the delay is mostly subjective on the part of honourable members; that many bills are introduced at first reading and don't come along till some weeks later. But this particular one - and I understand it - is one which everybody has an interest in and therefore the delay weighs heavily, but the fact is that we can't deal with it until we get to second reading. And when we get to second reading, there is no way, nor would we wish there to be a way, of the members not participating in the debate. We hope that they will also go to their community, just as we are doing, just as I went to a community in the constituency of Rock Lake. I was invited by the people, by the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.). . . . agricultural rep. Should I not have gone? They wanted a meeting. There was a man from the insurance industry there; I was there. My views on this issue are no secret; members know how I feel about this subject, and I went there and I said, "This is how I feel. The government position will in due course be announced." And surely my honourable friends are not suggesting that this is an unhealthy or an unethical procedure.

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

MR. SHERMAN: I wonder if the Minister would permit one question, Mr. Speaker. He made much of the fact that. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Question?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I'll ask the question but I have to make a reference to an aspect of his remarks. He made much of the fact that a monopolistic government-sponsored automobile insurance plan has long been part and parcel of his party's campaign literature in this province. And my question, Mr. Speaker, my question is: I wonder does he put the pledge or does he put the proposal for a \$2,000 exemption on real property taxes for pensioners in the same category of promises?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend knows, - or if he doesn't know maybe some day he will find out, not by ever getting into government but there must be some other way - there are many things that many members of the government would like to see happen, and any parliamentary program or any legislative program involves this priority. I can tell you without fear of in any way compromising my own position as an individual or compromising the government, that everything I wanted did not happen, that some of the things I didn't want happened, in terms of priority. And this could be said for anybody. And that happens to be one of the issues -- if the honourable member wants to know my personal position as between the rebate of taxes and the insurance program which will subsequently be announced, then I say without hesitation and I've said it before in the House, that I consider tax reform to be a very ineffective type of program for social justice, and I would say that the insurance program is much more important - in my personal view. It doesn't mean that on any particular time you don't pick one issue as against another, and we are all going to be faced with that. We're faced with it this year; we'll be faced with it next year; and we'll deal with it as time arises. And it's a reflection on one's ability to work within a group as to just how he is able to handle the group decision on priority. It's not a problem.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I feel that's it's only right that I should speak on this motion of grievance by my Honourable Member for Fort Garry here this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: There's no motion of grievance.

MR. McKELLAR: . . . go into Supply. Yes, I understand. I've been around here long enough - I just forgot during my absence. But, you know, I was sick during the hospital but I've become a lot sicker here this afternoon. It's unbelievable, unbelievable that a group of intelligent people who are, there's hardly, I think, one businessman or two businessmen at the most - three, maybe three - out of the whole group of you, could chastize an industry like you've chastized it here today, and the Premier on the public platform in front of our building. You have no right to challenge an industry. Your Minister of Industry and Commerce here is trying to get industry into the province, and what are you doing? You have three of the biggest companies in Canada here, with their head offices right in Manitoba here, and you are trying to drive them out. Sure, you can drive them out. They'll go to other places. But what about the people who established these businesses back in Wawanesa and Portage la Prairie? In 1896 in Wawanesa this company was established, as mentioned by the mayor this afternoon, by 20 farmers. In 1884 in the Portage area, I think about 20 farmers established the Portage Mutual Insurance Company. Are you going to drive these companies out of business? I ask you, each and every one of you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I'm wondering if the honourable member may not find a more appropriate opportunity to debate the merits of this issue at some other time.

MR. McKELLAR: No, Sir, Mr. Speaker, I'm on my own here. I'm on my own and I'm sticking up for the

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Because may I remind the honourable member that it is out of order to debate a matter at this time which is appointed for consideration.

MR. McKELLAR: I have a grievance motion. I am only speaking on the grievance motion.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member has a grievance motion, then the same restriction applies to the grievance motion.

MR. McKELLAR: All right, I'll stick to it. I've taken on one particular phrase that was mentioned by this group in the last election: the quality of life. The quality of life. I want to tell you right now that the quality of life in the Town of Wawanesa isn't very good, and I want to ask you: are not those 510 people of Wawanesa important in the Province of Manitoba? Are they not? I ask you right now. Is the quality of life in Wawanesa not important enough? I should say it is. But what are you doing to the Town of Wawanesa and the community? You're driving it out of existence by this very Bill, and I'm telling you you are. There's 78 people working in the Mutual. I would say 80 percent of the working people in Wawanesa work in the Wawanesa office, and I know every one of them personally. And I'm telling you I know their fate - I know their fate on the 1st of March next year when your bill comes into force. I know their fate. They'll have to go to Toronto, where one of their other offices are. Many of them will lose their homes which they have put in thousands and thousands of dollars. And I want to tell you that they're paying many dollars of income tax to your province. They're paying taxes to their own town.

You have a big investment in that town. On May 11th I am going to be at the official opening of their new school, which was approved by our government. They have already put in water and sewer, which was financed through Central Mortgage and Housing. They have other things that were paid there - a Senior Citizens Home which was approved by our province and opened up a few years ago. And they have a hospital which was built by the Liberal Government back in 1950. And all these things were built by the government of Manitoba which the understanding that this town would remain in existence for a long while. And I am concerned about the people of Wawanesa. And I am concerned to the point that I will debate this to the very end, and while I'm not going to debate with the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources today, I am going to debate his very points what he brought out today, because I know that he's skating on very thin ice.

This really bothers me. When statements are made accusing an industry -- I could get up on this platform right here today and I could say all the lawyers of Manitoba are not doing right for the people of Manitoba, but I will not do that because I know there's some good lawyers and I know there's maybe one or two bad, but the lawyers on the whole are very good lawyers; and I know the insurance industry is a good industry, otherwise it wouldn't have been in existence for nearly 90 years in the Province of Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- and I don't need any interruptions from you. I saw you on television the other night. But I want to let you people think for once. You could do away with the industry in the City of Winnipeg. I realize that - I realize that. You could maybe do away with the industry in the City of Portage la Prairie, and I know this is going to hurt the City of Portage la Prairie because I have a little part to play in it, but I know what's going to happen in the city. This is the biggest industry in the City of Portage la Prairie and I know where they're going to move if this comes about, if the fight is lost. I know where they're going to move. They're going to move to another province. And they are paying a lot of taxes. Don't ever under-estimate; they're paying a lot of taxes. And after all, the biggest thing when the government were over on this side was people, people, people, people. Now where is their concern? The only concern they have is for the New Democratic Party and let's not forget that.

We in the country have a hard time to make it a go right now. The farming business is rough. But let's not kill all the communities in Manitoba. In the Killarney paper two weeks ago, there was a headline, "The government is not concerned about rural Manitoba," and do you know who made that statement? It was the Mayor of Killarney. And I'm going to bring that paper in and read it next week to you.

But these are the things that concern me. Are you not concerned with people? Well I want you to answer that right now. Or are you only concerned about the New Democratic Party supporters? -- (Interjection) -- No, you sit down. You'll have all day to speak. I want to tell you right now, after all the interruptions I've had, that these companies invest many hundreds of dollars in government bonds in the province of Manitoba, and I would like to -- This is confidential. I don't ask the companies how many hundreds of thousands they invest, but it's up in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. These companies. Is that not worth something to the province of Manitoba? They're pouring this money back. And I want to tell the

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.). . . . Minister of Finance here that these agents who were chastized today pay a good sum of income tax, they pay a large sum of corporation tax into the province, they pay municipal, they pay sales tax and it's an everlasting thing.

These agents who you were talking and condemning in the Province of Manitoba - and I heard the Minister of Municipal Affairs on television the other night - these agents are one of the finest community people that you will find. You just name it and they will help any community project -- (Interjection) -- Would you keep quiet, sir. They'll help any community project that you name. I know most of them in the Province of Manitoba in the rural areas and they are some of the leading people in our community. Are you going to drive them out of all these communities? Where are they going to go? Where are they going to go? Some of these businesses are 50 and 60 years old. The business that I have is 46 years old, started by my father in 1924. There's one man up in the gallery here today that's been selling insurance for 55 years; 88 years old. I know he hasn't got long to live but he's active and it's what kept him alive. This is something -- you can't do these things overnight, you've got to at least have some heart anyway and I know that up to date you have had no heart.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the honourable member permit a question? The honourable member indicated that the agents had been chastized today. I wonder if he would like to be more explicit as to by whom and in what way were the agents chastized. I didn't get a chance to say anything.

MR. McKELLAR: You have been telling on television and radio that the agents have been doing a terrible job and you have said the companies have been doing a terrible job. You've been telling the public. I've heard you two or three times. While I was sick I was listening and reading and I . . .

MR. PAWLEY: The honourable member said today and I gathered he was referring to the demonstration outside.

MR. McKELLAR: No I meant. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Would the honourable member submit to a question? You expressed a concern for the agents and for the people of Wawanesa. Do you also share a concern for the hundreds of thousands of people who operate motor vehicles and pay insurance?

MR. McKELLAR: I have always done, and boy I'm telling you that if you go to the best people you will get the best service too and the best rate, and there is nobody can condemn. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, the debate has started, the debate will continue for the weeks or months to come, and it's not my purpose at this time to deal with the substantive arguments that I think can and should be raised and settled in this House in a proper manner. However, I rise simply because of the statements that the Honourable House Leader has made, because I think in his statements he has indicated a concern that I think should be highlighted again and, in turn, assessed from another point of view. He's an excellent debater. He is a person who successfully manoeuvres, because of his successful legal training, around an issue and there is no doubt that he is also quite entertaining. When he says that he tells the truth and he means what he says, I say with some conviction that that's true, and I believe that of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and I believe that of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood and I have so stated publicly, but, Mr. Speaker, there are other members on that front bench who have spoken and who I suggest do not mean what they say and this can be documented and proved time and time again.

The interesting thing is really, what is intended, and we do not know this until we get the details of the bill. But surely we can make one observation. Surely we can make one observation. Now what has happened is a cruel and heartless act on the part of the government who lack compassion for a great number of Manitobans - true, a small number in terms of the total voting public -- (Interjection) -- I wish the Honourable Minister of Government Services would just keep his mouth shut. . . .and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, for a great number of people, a great number of people -- (Interjection) -- well, it's equal to the parliamentary language that's been addressed to the members on this side in the last little while. . . . to a great and significant number of people who at least want to know first, whether there is going to be an opportunity of freedom of choice; secondly, whether there in fact will be a compensation paid to them as a result of government action. I suggest that there was an obligation on the part of the government

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.). . . . to forthrightly produce the bill so that in fact the debate could have intelligently been dealt with instead of having the report tabled, first reading, the Minister of Municipal Affairs go on with the chairman of the Committee and get on radio and make some silly and stupid statements - and I'm going to refer to him in a few moments - in connection with this, in dealing with a bill that he knows what it contains but the public does not know and we do not know, and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has a right to question the tactics that have been used.

Now I want to talk about ethics here because ethics are involved, and tyranny is involved. Oh yes, but not in the way that's been suggested. I have a different point of view and I'm going to express this in a few moments. In terms of ethics, I have indicated that I think the ethical position would have been on the part of the government, in the interest of the small number of voters, albeit maybe only 4,000 will be affected by this, to at least have some clear picture, you know, of what really was going to happen to them, because those on this side - and I speak I think probably for all the others in opposition - have had people who have come to us and have told us their particular problems; have indicated what the extent of their finances are; their obligations that they have assumed; the probable effect of the dislocation; the possibility of leaving this province; and have recited case histories, which may only be few in number measured against the million people in Manitoba, but nevertheless we as parliamentarians have a responsibility to be concerned with and you as government also have a responsibility to be concerned with. Now the ethics involved is that at least you should have made your position clear.

Now I say something else to you. . .

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, would the member permit a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I will at the end.

MR. DESJARDINS: At the end, thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: The Oscar awards were given away two weeks ago.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I'm aware and if it had been given you would have not won one, Mr. . .

MR. PAULLEY: And if you're attempting to get one now you're failing miserably.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm not trying to get one now, I rise simply because of the statements of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources because I want to talk about ethics.

I am going now to refer to another situation in which we can measure - and we have a right to measure the ethics of the government - and I'm going to talk now about the very few number of small fish processors whose livelihood and living and operation has in fact become redundant as a result of the operation of the Fish Marketing Board, and I want to measure the ethics of the government in connection with this specific situation to try and assess what the ethics of the government will likely be, will likely be with respect to the whole question of compensation and to the leaving of the people who are going to be dislocated as a result of government action.

Now let's talk about the fish marketing situation for one moment. At the time of the committee hearings in Law Amendments the then Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who is now the Minister of Industry and Commerce, said in answer to the questions of compensation, this is not nationalization on our part, and besides which, if we set up a precedent what will we do in automobile insurance? Now he said this in September of last year and I think that indicates to a large extent the ethics in terms of the policy that will be adopted by the government in connection with this matter.

Now let me say this to you, there were enough assurances given by the members on the opposite side, both in Law Amendments and in the committee hearings in this House, that they would examine and watch what would take place with respect to the Fish Marketing Board and if in fact a redundancy occurred they would declare it and compensation would be given. That was only fair, but what did we actually have? We have no redundancy declared yet but we have the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources writing a letter to the fish processors and saying, you know, if you want to sell your assets now, now that you are out of business, make an offer to us and maybe we will consider it. I want to tell the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that that was unethical -- oh yes, that was unethical. I want to tell you that people who have been put out of business as a result of government action and who were promised and assured, both in committee and by the statements in this House, that if that occurred their rights would be protected by the government, and to have the government use its force basically - or not to

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.). . . . use its ability to live up to that obligation but to suggest to people who cannot in any way sell their assets to anybody else, now to make an offer to you, I think is unethical and I think is an example of the kind of ethics that we are going to have practised by the government in connection with the automobile insurance.

And I must say to you that when the Premier stands outside this Legislature and says that I want you to come forward and to present to us what you think is a fair means of compensation, I don't think he means what he says and I'm going to say that to you now, because I believe that when the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources stands up and speaks, I believe what he says, but I'm saying to you that I don't think you mean what you say because at the very same time he said that he indicated that there will be a saving of 15 or 20 percent and if you really intend to compensate the people who are going to lose their assets and lose their business and are going to be forced into bankruptcy, if you really mean that in a sincere way, you are not talking of any saving of 15 or 20 percent and that's a fact.

And I want to refer back -- (Interjection) -- oh that is not nonsense. -- (Interjection) -- First year may not, second or third year. The first year of the Fish Producers Fish Marketing Board has knocked out several of the fish producers. They cannot make a living. They have pleaded at the doors and they have been with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and you have not been prepared to declare them redundant, and based on that performance I can suggest that this will be your performance in the automobile insurance field.

MR. GREEN: In what way does a declaration of redundancy guarantee or provide more compensation than the purchase of assets at market value, because a declaration of redundancy, all it means is that you buy at market value.

MR. SPIVAK: Buy, Mr. Speaker, that's all they've asked, is buy at market value. Why didn't you do that? You chose another action.

MR. GREEN: We have told them that they can come and deal with us. The government will consider the price of their assets and if they want to deal with us at market value, then I can assure my honourable friend that the government will deal with them at market value.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is now -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the floor. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is now telling us what he has said to them but that's not what was told to them six months ago. That was not what was told to them six months ago. In this House they were told that if they were redundant in the operation or the Board affected them and they put them out of business, that they in fact would be declared redundant and compensated.

MR. GREEN: That's not so.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh yes, that is so. There is going to be an opportunity to debate this issue in greater detail and we will take out all the newspaper reports of the committee hearings and we will look in the Hansard and I think you'll find -- and we'll have, possibly if we call the Standing Committee on Economic Development and we hear the people who in fact have been affected, I think this will be an exceptionally good exercise so that the thousand people or two thousand people that are going to be directly affected and out of work because of the actions of the government in connection with automobile insurance should be able to judge the ethics of the government and what in fact will happen, and to know whether they really mean what they say.

Now it's very interesting. The Attorney-General in this article that was referred to, in anticipation of what will take place -- and I want to talk about ethics at this point -- suggests, and I'm only going to quote a part, "that the vested interests will use every method available to them, including gross misstatements of fact." How do you know that's true?

MR. GREEN: We saw it in their pamphlets.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh, you saw it in their pamphlets. Okay. He knows that already, he knows that the vested interests are going to use gross misstatement of facts to convince you not to support the proposed legislation. I want to tell the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that this is unethical. I want to say that -- (Interjection) -- I'll say that that's unethical and that's my judgment, and if the honourable Attorney-General doesn't like that, then he can stand up and reply to it because if he in fact feels that there are misstatements in this, let him go ahead and read them and spell them out. Let him spell them out. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes you will. But I want to tell the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who so piously stood up before and lectured us in terms of the kind of ethics that he himself is not a part of, you better start lecturing your members on the front bench and your members on the back bench in connection with this.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

Now I want to talk about the question of ethics of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, who on the radio station when he was talking about the bill and the proposed legislation said, and I quote, "Insofar as the insurance agents are concerned, it's just poor luck." And those were the words he used. He said they're staunch free enterprisers, they're going out of business and it's poor luck. Well I'll tell you something, that if we want to talk about ethics, I suggest that it's unethical because while there is a sort of insinuation that automation will cause dislocation and that in fact as a result of this people lose jobs and people are affected and people therefore have to make adjustments, surely to God we have reached a point where we recognize that government is people and that government, as such, if it is going to use its instrument to deprive people of a living, should in fact be prepared to compensate and surely that compensation doesn't have to be begged for by the people who are protesting outside. Surely if we are going to be ethical, surely we are talking about action and leadership and surely we are talking about those who would set up this type of proposal to at least be prepared to be fair and to be prepared to do the right thing by those whom they are affecting.

And there are ways in which this can be done and it's not necessary to go out to them and say we will review it after you come begging to us. They shouldn't have to beg for you, because I want to tell you that the fish processors came to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and they got their answer, and I'll say God forbid for the people who are out there to have to go to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, or the Premier or to anyone else, to be able to get a judgment as to what they should be compensated for their living and their livelihood being deprived by result of government action, because government is not private enterprise and automation is no comparison, or has no relation to this specific issue.

MR. GREEN: They can sell it to you.

MR. SPIVAK: There's another interesting thing I want to talk about, and I'm sorry the Honourable Member for Elmwood is not present. There was a press release that was issued today and I'm going to read it. -- (Interjection) -- It says the NDP caucus and the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, and I'd like to read it if I may, "A demonstration by thousands of insurance agents and their supporters in opposition to government automobile insurance will prove nothing according to a New Democratic MLA." Well, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says we really are happy that we've caused participatory democracy, but he obviously believes as the Honourable Member from Elmwood does, that it really proves nothing.

"Basically it will show that 1,000 auto insurance men" - and we had a little debate between the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and myself as to the numbers, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources felt there were only 3,000 and I suggested to him that based on the experience of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia who has played in enough football fields to be able to judge a crowd, he believed that there was 8,000 - but "basically it will show that 1,000-odd auto insurance men each have a few friends, relatives and employees said Russell Doern, MLA for Elmwood.

"The insurance agents are entering the political arena, aided and abetted by the old line parties, he said. Their first attempt, picketing of the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra and Premier Schreyer, was a clumsy and ill-advised move, mixing culture and politics. Now there is to be a mass rally. The ad, Your Future Threatened, is an insult to the average person's intelligence, containing emotional words like free enterprise, socialist, compulsion, and dictatorship, which served to obscure the issues and weaken their case.

"These actions by the Insurance Agents Association of Manitoba will do little to influence the government to moderate its thinking or legislation. Such tactics will only ensure that the insurance agents lose whatever goodwill" - now this has to be the classic - "Such tactics will ensure that the insurance agents lose whatever goodwill they have guarded over the years with their general public."

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)

Now what difference does it make if they lose their goodwill? They're going to lose their lives and they're going to lose their business. Now the interesting thing about this is that, although there's reference to 1,000 auto insurance people and their relatives and friends, the basis of it is that the numbers are really small. And the basis -- (Interjection) -- Paper employees did you say? -- (Interjection) -- They were paid for.

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . if I pay them.

MR. SPIVAK: The interesting feature in this is that -- what it does indicate, and which is becoming pretty apparent in the commencement of the debate and I think we are aware of the fact that the debate will continue for the days and months to come, is that there really isn't the kind of concern for people that has been expressed in the past. I don't see in anything that the Honourable Member from Elmwood says here today, or in the remarks that have been made outside of this House, or in the statements that were made by the Premier, any of the compassion for the hundred families at South Indian Lake that we heard when we were on that side and they were on this side. Not at all. I see nothing of that; I hear nothing of that; and I doubt very much.

Now, you know, we as a government were criticized for many of our actions and in turn we have been criticized because of the fact that compensation was given in a manner which some did not consider proper in connection with Grand Rapids. But nevertheless, one thing that occurred in South Indian Lake, and probably the reason that the South Indian Lake issue was brought to its head, is that we were prepared and saw to it that a counsel was appointed for them to represent the interests of the native people, and it was paid for by Hydro at the instructions of our government when we were in government, so that in fact they would be in a position, they would be in a position to have legal counsel representing their interests so that in fact compensation would be given and it would be given fairly.

Now albeit the solicitor for them did a pretty effective job and he fought the issue on the question of the license and he was successful, but that isn't the issue. The issue is that we were prepared to recognize this, and we recognized it before they even had to appear before the proper person for obtaining a licence. We insured and we made certain that there was representation so that those people were in fact compensated, or at least had the representation who could make the best presentation for them to compensation. And we were concerned for the hundred families and yet we were accused of being arrogant, we were accused of being deceitful, we were accused of lacking compassion. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to review the statement of the Honourable Member from Elmwood again; I want to review the course of action; I want to review the statements that the Premier made today; and I suggest to you that what we witnessed is a very cruel, heartless, lacking compassion act of government. I'm not suggesting that you have not the right, because you have the majority, to take whatever course of action you so decide in connection with your policy matters, but I am suggesting that by not telling all the facts to those people who are going to be affected - and this is really the point of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry - and in turn by not being prepared, now, forthrightly, to say to them that in fact "if you are dislocated that you will in fact be compensated," that you in fact have shown that you lack the compassion, that because they are only a small group of people, you really are not interested in them and that you lack many of the qualities that apparently you exhibited when you were in opposition on this side.

And I suggest in doing this we have an indication of a trend. The trend is not just the question of what the Honourable Member for Fort Garry indicated, that you're going to go into the life insurance business which you are now looking at, that you're -- (Interjection) -- oh that's terrific, you know - that you're going to go into other business operations and that in fact this is the method in which you are going to create the jobs that are necessary in Manitoba. May I suggest to you that you've gone into the automobile insurance and you're going - or you're intending to - you're going to knock out 4,000 jobs; if you go into the life insurance business you'd probably knock out 7,000 or 10,000 jobs.

MR. GREEN: That's ridiculous.

MR. SPIVAK: That isn't so ridiculous, and I want to tell the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that it isn't so ridiculous, and it is not so ridiculous because, you know, it's a very interesting thing. The Premier indicated and the Minister of Industry and Commerce indicated that insofar as job formation in this province is concerned that he would do as good as we did, notwithstanding the fact that . . .

MR. GREEN: Better. Better.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh yes. Better! I'll show you how much better you're going to do; I'll show you how better you're going to do. That 11,000 jobs a year, which is what the TED recommended, no, we're not going to have to achieve that. The previous government achieved four -- we'll equal that record. Well, I want to tell you you're going to have a heck of a time equalling that record this year or next year if you knock 4,000 people out, because the truth of the matter is that that's what you're going to do. And I know the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources doesn't believe this, and I know -- you know, he can't sense that people, people will in fact be affected. But we know from this side that . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . compensate the people who lost 20 billion on the stock market yesterday?

MR. SPIVAK: Oh, that's very interesting. People lost 20 billion. I want to suggest to the Honourable Minister that we have a very valid point here. The problem here: is government people or not? Is the government people or not? And is government action either a responsibility on the part of government -- is there a responsibility on the part of government, is there really a responsibility on the part of government to compensate those people whom they've affected as a result of their actions? Now that's a good philosophical argument and we're going to talk the ethical position on this. Yes siree. I said before, I know what your position is in this. I see it in the Fish Marketing Board and I say God forbid that the insurance agents have to come to you for compensation because they're not going to get it. You know what you're going to say to them? Exactly what you said to the fish producers. When you put the plan in and when they've lost their business and when they owe the bank money and it's all taken away, and they've lost the goodwill that the Member from Elmwood says that they have -- they're going to lose all their goodwill -- then you're going to say, "Sell us your assets; we'll get it at market value." Oh yes, we'll take your assets at market value. You've got a chair, you've got a table, you've got a filing cabinet, you've got a typewriter and pencil. Then we'll buy. Now what do I do with the debts that I owe in connection with my operation? Well, there's only a very simple answer and the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources knows it. You have an assignment; you declare bankruptcy; you lose your credit; you affect your reputation . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, come on.

MR. SPIVAK: Now the Honourable Minister of Finance says, "Oh come on," and I want to say to you, Mr. Minister of Finance, that it's not "Oh come on." The Premier just only a matter of a few hours ago said, "If you give us a method we'll consider it." My God, why should they have to consider it? Why is there not an obligation on the part of the government now, forthrightly -- (Interjection) -- It was. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre . . .

MR. GREEN: Would the member permit a question?

MR. SPIVAK: I'd like to finish, if I may. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre asked why it wasn't under us. I've already given the example of South Indian Lake and I defy -- oh yes, there is a real comparison.

MR. GREEN: There is no comparison.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh there is no comparison, naturally no comparison.

MR. GREEN: There is absolutely no comparison.

MR. SPIVAK: Well now, there's no comparison at all, absolutely no comparison at all. Well, as I indicated to the honourable members, we are going to have . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . say there is a comparison.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh, it's an insult to the insurance agents.

MR. GREEN: That's right.

MR. SPIVAK: You know, in terms of real participatory democracy, what we should have had is have the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources address the group. And I think what he should have done . . .

MR. GREEN: Do they want to arrange a meeting?

MR. SPIVAK: No, and I think what he should have done is to have stood up there and said to them, there's no comparison at all.

MR. GREEN: Right.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, participatory democracy doesn't mean anything, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside has just informed me. It's if I accept -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, to me it does, far more than I think it does to you. And I must say that in listening to the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in talking about the ethical position, that we are going to have an opportunity to debate this and I look forward to it, and I would say and hope that instead of him trying to divert the attention from the real issue by making it into some personal situation, that he address himself to the problem. And I hope as well . . .

MR. GREEN: I will.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . and this, I think, becomes very important, when he goes out on the platform and the Premier and the others, that we do not have what the Honourable Attorney-General says will happen, from the government; that in fact there will be a gross misstatement of facts. Because right now we don't know what the facts are and we can only assume that maybe the Minister of Municipal Affairs does, but from every evidence we have, there are not too many members of the caucus that really know because this matter is still obviously either not settled or it hasn't been shown to them; and it's time, because of the course of action and its involvement with people, that you act forthrightly, produce the bill, and then the debate will continue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: I wonder if the honourable member would be so kind as to provide me with a copy of the transcript which he referred to from which he was reading certain remarks that he alleged I made on the Haslam program. I would like to review those.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the Honourable Minister my information is we do have the transcript. I must say that -- (Interjection) -- I indicated poor luck and I must say as well . . .

MR. PAWLEY: You'll provide me with that?

MR. SPIVAK: Well I'm not going to indicate the transcript. I say to the Honourable Minister that I listened with interest, that I made the notations, and I suggest that the transcript will show that he said "poor luck."

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move -- I believe it's in order -- I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Cultural Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: The question -- I will seek direction from the House.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that a motion for adjournment is always in order. The alternative is to go into Supply, come out of Supply, and then adjourn. So my understanding is that if I move adjournment now, that terminates the day and we go back to tomorrow's Order Paper. That is my understanding.

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