

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 o'clock, Tuesday, August 11, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

The Honourable House Leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): Mr. Chairman, just before the Orders of the Day I indicated to the Honourable Member for Riel that I would communicate to the House information relative to a question which he asked me some time ago in connection with beluga whales which had been contaminated by mercury. He indicated that the Federal Government department was concerned as to whether the beluga whale that had been contaminated were contaminated by fish from the Nelson River.

The report I have indicates that all fish in the Churchill area, that all of the fish that have been tested are below the mercury tolerance level, which would indicate that the mercury is not affecting the fish in that area in any event. The whale that were tested, of course, as indicated by the Member for Riel were above the tolerance level and they are attempting to find out where the whale would have received this mercury contamination. I would indicate, Mr. Speaker, that different species of life build up mercury at different rates and therefore it's difficult to say what the situation is with the whale; but the fish are definitely below the tolerance level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): I want to thank the Minister for presenting this information, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could ask a related question to him? Have there been any further measurements on the mercury levels in the Nelson, Winnipeg, English system which would indicate that there had been any reduction in the mercury level over the summer?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, none that I am at this point aware of. I think the information would have been communicated to me by now if there was any prospect that the matter was being cleared up, so I don't have good news to report in that respect.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. The news media carried a story about the possibility of a middle diversion at South Indian Lake. Could the Minister confirm or deny that, Mr. Speaker?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speculate about possibilities - I don't think the honourable member would want that either, or shouldn't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him if he has had an opportunity to examine into the provisions of The Noxious Weeds Act to find out if the Department of Transportation are violating the provisions of that Act?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): I'm sure Mr. Speaker, as I stated yesterday, that the Minister of Transportation is well equipped to do likewise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Transportation. Are you violating The Noxious Weeds Act?

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, that question is put in such a way that it is clearly out of order and impudent.

MR. SPEAKER: The First Minister's point is well taken. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have another answer for the Member for Fort Rouge who was asking some time ago again on the pelicans in the vicinity of Lake Winnipeg. My information is that the new developments in that area are not in any way a change from what had been

(MR. GREEN cont'd) carried on privately before and that the pelican population in Lake Winnipeg would not be affected. The pelicans are transients in the area and do not breed in the immediate vicinity of the beach. In any event, the situation has not changed so that there should be no effect on the pelicans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his information and ask perhaps a further question about Pipestone Island where they do have a breeding ground; whether this is within the Hecla area park and whether this might be affected?

MR. GREEN: Well Mr. Speaker, now I'm going to answer without the advice of my department and if I'm wrong, I'll correct it later on. Again, the Hecla development is not expected to significantly change what is happening in the Hecla area from what happened previously when the area was used by private people, except that there would be a park in the area. So I would not expect that it would significantly or in any way affect the pelican population, but if my answer at this point is incorrect I'll come back with further information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Transportation. I'm wondering if he could inform this House as to whether he intends to in his program have all weeds and grass cut on the P.R. roads that is the ditches of the P.R. roads in the Province this summer?

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, we intend to carry on a program which will prevent snow drifting in the winter time; in other words, when late fall a cut or two will be made along the shoulders on each highway so as to prevent snow from drifting and piling up by the highways.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Is the Minister of Transportation not aware that in carrying out the program that he has just enunciated, that he's in violation of an Act of the Department of Agriculture?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SCHREYER: Order, Mr. Speaker. The question is being put in a way, again, that is out of order, asking for an opinion, interpretation of law, etc. etc.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm not asking him, I'm telling him. . . -- (Interjection) --

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

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): If the . . . are finished speaking, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if he has any information from any authority in Ottawa how long July 31st is going to last - you know, is it going to be indefinite?

MR. USKIW: Well I haven't any definite information Mr. Speaker, but I would hope that it would last long enough for all farmers to have their four bushels delivered.

MR. WATT: Well Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could tell us who he has been in contact with in Ottawa to find out exactly when July 31st will end?

MR. USKIW: If my honourable friend would tell me who he has been in contact with in the last day or two.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I'm not the Minister of Agriculture at the moment, at the moment. If I was I would be finding out from the proper authority. I'm asking the Minister has he been in contact with an authority in Ottawa to find out how long July 31st will last.

MR. USKIW: I think if my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, would check Hansard, he would find that I gave that answer about a week ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: If it's any help to the Honourable Member for Arthur, if it's of any interest to the Honourable Member for Arthur I can advise him that on the day of the meeting of the Prairie Premiers that we were in communication that same day with the Canadian Wheat Board with respect to when there might be - to what date there might be continuation of delivery of the four bushel quota under the old crop year.

MR. WATT: I thank the First Minister for a sensible answer, but now I'd like to ask him, has there been any communication since that time between the First Minister himself and Ottawa to indicate that the extension will cover the four bushel proposed delivery quota?

MR. SCHREYER: I can advise my honourable friend that the information we were given that day was to the effect that an effort would be made to keep the old crop year, or to allow

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) the four bushel quota deliveries under the old crop year and that when it was felt that they could no longer keep that open, they would attempt to somehow equalize quota delivery opportunities in the new crop year, but we couldn't get any detail on that from the Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): A further question either to the Minister of Agriculture or the First Minister. We are speaking of four bushel - this is entirely in wheat I take it, that you're thinking? What then of people who have mainly been in barley etc., is my particular point, that the thing is cut off literally. I have some 1800 bushel to haul out and there is no way, I can't move to another point. What arrangements will be made in these cases?

MR. USKIW: Well I think Mr. Speaker, that the understanding that was given by the Government of Canada some time ago was that they would try to insure that a minimum of four bushels per acre of wheat was delivered by the end of the crop year. They made no reference to other crops and I'm sure that the situation will be as it always is; if you haven't delivered your allotment, it just means that you've missed out, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bill - No. 56 the Automobile Insurance Act.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 56. Section 2 (2) pass? -- (Nay) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: When the member says "nay" does he want the question put? Well then I say the chairman would say, move that Section 2 be adopted, are you ready for the question and then put it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just for clarification, since there has been objection to 2(2) - all those in favor of Section 2 (2) passing please . . .

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

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (River Heights): Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. We are now voting on the motion to pass Section 2 (2).

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 27, Nays 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried. Section 2(3) passed. 2 (4) -- The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): I beg to move that 2 (4) be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of Section 2 (4) passing please say Aye.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. The member wishes to speak?

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman, I'll be very brief.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose. -- (Interjection) -- The Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Did the Chairman accept that motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not really, I'm sorry I took the Member for Ste. Rose to mean he was speaking against 2 (4) and that this would be done by a voice vote, but I did not wish or mean to accept a motion to delete, by speaking against it and voting against it that will be sufficient. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear what the motion is, I understood that . . . well may I ask then on a point of order, whether the Member for Ste. Rose was rising to propose an amendment or whether . . . because if he wasn't I assume that the routine procedure would be to either vote for or against, but I assume that there was a motion to amend in some way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, my objective is to remove 2 (4) from the bill. If it is

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . your ruling that you want to do that simply by a voice vote, fine I'll accept that procedure and I will speak briefly against 2 (4).

I don't believe that 2 (4) is required. I spoke on this subject on Bill 43. Here is one more job that's going to be given, presumably, to a member of the government. I pointed out then that in my opinion there are far too many jobs now, that the members of the Legislature are paid to be members of the Legislature, not to be appointed to a multiplicity of boards. Here is one more. When you add that to all the ones that already exist, the Hydro Board, the Telephone Board, the Water Control Board, now four legislative assistants plus God knows what else, then we end up by having every government member with a government job and I don't think that that's the basis on which we ought to be starting off on auto insurance.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, may I indicate that if the Honourable Member looks closely at the wording of the clause, he will see that it is worded to give greater flexibility so that conceivably instead of a minister on the board, it could be a member.

However, there is no strong feeling about this and I wish to advise now that we are prepared to withdraw this particular clause, and by leave ask that it be withdrawn, if that's acceptable. It is not in any way central to the bill, simply what we thought was one way of providing for greater involvement by the Assembly, by members of the Assembly in the operation of this corporation. There is precedent for it; however, I admit that it is not well established precedent and prepared to withdraw that clause.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Honourable First Minister have leave to withdraw. (Agreed Section 2 (4) will be deleted) Section 2 (5), (6) pass. Section 3 pass. Section 4 pass. Section 5 pass. Section 6 1(a) pass; (b) pass . . .

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Chairman, are we on Section 6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we are on Section 6 (1). The Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I have given notice of an amendment I'd like to move, that subsection (1) of Section 6 of Bill 56 be amended (a) by adding thereto immediately after the word "operate" in the first line of clause (a) thereof the word "competitively"; and (b) by striking out clause (b) thereof.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this has been relatively well debated; I don't propose to carry on further debate at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I understand that the honourable member doesn't want to debate it, but are we not back in the same position as to whether the motion is receivable at all in view of the fact that -- (Interjection) -- Well, I just don't feel that I can without objecting, permit an amendment which has previously been put. I rather am reluctant to have a debate on that question when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said he doesn't even want to debate the question at all. It's just hard to let it go by.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might speak to the point of order raised because, Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that we have had a debate on an identical point of order yesterday, at which time I recall that you made a ruling, Sir; and I recall also that the Member for Ste. Rose made the valid point that there must be a greater and a more precise understanding as to in what sense this rule applies, that the same subject matter may not be moved in a subsequent amendment to a subsequent clause of the Bill and I may say, Sir . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. It's rather loud in the Chamber. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: No doubt, Mr. Chairman, you have consulted the authorities on the rules in this respect and I have done likewise, because it seemed a point of order that required clarification in our own mind; and if you are wishing some opinion as to the point of order that is before us now, it is my understanding that it is in order to have the subject matter, the same subject matter moved in an amendment, the same subject matter as one that has already been moved and dealt with by the committee or the House, but at different stages, and that is the point at different stages of the process of a Bill. But it is not in order to move the same subject matter in an amendment in the same stage of a Bill if that subject matter has already been dealt with by the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, yesterday we dealt with definitions. Now we're dealing with a section dealing with objects and powers and we're going to grant certain powers to the corporation. Certainly members if this House should have every right to amend or restrict or widen the powers if they so desire. I think this is what the amendment does, it changes the powers that the corporation will have. Surely such an amendment is in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, not to get into a lengthy debate on rules, but I'm one who believes, like the Member for Rhineland, that when you have decided on the definition and the definition within the definition section of the Act, you can hardly be construed to have considered all of the powers and objects and the whole Act all the way down the line.

Mr. Chairman, I'm one who believes that deciding the same subject matter is deciding - a clause is in the same basis as a Bill would be while we're in the committee stage and I just can't for the life of me see this being a logical application of the rule as it exists. I haven't done my homework. I don't have the authorities to present but in terms of ordinary logic, I just can't understand it for a minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I have consulted with those who follow parliamentary procedure carefully and who have what I believe to be a good understanding of the rules. No doubt at the same time, Sir, you were consulting others equally knowledgeable of the rules. May I make this point once again, that there is just no question in my contention, there is no question but that the subject matter of an amendment, if it is the same subject matter as one that has been already dealt with by this committee, is not receivable at the same stage of a Bill; but to come to the point raised by the Member for Ste. Rose yesterday, could the same subject matter be receivable, if it is moved in another stage of the Bill and the answer I suggest, Sir, is yes; but it is not receivable in the same stage where the same subject matter has already been dealt with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I would refer you to Erskine May, Page 548, "Admissibility of Amendments" - on that basis Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no reason why this cannot be dealt with in the manner it's proposed. The fact that the matter may have been dealt with on another clause does not preclude an amendment or a debate in connection with a clause further on in the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Chairman, may I just point out to members that this issue was raised yesterday; a ruling of the Chair was made and a vote taken thereon and I would respectfully suggest that we just carry on. The precedent has been established, a ruling has been made. Now, as the First Minister says, at a different stage of a Bill - for instance on third reading, I would suggest it would be within the Parliamentary procedure, but not at this stage. We went through the rule books and Beauchesne yesterday on this very point; I think the matter was resolved at that time and I think that we should adhere to the ruling, Mr. Chairman, that was made yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: One can see how the rights of members are being chipped away by the government. If this ruling is to be adopted, Sir, let's take the example in reverse. If the government were to move an amendment to a Bill that during the course of the Bill there were subsequent amendments that had to be made in order to conform with the original one, they would be prevented from doing so by virtue of the suggestion made by the Minister of Labour now, and I'm sure that the government would object very strenuously if that course of action was to follow. Gradually, but surely, the government are chipping away at the rights of the Opposition by establishing bad precedents, by attempting to impose restrictions on the Opposition preventing them from taking their place in proper debate in this Chamber, and Sir, I resent it very much.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may, Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Honourable Member for Morris. The government is not and neither is the Minister of Labour attempting to curtail the rights and privileges of anyone in this House, and there's no one who has fought more for the rights of the individual -- (Interjection) -- When I was there, yes. And while I am here, yes, too; because we have our parliamentary guides, our parliamentary rules and it was on the basis of Beauchesne yesterday and our own rules, yesterday, that the Chairman

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) made his rulings. It was challenged, the issue was decided - not on the basis -- (Interjection) -- Well, it might be a bad precedent and there have been and I frankly admit that there have been bad precedents established, but until those precedents are changed, then I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they are among the rules of the conduct of this Assembly.

And I want to assure my honourable friend, I think that I'm being sincere and honest when I say to him that no one has fought more in this House for the rights of the individual member, no matter where they sit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, again I would like to refer to Erskine May and I'd like to read from Page 534 and then refer again back to Page 548. "The functions of a committee on a Bill is to go through the text of the Bill clause by clause and if necessary, word by word with a view to making such amendments as it may seem likely to render it more generally accessible. The rules as to the admissibility of amendments are explained in detail on Pages 548, 552 below "but the general powers of the committee and the limitations by which it is bound should be clearly borne in mind; 1. A committee is bound by the decision of the House given on second reading" - and I'm not going to complete that. "2. The objects of a Bill are stated in its long title which should cover everything contained in the Bill. 3. An amendment which is outside the scope of the Bill is out of order."

Mr. Chairman, if you refer to admissibility and inadmissibility of amendments there is nothing in Erskine May that would prevent the introduction of amendments to other clauses even though they may have been dealt with in an earlier clause.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, you know, if one were to take the Member for River Heights seriously, the amendment that is being put now, one could technically argue that it's contrary to what the House approved on second reading and therefore is not admissible from the first rule that he read, so when we talk about curtailing debate, if we were trying to curtail debate we would be arguing that this amendment is contrary to the principle of the Bill, which was well argued on the second reading of the Bill.

That's not what concerns me; what concerns me is what the Member for Morris said because I believe that the rule as being applied now by the Chairman and has been established by the House, permits the greatest debate on an issue and says that when that issue is decided, a new debate shall not be renewed. That's all that's being said. Surely there was a full debate on the question as to whether or not there should be a competitive plan.

Now every set of rules and every set of laws leaves a residue for common sense and the honourable member knows full well that if an amendment were approved by the House and this required changes in other sections of the Act in order that the Act as drafted would be consistent with the approved amendment, that would not raise the necessity for a new debate and it would not be renewing a matter that had already been rejected by the Assembly, which is what the Leader of the Opposition's motion does. That's the only reason that I got up, Mr. Chairman. I realized the Leader of the Opposition said that there wouldn't be a great deal of debate on the amendment and I knew that the point of order would be fully debated; so rather than restricting debate we have opened up debate because there would have been hardly any debate on the amendment, but this matter is now being debated. So the point of order was not put in order to prevent debate nor did I believe that it would prevent debate. I rather suspected that it was going to inspire debate, which is what has happened. But the fact is that we are sitting in committee, we have voted on a certain principle, we have rejected it. As I understand the rule, you do not reopen a matter which has been rejected. That does not prevent you, and the Member for Morris knows it full well, from making a Bill consistent with an amendment which has been approved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Well Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't subscribe to the matter put forward by the House Leader. If I were to amend a Bill for the corporation to go into fire as well, and this can be done under this section, to give them the power to go into fire insurance as well; this could be done. Would the Chairman rule that out of order?

This is the very point: we're debating the powers that are going to be given to this corporation and I feel we have every right to amend it, to restrict or widen it and this is what we are doing - the amendment will make it so that it will be operating competitively and we feel very strongly on this side of the House that it should be operating on that basis and therefore I

(MR. FROESE cont'd) certainly maintain that the amendment is perfectly in order under this section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I would say once again that I feel that the acceptance of this motion by the Chair would reopen a debate on the competitive aspects of the plan and since that debate has already taken place and since the Chair made a ruling to that effect to prohibit additional amendments on the same question yesterday, that the motion is in fact out of order.

I would again refer to our own rules, section 54 which says that "a motion shall not be made if the subject matter thereof has been decided by the House during the same session"; and again to Beauchesne, 148 (1). Therefore I would consider and rule that the motion of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition is out of order.

MR. FROESE: I challenge your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the member have support?

MR. FROESE: I don't think I need support for a challenge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Members. I'm sorry . . .

MR. GREEN: There'll be a few minutes of recess, or not recess, but waiting while the Chairman prepares his motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, while considering Section 6, subsection (1) of Clause (a) the Leader of the Official Opposition moved that Clause (a) be amended by adding immediately after the word "operate" in the first line of Clause (a) thereof the word "competitively"; whereupon I decided that the amendment of the Leader of the Official Opposition would reopen a debate which has already taken place. Further I ruled out a similar or identical proposed motion yesterday in this committee. Based on our Rule No. 54 and Beauchesne Citation 148, I must rule the amendment out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the decision of the Chairman be confirmed?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed to rule on the matter I wonder . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I do not believe there is any debate allowed at this point.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, can I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. GREEN: . . . he indicates that the Speaker is going to rule on the matter.

MR. MOLGAT: No. I realize that the Speaker is going to put the matter to the House but I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, to wonder, if I may, whether the matter should not be taken into careful consideration by yourself, because I would consider that a decision

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member knows that the appeal from the Chair is to the House and Citation 232 subsection (1) of Beauchesne clearly states no discussion is allowed on the appeal. Shall the decision of the Chairman be confirmed?

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the decision of the Chairman confirmed.

MR. FROESE: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member support? Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Shall the decision of the Chairman be confirmed? Those in support thereof please rise.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas 28; Nays 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the decision of the Chairman confirmed. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 6(1)(b) pass. . . -- (Interjection) -- The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WEIR: May I just indicate that I'm tempted to use this opportunity to say the things that I wasn't going to say on the amendment that has just been rejected, because by virtue of the fact that the motion is before us, the subject matter that we were concerned about stopping is before the House; but I just want to say I won't subject the House to that harangue at this particular time, I'll content myself with voting against the sections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Chairman, I've said I'm going to be very brief. Mr. Chairman, section 1 - I do not intend to debate the word "corporation" as it is defined under (z) because there was a lot of debate on that yesterday. Certainly I am definitely opposed to the section (z) which was passed but the word "corporation" in section 1 means that the corporation may be able to set up a monopoly compulsory automobile insurance plan in this province. Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council it has the power to - Mr. Chairman, I don't, as a layman, I'm not a legal mind, but I would be very much in doubt personally that this could legally be done, and if it can legally be done, it should certainly be changed. The fact that the Lieutenant Governor in Council, which is a quorum of the Cabinet, can make all the rules and regulations pertaining to the corporation, or pertaining to the Manitoba Insurance Corporation, as it is called, is just inconceivable to me. I don't know how the members of the government, all the elected members of the government who are not part of the cabinet could possibly accept this.

You know, I just wouldn't like to be, I said this before very early in the debate a couple of months ago, and I won't dwell on it, we have had too much going over so far in the past few days, but the fact that you are an elected member and you don't have to be consulted as to the regulations, it's bad enough to be part of the government on the opposition side and not be consulted as to the powers that are given the Lieutenant Governor in Council in this section, but it certainly is disgraceful that it could happen without the elected members on the government side not having anything to say.

As I said, I don't really think it should be legal; I don't know whether it is or it isn't, I think it could be challenged, that the present NDP government or the Government of Manitoba is giving powers to a quorum of Cabinet over this province. Mr. Chairman, I think it's rather a disgraceful thing and I think that this section should be amended. I would ask the government to seriously consider having somebody else that they have to go to, having somebody - a board, of some kind, that the government is responsible to while making the regulations of this bill.

That's really all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. I will not go over the word "corporation" again as we debated in (z) but the fact that they can do this is rather disgusting and I think it should be reconsidered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the amendment was voted down but still leaves us open to debate the section as such. Section 6 gives the corporation its powers and objects and I still maintain even though we were voted down that this Legislature has the power to restrict the operations of the corporation. They have the power to widen its powers, and they should also have the power to vary its powers, and that's the very thing that was trying to be accomplished by having it made competitive. I'm just wondering whether if I did propose an amendment that this corporation should not only deal with automobile insurance, but also with marine insurance, whether this would be acceptable.

We have heard from the Member from Churchill that apparently the season up north, the shipping season is curtailed and shortened because they are unable to get the insurance. What would be wrong with adding marine insurance under this bill so that shipping can be extended to the Lakehead or to the Port of Churchill?

MR. SCHREYER: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. FROESE: Sure.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Honourable Member for Rhineland what his attitude would be if that were in fact proposed, because certainly there is no attitude of opposition to that suggestion. It's just that it would not seem to be consistent - or not consistent but it would not seem to be relevant to the main purport of the bill which is automobile insurance. The question of marine insurance is one that has interested successive Manitoba

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) governments for quite a few years. It's not a matter of cargo insurance either but - rather it's not a question of vessel insurance but of cargo insurance, that's the problem, and it could be that - would the honourable member be prepared now to indicate whether he would be willing to consider legislation with respect to cargo insurance? At some future date?

MR. FROESE: I would be willing to accept it right now. Throw this auto insurance out and let's deal with that matter and I'd be a very happy man. I'd be happy to support it right away, because then we would be performing something useful, so that the activities at the port could be extended. I think this has been mentioned time and again; nothing seems to be done about it. Here we had the opportunity to do something about it and we are not doing anything, yet we are busying ourselves with matters of this type which I think were much better left alone. Certainly if it had been proper to amend this section to that extent, I would have done so, but as the First Minister pointed out, some of the sections certainly don't lend themselves to it. But I would feel that this Legislature should have the right to amend and to widen, restrict or vary the powers of the corporation and this is what the leader of the Opposition was trying to do before and yet we were ruled out of order. I feel that was very unfair although we are not to pass judgment apparently on what actions have been taken.

There are other things that could be done with the insurance company - they could handle fire and so on. No doubt this will be considered at future sessions of this Legislature once you have the corporation; no doubt its powers will be widened. I think this is just a matter of time because we see this is happening in Saskatchewan and there is no reason why the Government in Manitoba will not at some later date try to do the same.

The matter of using reserves under this section, I'm just wondering how much is the government

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . point out to the honourable member that we are dealing with 6 (1) (b) and reserves is (d).

MR. FROESE: Well we hadn't passed (1)(a) yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes we have. We are now on 6(1)(b).

MR. FROESE: Well no, you were challenged on the amendment that was being put forward and we hadn't passed (a) at all. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, but that was on the matter of the amendment, not on the section as such.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: When I rose to speak on Section 6 (1) I was speaking on 6 (1) (a). You may have got it checked off before you recognized me, but I was speaking to (a) and to (b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: On the point of order. It would seem to me that the remarks that are being made by the Member for Rhineland are equally relevant whether it be 6(1)(b) or 6(1)(a). That's not to suggest that I regard them as relevant; that is not my function; I leave that to the Chair as to whether or not they are relevant, but I am suggesting though, that if they are relevant, they are just as relevant to 6 (1)(b) as 6 (1)(a).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I understand. Perhaps for the sake of clarity I should ask for the passing of 6 (1)(a), but regardless of that the Member for Rhineland was dealing with Section (d) and the question of reserves and I'd prefer that he wait for that.

MR. FROESE: . . . Section 6 which deals with objects and powers and I think we should have a little latitude when we discuss the section as such with powers and objects, that we not be confined to a certain clause in making our comments.

Certainly yesterday they went over - well, the whole universe when they were discussing certain clauses which would have been completely out of order under that ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I may suggest that if it is reserves, the question of reserves that the honourable member is addressing himself to, then where the sub-clause specifically makes reference to reserves - that happens to be sub-clause (d) - it would seem logical and in accordance with the rules to address any remarks relative to reserves at that time which is just two sub-clauses away.

MR. EARL MCKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, are you dealing with all sections (a)(b)(c)(d) at one time or what . . . ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I'm not. I just tried to point out to the Member for Rhineland

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) that we were discussing (a) or (b) and apparently it's not clear so I intend to go back to (a). In his remarks he began further remarks on the question of reserves and since reserves are dealt with under (d) I suggested to him that he wait to make his comments under (d).

So I would go back just for clarification to Section 6 (1) (a) -- pass

MR. WATT: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to make a lengthy speech; in fact I really don't intend to make a speech at all any more than to clarify my position again as I have done in the House insofar as the powers of the government to establish a monopoly in the insurance industry and to say that I have taken my position in conjunction with what the people in my constituency believe and what I believe the most of the people of the Province of Manitoba believe; but I rise more particularly now because I'm interested in hearing the opinions of some of the backbench on the government side of the House. I would like to hear, for instance, the Member for Winnipeg Centre get up and say that he agrees with a Bill that will force me to put compulsory collision on my own automobile. I'd like to hear him justify the reasoning behind his support of this Bill if he is going to support this Bill on third reading.

And I'd like to hear the Member for Rupertsland, for instance - I'm sorry he's not in the House now - to get up and justify his position in regard to compulsory insurance on personal property.

I haven't heard anything from any of the backbenchers in this area, nor indeed have I heard any justification from the front bench that would establish sound reasoning for forcing the individuals, private people in the Province of Manitoba to be forced to insure private property.

So I appeal to members on the backbench to stand up and justify support of this bill that will take away the rights of the individuals of the Province of Manitoba to decide themselves whether they insure or not their personal property. I'd like to hear from them on this particular aspect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: The Honourable Member for Arthur makes a pointed reference to the question of first-party liability. May I say to him at the outset that of course we are aware of the arguments that can be made on both sides of the question, and there are very good arguments on both sides of the question. Certainly it would seem pretty obvious that with respect to the responsibility of society, that there is less need for insisting on first-party liability coverage, at least of a certain amount, than there is a third-party liability which is something which hardly anyone questions, or very few question.

On the other hand, requirements of having some mandatory first-party liability coverage does have the argument for it that it is one of several ways of reducing litigation costs to the extent that if everyone driving on the road has first-party liability coverage to a basic amount then the necessity of having costly litigation diminishes and these things have to be weighed one against the other.

Or it could be put another way; that the requirement for at least a basic amount of first-party coverage, collision coverage, to put it another way, is one way of insuring against increased litigation costs. It is, to put it another way, an anti-litigation cost type of insurance feature.

I might add that other jurisdictions that have given some study to the matter have come up with such findings and admit that there are arguments for and against such a requirement. In the end you have to weigh one against the other and determine which in your judgment is in the best interests of all.

In a sense it is to be likened, I suppose, with medical care coverage, because that is first person insurance against sickness and the costs of medical care. Certainly Medicare is not third-party coverage, it's first-party coverage, and so the same kind of basic argument presents itself in that case as well.

I would like to go into this more, Mr. Chairman, but at a subsequent clause of the Bill I intend to and it will be more relevant there, for me to address myself at greater length on the question of first-party coverage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I concede the floor at the moment to the Member for Winnipeg Centre. I'm interested in hearing his

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Since the Member for Arthur directed a question to me, I think I should just add a word. It always kind of annoys me a little bit when the Premier puts it in much better terms than I could possibly, but I can certainly understand the member's question because this is a question I have about the Bill and the Premier puts it, in my view, very succinctly. I have two cars, for example. One's an old '60 Chevy and the only value that car is to myself, on the market it has no value, so I question this particular aspect of the Bill and it's something which will be dealt with, I am sure.

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

MR. McKE LLAR: I'm greatly interested in the debate that's going on because I think there's one point that I think the public do not realize when you try to decrease the litigation costs and assess the no-fault coverage on each individual auto, it means in an actual fact that if the First Minister slams into my car out in front of the Legislative Building that I have to assume all costs and I don't think many of the people - it's very difficult to explain this to the public and this is what I'm afraid of. I understand it myself, but there's very people understand that if somebody slams into your car in a parking lot, that you, as the owner of that car have to assume all responsibility for the fixing of that car, your own car.

Now this is where the agents have a lot of problems even under the present law, is trying to explain to them, in a case of hit and run that they have to fix their own car under their own collision coverage; and if this feature, no-fault feature was brought into existence as the government say it is, it will create many hardships and also many real problems for people that don't understand why they are liable for damage that somebody else does to their car. One of the biggest problems that we have in our insurance bill is hit and run in parking lots and hit and run, many other cases that you just can't - in fact I heard not too long ago where somebody out here east of Winnipeg was a hit and run case but the man gave himself up. I think one or two died in that particular accident. But this particular feature, while it looks good on paper, while it looks good on paper, for the life of me, many people are going to have trouble trying to understand why they should be liable for damage to their car damaged by someone else. I'd just like to bring this point out right now because we are debating on this very particular point here.

MR. USKIW: On a point of order.

MR. McKE LLAR: You can talk in a minute here if you want to. Now if the government are going to bring this feature in I'd like to know right now, and I think the public would like to know if this is part of their old plan. I understand there are amendments later on in Section 29, that they are going to look into this feature. -- (Interjection) -- No, this is the plan we're discussing, we're voting on something here right now on a universal plan here and I think that the government, before we go into these things too deep it should come out - if they've got a plan, let's have it right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 6(1)(a)--passed; Section (b) . . . The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, I wish to register my objection to 6(1)(b) and to indicate that my colleagues and I wish to vote against it on grounds that have been elaborated upon to some considerable length in the last few days and weeks in this Chamber and need no repetition at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on Section 6(1)(b) and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SHERMAN: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ayes and Nays. Call in the members. We're dealing with Section 6(1)(b) of the Bill. All those in favour of that section please rise.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Ayes 27; Nays 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the section carried. Section 6(1)(c)--passed; Section 6(1)(d) -- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On (d), (d) has to do with the matter of reserves. If there is not sufficient moneys coming out of the plan that they can. . . However, we know that during the initial period there will be no reserves. I would like to ask the government, what is the intention - is the government going to put certain moneys into a special reserve from which to draw under such case; and if so, how much?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I just want to point out we are coming to a section dealing with the borrowing power of the corporation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 6. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): I suggest that there will be reserves hopefully set up as the plan progresses to deal with contingencies that will develop.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, it is difficult to hear the Honourable Minister. I would ask him to repeat his point.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, I wish to point out to the Honourable Member that as the plan develops over a period of years, that there will be reserves that will be established as in any wise operation of any insurance plan, in order to protect the plan against future contingencies or bad or abnormal years insofar as accident claims and ratio of accidents are concerned.

MR. FROESE: Is it the intention to have one general reserve for all purposes or will there be different reserves set up for different purposes?

MR. PAWLEY: Well there will be separate reserves - the reserve that I have chiefly in mind though would be a contingency reserve to protect the plan from future abnormal years insofar as accidents would be concerned. These would be reserves that would accumulate within the fund itself, so that if four or five years from now there is a great increase in accidents, then there will be something in order to draw upon from a reserve. Let me just draw for your attention this year, which has been a very bad underwriting year; I'm sure the private insurance industry have had to in some instances, draw upon reserves because of the abnormal circumstances affecting the past year insofar as accidents and claims are concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 6 (1)(d) passed. 6 (1) passed. 6(2) . . . The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, before we vote on 6 (1) - and 6 (1) is probably one of the two or three clauses that becomes critical in terms of the bill - let me say this again. The government has not proved the necessity for a monopoly. Mr. Chairman, there are those on the other side who say I am hard of hearing. I would like to, if I may, read just a short portion of an editorial in the Winnipeg Tribune dated May 28th. Mr. Chairman, this is a case for the opposition and I wonder whether the members on the opposite side are going to be in a position to present their case.

The editorial is entitled "Why a Monopoly?" And the editorial states: "When all things are considered, the savings being promised may not be there at all; at least, as far as the average motorist is concerned. This poses a large problem for Manitoba motorists and for the Schreyer government. What in fact is the total net effect likely to be? Is this something the government would rather not discuss? Even at this late date the government would at least get high marks for honesty if it frankly admitted the real reasons for its insistence on monopoly; It would be showing wisdom and courage if it would go one step further and modify its position and let the private firms compete. Already, Mr. Schreyer has achieved much of what he set out to do. The private firms have been served notice of public dissatisfaction. They face an ultimatum. The government has the upper hand. It should be absolutely sure that it is doing the right thing, even if it means holding up or amending the bill. A year of competition between a Crown company and a private firm should establish which system is best for Manitoba motorists; all private, all government, or a combination of two."

Mr. Chairman, let me just repeat one of the conclusions of the Wootton commission, page 728: "Significantly the insurance industry has not yet had any notice in British Columbia from government of dissatisfaction with the conduct and performance of the industry. Before a takeover or entering into competition by government, in the opinion of the Commissioners, the industry is entitled to some gesture of dissatisfaction by way of warning or notice." Mr. Chairman, I submit in voting nay to 6 (1) the government has not indicated that they (a) cannot compete or that sufficient notice or warning or regulation has been undertaken to in fact satisfy those who have been dissatisfied with the industry and that the case for the government has not been made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to deal with my honourable friend's remarks, and those of yesterday very briefly if I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . brief on both sides, because we have spent some considerable time here.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I really resent that suggestion because you did not make it to the Member for River Heights. I indicated I intended to speak briefly and I don't

(MR. GREEN cont'd) think that I need a further admonition in that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not singling out the present speaker, but simply pointing that out in general.

MR. GREEN: Well thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate that the Member for River Heights yesterday picked on the National Farmers Union representative for having said that well, in answer to an argument, that well, bread you may not have to eat, insurance you have to buy, and he indicated that that was the level of the support for the bill. I think that was the suggestion that was made by the Member for River Heights. He ignored that Mr. Singleton had said various other things, which had been said in this House on various occasions and which the honourable member knows full well have been said, and which constitutes support for the bill far and beyond any savings in premium, and the honourable member knows this. The Member for St. Vital said that the government is looking for money so that they can support municipalities. It wasn't our side who said this; but the Honourable Member for St. Vital said that the government will accumulate \$25 million in capital, out of which they will be able to give assistance to municipalities. Mr. Singleton of the Farmers Union said if we don't save a cent in premiums, at least we will know that the capital that is generated by automobile insurance would accrue to the benefit of the people of Manitoba and would be used for their purposes.

Mr. Chairman, the biggest reason, and I have indicated on other occasions in this house, that the premium saving is not the main feature; it is the feature by which it is demonstrated that a service that is now being provided to the people can be better provided, and that is a sufficient reason for indicating that a service should be provided by the public. But once that service is provided by the public, that is not the sole feature or even the most important one; the most important feature is what the Member for Souris-Killarney has been worried about.

The Member for Souris-Killarney says to us: how are we going to keep business in the province, and Mr. Chairman, we do know that various business people come to us from time to time, and they say that if you, the legislator, don't behave in one way or another, we will withdraw our capital from your province; and the Member for Souris-Killarney says well in answer to that, we should say: "Oh, we will do your bidding, please don't withdraw your capital from our province"; and I say that the best way of insuring that the capital will remain in the province is for that capital to be controlled by the people of the Province of Manitoba. There is no doubt, we don't have to worry about whether the Manitoba Public Automobile Insurance Corporation is going to leave Manitoba or not; we won't let it leave Manitoba. But the Member for Souris-Killarney says that we should constantly be worried about whether the Wawanesa Company will leave Manitoba.

MR. McKELLAR: That's right.

MR. GREEN: Well I am telling you that the best way of resolving your problem is to make the insurance company belong to the people of the Province of Manitoba. That way it will never leave. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I intend to continue speaking. Mr. Chairman, we have heard this before, we have heard the Member for Souris-Killarney talk about the companies being here and how they're trying to do good and how they're trying to invest in Manitoba, and Mr. Chairman, there's an interesting feature to that. I show you this -- what will we call it? -- I would like to call it something else, but it would be unparliamentary, so we'll call it a banner that has been produced by these people who are trying to do good and to try to invest business and create employment in the Province of Manitoba -- "Government monopoly No; Free Enterprise Yes" -- printed in the United States of America.

Now Mr. Speaker, these people who are investing capital and want to produce jobs in Manitoba, they couldn't find a printer in Manitoba who could prepare this piece of material. Now the honourable member says that we haven't proved anything and in the last analysis, there is a difference of opinion, the honourable member knows it, and we can't unprove that difference of opinion. We say that in this industry what has been demonstrated is that there is a problem, and the member says the industry didn't get notice. In 1966, he was a member of the administration which passed a resolution which said that there was dissatisfaction -- I can't remember the exact words -- which said that there was a problem with regard to the industry in Manitoba, in 1966, they gave notice -- they didn't do anything about it, but they gave notice. What the people of Manitoba are now saying is that in view of the fact that we can provide the service better, and in view of the fact that we can do it at a more efficient and more effective and less expensive level, then why not have all of the attributes, all of the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) advantages that providing that service gives to the companies now. Who decides now where mortgages are given, whether there will be development in downtown Winnipeg, whether monies will be invested here or in another place? Well we know who decides - it's the people who come to us and say that unless you reduce your income taxes we're going to leave your province. Now you say, well the obvious answer is, well by all means, reduce the income tax; and I say that just for a little bit, just a little bit, 25 to 30 million dollars of economic control, which is demonstrated to be legitimate by virtue of the service being provided, that the people of Manitoba not only have proof but have every reason to go ahead with the program which will provide their service better and which will give them all of those other advantages.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would again appeal to members - I cannot refrain from pointing this out and I cannot stop any member - there has been considerable repetition in this debate; I hope that we now don't initiate more of the same. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources made reference to Mr. Singleton. I do not intend to deal with it in any length, except to say that what he said and what's in the transcript are not the same thing, and that if he has any doubt - and he's walked out already - but if he had any doubt he'd have to look at this. If the Honourable Attorney-General wants me to read into the record what Mr. Singleton -- (Interjection) -- I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that what the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said, is what he believes he would like Mr. Singleton to have said, but that's not what he said. Now that's one thing. The second thing, of all the most ridiculous arguments to present that we now have taken over a bit of economic power, a bit of economic power which is more capable of delivery by the government to the satisfaction of the people. Well Mr. Chairman, the government might as well take over the truck and transport industry in this province, completely, because I want to talk about that. That is economic power and it is delivery to the people and there will be a far better result than what's happening here, but I'm not suggesting that.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Not yet.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has been worried for some time about those who control industry and who make decisions and those decisions affect the people of Manitoba and the people do not have control over those decisions. But, Mr. Chairman, even though we talk in theory that we are the people who represent the people of the province, the fact of the matter is that the people who are affected by government action have very little redress if they're a minority, against the actions of government. All we have to do is look at the small fish processing companies who for the past year have gone bankrupt, and I can name them, who've gone bankrupt because the government on the other side - for reasons best known to themselves, because of a political decision, and because they had not settled on compensation for the insurance agents and they didn't know what they were going to do - allowed the small minority to suffer without question, so I have to be concerned about the exercise of a majority will through a cabinet and I have to be concerned that their exercise of their power is any better or their tyranny is any better than the tyranny that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has referred to? Well I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman; but I do know that government at this point is not capable of taking over everything as much as some of those members on the opposite side would like it. They cannot take over everything. So what we do is we take, we take what we can and we move as we can, and this is the first step; and anyone who suggests it isn't is mistaken.

Now Mr. Chairman, I say again - there may very well - and I have no hang-up, I'm in this respect the same as the Member from St. Boniface - I have no hang-up in terms of free enterprise - oh I have not - and I have no hang-up of government involvement, absolutely not, and I never said anything and I ask the Attorney-General if he believes that to be the case, to show me, because I've never made a speech and I've never said, or made a comment on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . honourable member for River Heights that he's repeating himself. He made the same comment the other day and I would again plead with him and with other members not to go on with this debate forever and to bear in mind that some of this has been repeated. I think that they should consider the other members of the House in addition to their own interests.

MR. SPIVAK: I'll tell you Mr. Chairman, I'm not considering other members of the House, I'm considering the agents and the people in the industry who are going to be wiped out.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) Mr. Chairman, they're a small minority and they're not being heard right now and right now they've probably given up and they've settled, that it's finished and it's over with. -- (Interjection) -- They haven't been heard.

MR. SCHREYER: For 2, 3, 4 weeks they haven't been heard?

MR. SPIVAK: They haven't been heard.

MR. SCHREYER: Well that's nonsense.

MR. SPIVAK: They've talked and there may have been a few people who have listened to them, but I'm not sure anything that I can see or anything that's been mentioned indicates that they've been heard.

Now Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I'm concerned for them, I'm concerned because they represent the small minority. I'm concerned because in fact there is an exercise of a tyranny and majority against them, and anyone who doesn't believe that is mistaken. I say Mr. Chairman, I'm not one who is going to vote for 6 (1) on the proposition that the government has presented a case. They have not. For the government to stand up and say Mr. Boldt from Saskatchewan says this and this and this and for this reason it has to be good - I mean where's the logic. I have Mr. Stewart's statement and I'll match Mr. Stewart's statement with Mr. Boldt's. Mr. Stewart's didn't say, he has doubt about the car plan. So now we have his opinion and another

MR. PAWLEY: Would the honourable Minister submit to a question?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes I will at the end. . . . from another Minister from Saskatchewan. Mr. Chairman, we have no figures, we have no specifics, and the First Minister stands up and says the Superintendent of Insurance has various statistics and information. Well that may be true; but has the First Minister ever taken those statistics and information, compiled them and told us what his conclusion is, in detail, specifically, spelled it out?

MR. SCHREYER: Right.

MR. SPIVAK: Tell me when you specifically stood up in this House or before the committee and gave statistical information on the basis on which you've arrived at a judgment, because I, Mr. Chairman, say to the First Minister because he says it's so, doesn't make it so - and because he says it is so doesn't make it so.

Mr. Chairman, had we had the opportunity for the Superintendent of Insurance to be present here, or to be before the committee - oh no, naturally no - if we had had the opportunity it would have been very interesting to have heard his observations and for him to have given us his impression. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing that suggests that the government could not by legislation have regulated the industry and accomplished the result. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if you don't want to accept it, that's fine; that's fine. That's fine. But Mr. Chairman, let me say this, that those who believe that the ideology between the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Member for Crescentwood and the First Minister are anything different, are mistaken, and those in the province, including the Member for St. Boniface and the other who say, "Thank God, thank God we have a moderate as First Minister of this province, are mistaken, because he's no moderate, Mr. Chairman, at all. He's the person who has introduced auto insurance. He is no moderate at all. He is as convinced ideologically as the others are of his position and he is doing this as a deliberate act with full knowledge. He may want to feel that he has compassion and that he's now presenting a plan that may in fact give agents a better deal. But Mr. Chairman, it's not a question, it's not a question of whether there is compassion in dealing with people. The question is a question of principle, and what principle motivates it. A public utility? Nonsense, absolute nonsense. A public utility, nonsense. A 10 percent saving you could have made without any question by regulation, and you know that. -- (Interjection) -- Well, you've answered twice; you haven't said anything.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, I'll answer you again.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, for those

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is one of the points I'm attempting to make, that we're never going to satisfy each other and I wonder whether or not some of these comments are really necessary in the sense that we have heard identical speeches from members of the Opposition, followed by identical speeches from the government, and I would ask members to ask themselves at this time whether some of these speeches are in fact necessary. -- (Interjection) -- Sounds mighty familiar.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, the takeover of the insurance industry in this province will be a highlight in our history, and certainly a highlight in this decade. It'll be more public

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) participation. Mr. Chairman -- (Interjection) -- Oh, you want the facts gone into. Then you should have gone into the facts before you presented the Bill.

MR. SCHREYER: We had the facts.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, anyone who presents 45 amendments to a 65-clause bill doesn't know his facts very well.

MR. SCHREYER: The honourable member will be sorry he said that.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I must say to you that it will be a highlight and it marks a turn, but not the turn that people suggest and not the turn that the others would want to predict.

I mentioned yesterday the interview with the Winnipeg Tribune that the Premier had on July 15th of July 5th of last year. I'm not going to quote chapter and verse but he made particular reference to the image of Manitoba

MR. SCHREYER: Go through it again.

MR. SPIVAK: No, I've gone through it.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, go through it again. You're going through everything else.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I may say to the First Minister the inconsistencies between what he said then and what he's doing now are pretty apparent.

MR. SCHREYER: Not at all.

MR. SPIVAK: Oh, yes. But Mr. Chairman, the one thing that comes throughout this, and it came through the election campaign, is his concern for the total image of the province, for the recognition that as a province, in order to accomplish things, your image has to be good because if it's not good nothing would happen. Because I think there was a recognition on his part that maybe government can't do everything, unlike the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' position.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I never said that the government can do everything.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, who's now in his red shirt, may say that he did not believe

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, let the record show, let the record show that the Member for River Heights is wearing a red shirt too.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, may I say that although I am wearing a red shirt, although I am wearing a red shirt, I have and Mr. Chairman, I may say, as well, that my shirt is faded, and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' shirt is very loud and bright. Mr. Chairman, as I've indicated before, I consider myself a red Tory in any case.

Mr. Chairman, the one thing that comes loud and clear from the First Minister's interview is his concern for Manitoba, and I may say, Mr. Chairman, -- (Interjection) -- Loud and clear is your concern for the image of the province and the people. All right. I may say, Mr. Chairman, what you're doing for the people is nothing that could not be accomplished by regulations.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, I say nonsense.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I'm saying that's my opinion. What you're doing for the province is a disaster. What you're doing for the province is a disaster. If you're concerned about the image of this province, if you're concerned about those people who, in fact, can make things happen in this province, and what you're doing is a disaster.

MR. GREEN: Who are they?

MR. SPIVAK: I'll tell you who they are. They are the people like the developer yesterday who came in and talked to the Premier and made an announcement - one developer. Mr. Chairman, if I wanted to and I brought a list of the pictures of all the developments that were announced a year ago but have not taken place, if I was to take to announce or to present the buildings and the construction jobs and the new permanent jobs that were supposed to be begun or taken place in the past year, I think many of the members on the opposite side would be shocked, because they have not occurred. They have not occurred, Mr. Chairman, and they are not going to occur in a situation

MR. SCHREYER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, because if the Honourable Member for River Heights is to be allowed to get into the matter of construction in downtown Winnipeg and economic development generally, then I would like the privilege of being able to reply, because I would like to be able to point out to the honourable member that we have had indications of 70 million dollar investments in the mining industry, of investments in downtown construction in residential and hotel accommodation, and also to be able to tell him

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) that there have been plans in Toronto cancelled out in the past 12-month period because of general economic conditions. Now if he's going to be allowed, under the rules, to get into economic development matters, I would like to be assured that I will have the privilege to reply under this bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that point was well taken, and I would ask the Member for River Heights to attempt to concentrate on this section of the Bill. I know he can bring in other examples and I know that this can lead us to other debates, but I would ask him to attempt to curtail his remarks rather than expand them. The Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: On the same point of order, I have sat quietly for this last few days and I'm certainly disappointed, as you are, in the behaviour of the House. Nevertheless, I think the precedence has been created by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. He has from time to time defied your pleading and the Speaker's pleading to stay within the rules of the House, and Sir, if you're going to allow that sort of thing to go on, certainly the honourable members on this side of the House should have the same privilege. I noticed only a few moments ago

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. BILTON: Order, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Would both gentlemen sit down. Order. Would both gentlemen please sit down. If the Honourable House Leader has a point of privilege I would like to hear it.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Swan River has charged me with defying the admonitions of the Chair. I suggest that that is a point of privilege and that the Member should retract it.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, if that has grieved the Honourable Minister I withdraw it, but shall I say that he has ignored the Chair?

MR. GREEN: I demand that that remark be withdrawn. Well, if he doesn't withdraw it, Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of privilege and I say that I have not ignored the Chairman and I would ask the honourable member to withdraw the remark.

MR. BILTON: I will certainly be very pleased to withdraw the statement but I would hope by my comments that the Minister of Industry and Commerce would mend his ways in the debates of the House.

MR. GREEN: On the point of order, I can tell the honourable member that I spoke twice yesterday; once I spoke on the debate; once I spoke in answer to what the Member for St. Boniface said on a point of the Bill, which if he was in order then I was in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would just like to say, before we continue, that the Chairman cannot alone restrain the members of the House. I think that it is incumbent on all members of the House that when another member is speaking and is out of order that this should be drawn to the attention of the Chair. I think this helps the Chair maintain order in the House. I don't think that I can, as an individual, control all the debate in this House; I think that assistance is required. And I would also say, again, that on this particular section that many of the people who are involved in debate have made the same speech several times and are now repeating themselves or are going into other areas. I really feel that the debate should be strict and to the point, and secondly, should be brief. There's no need for 40-minute speeches that have been made before at this time.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . simply to suggest to you, Sir, that if that is your position, then far be it from me to add much more except to say this, that like the Member for Swan River, I really believe that it is important that members on both sides accept the advice of the Chair with respect to procedural order, and difficult as it may be to contain myself with respect to this question of general economic development that has been drawn in, I feel that I must, under the rules, refrain from getting into the question of general economic development although the Member for River Heights apparently feels that he's somehow different and doesn't have to abide by the rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I would just say again that I hope that members will consider the other people in the House and will not subject them to repeated comments, repeated illustrations and repeated deviations from the questions and clauses before us. I think that they owe that to the rest of us.

August 11, 1970

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, general economic conditions and the effect that this will have on it, is a factor of 6(1), and it's not my intention to deal with . . .

MR. SCHREYER: On the point of order, if this is going to be allowed under the rules, then I feel that there is no alternative but to allow response on the specific question of general economic conditions and I'd very much like to be able to say something about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, perhaps the Member for River Heights is not going to go into that at great length. He just seemed to . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, there are certain side effects to Bill 56 and in the context of what has happened so far, I think general economic conditions and any attempt to explain why one is objecting to 6(1) can be made. Mr. Chairman, let me suggest to you that government action doesn't necessarily meet with the approval of everyone. We accept that. And it doesn't follow because the government is involved in any industrial activity that that in itself will directly affect or have its direct effect on the growth or the development of economic life in the province.

But Mr. Chairman, I suggest that with respect to this particular situation and the government's adamant position not to compete but to go to a monopoly plan and its position as it stands today, having, and in my belief not presented its case adequately, not attempted to in fact deal effectively with the industry, not having attempted to in any way other than ram the bill through -- (Interjection) -- Yes, ram the bill through . . .

MR. MACKLING: . . . other than distort facts.

MR. SPIVAK: I'm not distorting any facts. If you ram the bill through, whether it's a matter of a week or two weeks or three weeks, you still ram the bill through. Mr. Chairman

. . . . Continued on next page

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could speak on the point of order.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: ... and also make an appeal to the members of this House. It seems to me that we have certain procedures to follow. We discussed the question of principle on second reading. We've had 57 different speeches. Then after that we go in committee, and if the committee report is not accepted, we vote against it because we don't like the principle, now we will have third reading, we will have a motion that the bill be reported, that we can vote in the positive or negative.

Now, I certainly don't feel that anybody should be prevented from speaking but I think it is out of order, and certainly there's nothing to gain by it anyway if we are going to, on every single clause -- we started on clause 6 (1)(a). We talked about the monopolistic plan; now we are back on 6(1) and then we'll be back on 6, and every single issue we see, well, what happens? We bring the topic of compensation and everything. Well, compensation, yes, because of your monopolistic plan, and everything; so on every single issue it's wide open - and I don't think it is in order. I think that we have to stay with the motion. If somebody wants to protest, to form a protest and say all right, right from the start, and that has been done by both parties, "We are against the monopolistic plan," and they can do so again when the bill be or be not reported. But surely -- if this is a filibuster, well let's know, and if not, there is nothing to gain especially when it is speeches that are repeated and repeated all over again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would think -- I don't wish those remarks to be exclusively directed to the Member for River Heights. I think that this applies, I agree, I think this applies to all members. If there are other opportunities available, and there have been opportunities available for members to speak in the widest possible sense, and they are still before us on the Bill being reported and on third reading, and I think we are now dealing with a specific section and I think members should attempt to restrain themselves and deal with specifics, and deal in a more narrow sense rather than a broader sense. So I then, having said that, generally appeal to the Member for River Heights to attempt to be more specific rather than broad.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I've been interrupted by several points of order that have not been points of order. I have no objection to the others making their comments on the various sections. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, as I did in the beginning, that this is one of the more important sections. I suggest that the government hasn't made its case. I suggest that this has a very side effect in terms of economic life, and I'd be happy to hear the Minister of Finance, who I think is in a position now to stand up and say that, in his opinion, entry into a government monopoly plan and the manner in which it has been handled and our position to date, will not have any effect on the ability of the province to be able to finance its capital debt over the next couple of years, on the ability of the province to be able to finance its highway development -- (interjection) -- Yes. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm suggesting that what happened before is not my concern. It's what's going to happen in the future that is my concern, and I'm suggesting as well, Mr. Chairman, that the government having now come to the point, the almost final point where the plan will be introduced, and having not proved its case to the people of this province - and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that they have not proved their case to the people of the province and that's one reason why they're not going to go to the people of this province - having said that, Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister of Finance to say with enthusiasm that there's no problem, as far as he can see, in terms of the financing of this province for its capital indebtedness and its capital requirements at least for the next few years, and I want the First Minister to stand up and say that in his opinion there won't be any question that the economic life of this province is going to grow and progress, because, Mr. Chairman, I have some knowledge of business activity and I know that business activity of this province is dependent on the banks, on the mortgage institutions, on the life insurance companies and on the credit institutions who provide

MR. CHERNIACK: Do you want me to answer now?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, you can answer when I finish -- who provide the credit arrangements for the private entrepreneurs to do the things that have to be done in this province, and I must say, Mr. Chairman, that there cannot be but a question that in the course of what has taken place so far, and the inability of the First Minister and the government to present a case, that there has to be serious question as to what your intentions are and there has to be serious question as to whether this is simply motivated by ideology and that's all, and that's why economic development and the side effects -- (Interjection) -- No, mine is not ideology. Mine is

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) naturally . . . Mr. Chairman, 20 percent last year, maybe at least 10 percent this year. My question is dollars and cents and not ideology, and there's a big difference. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, there is a big difference. An even rate, a flat rate, now a rating schedule that will be the same as the insurance companies before, very little compensation before, no compensation, very little compensation, major compensation. I say, Mr. Chairman, that there has to be some questions of what the government is really intending. Why does it have to be introduced next year? One year would have made a difference for them to have sat down and have worked out something better. No.

MR. SCHREYER: You'd take five years, I suppose.

MR. SPIVAK: Well why not, Mr. Chairman, why not regulate and see if you could make these savings and then go in? Mr. Chairman, as I've said before, the question of ideology has to come into it and if anyone suggests that there will not be economic side effects to this -- and this is why I have indicated in terms of Manitoba this is a particular highlight because of what it will mean in this decade and what it means in terms of our ability to be able to handle our situation. So the insurance agents were going to have to make adjustments and there may be a few people who are going to lose their jobs, and there may be others who are going to leave this province as a result of it. We've had evidence presented here by different people and so the others can still feel on the opposite side that we have done the right thing, but what have we done? Let us begin and let us begin what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, when the honourable member stood up to speak, I took a leaf out of his book and I left my seat because that seems to be his practice, but he continued for such length of time I felt that it was my responsibility to return to my seat and now he's asked me a direct question. My inclination, Mr. Chairman, was not to rise to debate and not participate in the debate, especially with the Honourable Member for River Heights, because I must confess that I have lost a certain amount of respect for the honourable member's participation in the debate and I just felt that I did not want to get involved and I'll stay away as much as I can.

Mr. Chairman, we are now dealing again with the same issues that we've been dealing with all along on many occasions, in many parts of the debate. It's unfortunate, of course, that the Honourable Member for River Heights did not participate in Public Utilities Committee to the extent that he might have.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, this is the second occasion on which the Minister has indicated this -- is that a fact? I want the Minister of Finance to look at the record and he'll find of the 22 Meetings that were held I was present at 17, and that there are other members -- Mr. Chairman, let the Honourable Minister of Finance look at the record and I might suggest there were members who attended less.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it so happens that whenever the member was present he participated in debate, but I think that there are long lapses of occasions when he did not speak, which was a pretty good indication that he was not in the room.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, clause 397, says that each clause is a distinct question and must be separately discussed. When a clause has been agreed to, it is irregular to discuss it again on the consideration of another clause. Mr. Chairman, how often are we going to be discussing, again and again, the matters which have come before us?

But there was this specific thing that the Member for River Heights directed at me. I must say he asked me a question and I want to deal with that, and I remember when he sat back here somewhere in the second row and attacked the opposition for raising such matters as would damage the credit of the Province of Manitoba, where he attacked us when we were on that side of the House for speaking about those matters which he felt, in his judgment, would hurt investment dollars from coming in, and he's shaking his head, but I have the privilege of making my statement of what he did and I don't ask him to agree. I have found very often that when we make statements in this House he is so busy not listening to them, planning his next statement, that he doesn't really -- of course it's easier for him because he has one or two speeches which come to his mind quickly.

I don't want to deal with his style and technique -- that's a matter for him to deal with and for his colleagues to deal with; but I am concerned about the way he is relating what we are attempting to do here to the credit of this province, and in relation to the credit of this province I've had occasion to report in the past that one of my very first duties that the Deputy Minister

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) of Finance told me I had to do was to take a little trip and meet the assessment people of Manitoba and of Canada and of the United States, and during the last year I have also had occasion to visit members of the investment community in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that in just about every one of the speeches I made and I must have made - let's not exaggerate - six, seven, in addition to discussions, the program and policy of this government was discussed, the attitude of this government to private business was discussed, and the very question of auto insurance was raised and was discussed. And when I indicated that it was our desire to rationalize the industry, to reduce the cost to Manitobans, to improve delivery of service to Manitobans and we felt that this was the way to do it, I can say that there was no adverse reaction, and I say that because I was asked to. I'm not asking the Honourable Member for River Heights to believe me because he can't believe me when he doesn't hear me. He was listening at the moment but when I was saying what I did, he was talking to the Honourable Member for Lakeside with whom he probably had a more interesting conversation to him than what I have to say, but I am answering, not for his benefit, but for the benefit of those who are interested in listening to me.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder if you indicated to the financiers that your intention was to take over the industry. Is it rationalizing? It's one thing to rationalize and another thing to take it over.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, is it not obvious that what I say has, that it falls on - is it barren ground? And the Honourable Member for Lakeside, who always succeeds somehow in making me somewhat intemperate because of the speeches he makes from his seat, and of course I must admit that when he stands up it gets worse, that I would be better again to ignore his bad manners . . .

MR. ENNS: Nothing you say is obvious.

MR. CHERNIACK: I should ignore his bad manners to you, Mr. Chairman, and to other members of the House --(Interjection) -- and what he has to say and he's saying it up to the press - I suppose he wants them to hear it. Would he like me to soften my voice a little so that he could be louder?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would just hope, I would just hope, Mr. Chairman, that when the Member for River Heights is next on his feet and is challenged for veering away from the subject at hand and the issue before this committee at this time, that you'll recollect, Sir, some of the remarks just now and just recently made by the Minister of Finance and others, which I suggest, have strayed far wider from the topic than anything the Member for River Heights said or did.

MR. MACKLING: On that point of order, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order from the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. When an honourable member is speaking and is being interrupted by ejaculations from across the floor -- (Interjection) -- Just a moment. I have the floor -- he's entitled to make comments and to point out the difficulty he has in making presentation of his remarks on the subject matter because of those interruptions, and that is exactly what the Minister of Finance is doing, and the honourable member's point of order is groundless.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, I want you to know, Sir, that any comments made about the manner of my speech and the kind of speeches that I make are very apropos to the subject matter before us.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I feel I want to apologize to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry because I do think that he is one of those that does, in the main, follow the chair, follow the rules of this House. I said in the main because he doesn't always, and I think he has a respect for the parliamentary tradition, and if he feels I have offended, then I apologize to him. I cannot apologize to those members who interject from their seats and distract me into answering them and I think it's only a natural thing that I should do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think if apologies are made, I don't think it should be made just to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It's difficult to hear. I would ask the Member for Rhineland to repeat his point because I was unable to hear it.

MR. FROESE: My point is this, that if apologies are made I don't think they should be made just to certain members. I know of other members who are abiding by the rules.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree, but if I apologize . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . that we do not name them now one at a time.

MR. CHERNIACK: I admit I would have to go through a long list of people, but I would also have to leave out certain ones and it would not be of any advantage.

Let me get back to the question which I was asked and which I was trying to answer, and I hope that I did not deviate from what I was doing other than to react to statements made from the seats by certain members. I'll try to ignore them as best I can.

I was talking about the fact that the question of the Throne Speech, of our platform, of the New Democratic Party, of our thoughts and objectives for Manitobans, was discussed on several occasions, on a number of occasions with members of the investment community of this continent and in part in Europe, and it was indicated that our program was such that we thought would bring back to Manitobans a greater control over their own destiny, a greater participation in the economics of the province: Mr. Chairman, I met people who didn't agree with what we are doing, but who at the same time said that what you are doing, although we don't agree in principle as free enterprisers, we see that what you are doing is not harmful to those who are willing to lend money to such a province, and although they may have felt not as representative of the job they had to do, which was to sell bonds, sell debentures, to raise capital for the Province of Manitoba, not in that relation, but in relation to their own thinking, and each individual has certain reactions, to whether or not we were doing the right thing and I speak again to the laissez-faire people - that although they didn't agree with some of our program, they did agree that what we are doing was not harmful to the credit of Manitoba and I might say to some extent - well, I say in certain numbers they agreed that what we were doing could be even more beneficial for the credit of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I am not getting into a field which I think the Honourable Member for River Heights should have stayed away from, and that is investment dollars coming in, free enterprise dollars coming in to invest in enterprise and free enterprise. I'm staying away from that although I'm prepared to discuss it at the proper time. I'm dealing only with the question which he asked about the investment community.

Mr. Chairman, we have been successful, really successful, in the issues in Canada, in the issue, the \$50 million issue in the United States, in the negotiations for the \$12 million in Brussels, at competitive rates and received graciously by all and with a quick sale - and not too quick as to indicate that we might be overpaying, it wasn't caught up immediately which is a sign, often a sign that we've oversold ourselves, but it certainly didn't take long to make the sales. And then the greatest example is the confidence of the people of Manitoba when we went out on a savings bond issue when I reported to this House, and I did it with some degree of anxiety, that we were advised by - we met with some 40, all of the representative local investment dealers - we were told, well, you should get 25 million and others thought you should get 50 million and the consensus was you'll be all right because you'll get at least 25 million, but some said well, don't aim at more than 30 or 35 million, and when I reported to the House I was awfully careful to say that we wanted a rollover of some 11 or 12 million and we hoped that we would, with the rollover, succeed in convincing Manitobans to invest in Manitoba for between 20 -- (Interjection) -- I know I'm not dealing with the Honourable Member for River Heights, but I'm telling the House which must be interested -- that I announced that we were going for between 25 and 50 million based on advice received.

Mr. Chairman, we broke all records and we succeeded in selling \$55 million in bonds before we could stop, because we felt that there was a limit to what we needed and a limit to what we would ask for. And the response was that we stopped at, I think it was about 37 million; we had to give 48 hours notice. By the time the 48 hours notice was up we had sold some 55 million and there are still some in excess of \$7 million outstanding in previous bonds. That to me was the confidence of the people of Manitoba; and Mr. Chairman, our program on auto insurance, in principle, was well known, was well known for many many years; was made better known during our campaign; was made even better known when we brought in the Throne Speech, and then this bill has been before us a long long time, Mr. Chairman, and the people of Manitoba - again I'm not talking about whether or not they support auto insurance, I'm saying that the credit of the Province of Manitoba is as good as it ever was, and I believe it will be better.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the debate of this section of the Bill, 6 (1) and will try to confine my remarks as best I can to that section which I oppose. It may be that I could have spoke at 6(2)(b) but I think I'll try and confine my remarks to this section of the bill, Mr. Chairman. Because, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't sleep

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) last night thinking about what this government was doing to the agents of this province, and I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, at 4:00 o'clock this morning I got out of bed and I finally decided I'd better write down my thoughts. I couldn't find any stationery in the room so you'll notice that my remarks are on a laundry bag. They're rather lengthy, but I as a last effort appeal to this government for some common sense with the insurance agents of this province; and I wonder, Mr. Chairman, how many others in this city or in rural Manitoba, people like myself, agents and their families didn't sleep last night? No doubt there are many. No doubt there are many who today don't know whether they're up or down, this way or that way or what this government is going to do for us or where they're going to leave us. I submit in 6(2)(b) it says there they will do as it deems necessary, and I submit that that will not be very much, Mr. Speaker. And no doubt. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the honourable member if he's dealing with 6(1), not to refer to another section of the bill.

MR. McKENZIE: I will try my best, Mr. Chairman, to keep my remarks to 6(1), The Object and Powers of the Corporation. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, are there no socialists or doctrinaire leftist in this province who care about their fellow man, who care about their friends, who care about their neighbors, who care about these so-called agent parasites that they call us in this province. I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Highways is going to call these new agents "parasites"

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. These parasites called us a lot worse names in committee; they called us communists and nazis and I didn't see you clowns get up and protest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think it would be unwise for the member to speculate on what the Minister of Transportation might say in the future.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I humbly submit that there are some of those political animals who in fact have any common sense or have any sympathy for the agents of this province because they've espoused at great length and labelled us all the names under the sun. But I surely hope that there would be a Liberal Democrat or an Independent member of this House who would have the courage and the initiative to stand up and say that there are not those kind of people in the agencies of insurance business of this province.

And why - why is this hard core feeling built up in this bill, Mr. Speaker? Why are all these remarks being related to the agents of this province? It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, the reason is because these hard core socialist and leftists people around this province, they're all talking the same language and they're all branded with the same color. They're all saying that I'm not doing my job, that I've been grabbing from the people that I represent. They say that the insurance industries of the province are putting money in my pocket as I stand up here to defend them in this province today. You go any place in this province, you'll find all the socialists have the same line of chatter, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, they've all been brainwashed; and they've even got the Honourable Member for St. Boniface brainwashed and the Independent Member for Churchill is brainwashed as well.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I don't think that anybody can brainwash me, not even the member I'm speaking to right now. I'll make my own decisions.

MR. McKENZIE: Then Mr. Chairman, I ask the Member for St. Boniface to stand up and let's fight this Bill 56 together, the way it should be fought, and not let this agency

MR. DESJARDINS: Is the Member suggesting that if I vote his way I'm no longer brainwashed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the Member for Roblin whether his remarks are in fact related to 6(1) or whether he could better these comments at the time when the bill is being reported or on third reading. They sound to me very general in nature and I wonder whether he is dealing with the section before us.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I'll try and confine my remarks to the section, but it's a broad covering section of the bill, the objects and powers that's covered under 6(1).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I agree, but there is also the question of repetition of speeches and so on which must be borne in mind.

MR. McKENZIE: But I'm appealing to you, Mr. Chairman, that surely - surely somebody over there, somebody amongst this group of terrorists who are scaring the daylights out of the agents of his province, that surely somebody will come to his senses and have a second thought about this bill. Many people that I've talked to, Mr. Chairman, have even said in fact

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) that this is similar to when the Russians moved into Czechoslovakia. And remember what they done to Dubcek. They just drummed him out with words and phrases and clauses that was labelled against this man, until finally the atmosphere was such that he could no longer live in his own country; and that's basically what's going on in this province with the agents. This is the treatment they've had and the words that are being espoused around about what we are and what we've done, and I appeal to the members on the government bench to take another look at the agents of this province and the services they have provided over the years.

How much is my insurance business worth today, Mr. Chairman? Peanuts, absolute peanuts. I ask the First Minister to stand up, tell me, what is my agency in the little village where I work worth? It's worth peanuts. How much compensation will I get? Nothing. Not a cent. I ask the First Minister, stand up and tell me - or the Minister of Municipal Affairs - how much am I going to get for my business? Stand up and tell me, because I'd sure like to know. And if you can tell me, you can tell the Member for Souris-Lansdowne who is also an agent. What's his business worth today? What compensation are we going to get, and how can any man in his right mind, an agent of this province stand up and support this bill when you don't know where you stand or where you're going or what you're going to get. I submit it's wrong, Mr. Chairman, for us to be supporting a section of the bill that'll do that thing to the agents of this province.

I ask the Member for St. Boniface, will there ever be an insurance agent in my town again?

MR. DESJARDINS: I'll tell you something; if you don't quit speaking, you won't be an insurance agent, you won't have time. You won't have to worry.

MR. McKENZIE: I know, I know I'll be drummed out. I know I'm going to be drummed out. I know the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, he's going to be drummed out, for the simple reason we don't believe in the same political philosophy as those people over there. We're going to be drummed out. There'll be a padlock put on the agency in my town. They'll put a padlock on the agency in Nesbitt. There'll be padlocks all over this province, and I submit, Mr. Chairman . . . salted red jacket beer cases, compliments of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, Mr. Chairman, I humbly submit to the Honourable Member for Crescentwood that I'm not a beer drinker and if he'd be kind enough to take them back I'd be most grateful, because I have no use for them.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, an offer had been made and it's been accepted, I think is a contract.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, I speak through you and I ask this government with the support of the Liberal Democrat and this Independent from Churchill, what's going to happen to the villages of this town who have insurance agents today? The padlock will be put on the door and there'll be no more agencies. There'll be no more agency in Nesbitt; there'll be no more agency in the village that I live; there'll be no agency in hundreds of towns of this province who today those people are being served by a local agent who has done a darn good job; who's got a friend in every corner, and this government standing up here supporting this type of legislation that'll just drum us right out the back door. Maybe leave this province, a lot of them no doubt. What's a man like our Mr. Harbun going to do. I've never heard what's going to happen to that man. Why doesn't the Minister stand up and say "we're going to compensate him in full." He's going to have to appear before a bar like me and the Member for Souris-Lansdowne and plead for his life. Is that fair? Is that the compensation that we agents of this province deserve? I say not, Mr. Chairman. I say it's wrong, and I say it's a farce. This whole Bill 56 is a farce -- (Interjection) --

MR. MACKLING: . . . on a point of order. I think, Mr. Chairman, you've indicated that you would appreciate the House giving you guidance from time to time about drawing attention to the fact where members are dealing with subject matter which as no relevance to the particular clause - now I can hear some static across the way - but there are amendments and there are sections of the bill which specifically deal with subject matter that the honourable member is now discussing, and obviously his remarks can be better made and more thoroughly understood and appreciated when all members are dealing with those amendments or those clauses. I'm sure we all want to hear what he has to say but they should be made in context of the subject matter of a clause dealing with that particular matter and not in general context.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken. Much of what the honourable member has just said could be dealt with under the section dealing with dislocation or compensation and

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.) I might appeal to him to bear that in mind. But again all members must attempt to be specific and to deal with the clauses of the bill and that of course is subject to interpretation.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could I speak to that point of order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: The section, Section 6 which we're concerned with is titled "Objects and Powers" and I submit that there is nothing more germane to the undertaking of a government where the people in the society under its jurisdiction are concerned than the definition of the object of the government where that legislation is concerned and the parameters of its powers. This is what the Member for Roblin is talking about. I think that the debate so far has under your fair and objective chairmanship ranged pretty widely from the subject but this is hardly the time to draw strictures against one member that were not imposed against others; and the Member for Roblin is talking about what will happen under the objects and powers granted this corporation should it come into being.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. I rose only when the honourable member was dealing at some length with the question of compensation not with the general application of the corporation; and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry can appreciate that I remained silent for much of the honourable member's address because I thought it possibly could be germane and not offending; but surely when it's clearly offending, honourable members, and I welcome his participation as well, should assist the Chairman, to draw to his attention when the honourable members are straying too far afield.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would point out to all members that general speeches, or speeches that we've already heard I'm sure can and will be made again on the section on regulations, on the very next section on "Additional Powers". You know, it is easy to make a lengthy and general speech and it is difficult for me to restrain members, but I again say that they should attempt to speak specifically and precisely. Full blown speeches and forty minute general speeches have been made. There are other opportunities to make general speeches and I would think that they should restrain themselves from so doing. Section 6. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I, in all good faith, am trying to find out what's going to happen to my business, and is that not a fair question under that section of the bill? Or what's going to happen to the agency in the village where I live? Is that not a fair question, Mr. Chairman? I think it is. What's going to happen to the agency in Nesbitt and the other towns of this province? I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, the people of this province deserve an answer before we proceed with this bill and pass this section "Objects and Powers", because I humbly submit that what we're doing here is granting this government the license to steal. They're being granted all the powers of - I can't believe the powers that have been granted under this bill - and granting them to a radical . . . social group . . .

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. McKENZIE: I would when I'm finished.

MR. GREEN: Oh, fine.

MR. McKENZIE: But to grant these powers to a government that in many quarters is considered radical and some place doctrinaire, led by that smooth talking syrupy First Minister who's been trying to tell the people of this province that he wouldn't do all these things that he's doing, then I ask under the Objects and Powers section of this Bill, what's going on, what's going on? What's going to happen to the agents of this province? What's going to happen to me? What's going to happen to the Member for Souris-Lansdowne? What's going to happen to those agencies and what kind of service are the people in those communities going to get? Simple ordinary questions; and I submit that they do deserve an answer, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. The honourable member missed out one other honourable member.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, will not the House allow the honourable gentleman to finish his speech without any further interruptions. I believe this should be done. He's making an endeavour to make a point in his own way and I don't think he should be ridiculed or interfered with.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I humbly submit that many of the villages and small towns of this province are being padlocked; not only by this government; they're also getting the same treatment from this - what do they call him - this Postmaster General, who is also supposed to be another genius in handling government affairs, and you know how he's handling

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd.) the Post Office of this province today. Well there's two examples in a little village like where I live happening all at the same time. If you want to put the kiss of death on this community just let go on what's going on now. We can pack it up and get out. What's happened to Wawanesa? Simple. They're going to have to pack it up. They can't all live there now. And that's why I'm asking, what's going to happen to my village or the Village of Nesbitt or the agencies that we - can I sell my business? Absolutely no. It would be economic nonsense for me to even to suggest that it was for sale today. There I stand, pleading for the agents of this province: What's going to happen to us? And how long do we have to wait, how long do we have to wait for the Member for St. Boniface to make up his mind? What are they going to get? And I guess it all hinges on him. He'll decide what they're going to get; and if he knows I would humbly submit, Mr. Chairman, that he should let the agents know now before we proceed any farther with this bill. What compensation are we going to get or are we going to have to stand and plead to that board, plead for our livelihood, plead for the things that we stood for all our lives, the things that we worked for all our life, and there we are pleading for it - I submit in this year 1970 Manitoba insurance agents do not deserve that kind of treatment, not the record that they have put into this province, the taxes they've paid, the community services they've given to this province, the best years of their life they've given to this province, and now they stand pleading before this government, pleading before this socialist Minister, this First Minister, for their lives.

Not in 1970 I hope, Mr. Chairman. It's not fair. It's wrong, and I appeal to those members over there to take another look. Don't do it. Don't do it to the agents of this province. I say sit down with those so-called parasites; sit down and talk to us, sit down and talk to us; we're reasonable guys, we're not that bad, even though as I say you call us parasites. You say we steal from our policyholders; we're walking around with insurance money in our pockets; we've broke all the rules in the book and in the insurance business. I say, try us out for size and sit down and have a talk with us. Talk with the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne and I. He's not a bad guy. He's not a bad guy. We're not going to sell you down the province, but I say that this government owes us at least a chance to sit down and talk about the future of insurance in this great Province of Manitoba. I think any man in his right mind today in an insurance business is sick. He was like me last night. He didn't sleep. He didn't sleep.

MR. USKIW: That was your conscience bothering you.

MR. MCKENZIE: Yeah, it was my conscience. It sure was. If you had a conscience and you were in the position that I'm in, I bet you wouldn't sleep either, wondering what's going to happen to you; wondering what's going to happen to the things that you provided for yourself. The government walks in, takes it over, makes us stand up and plead, plead, absolutely plead, under an amendment that wasn't going to be in the bill at all, but now we have an amendment so the agents of this great province can stand up and plead for their lives. I say, Mr. Chairman, that this government is being granted a license to shoot us into oblivion, shoot us into oblivion. Certainly they are; and the work that we've done over the years, the way we've pioneered this industry, she's going right straight down that socialist drain as fast as they can push us down. No way, we gotta go. We gotta go - why? Because of a socialist doctrinaire bunch of people who say we're no good. Have said it for years, years and years. This has been on the NDP policy platform for 25 years and I ask you now, show me one other jurisdiction in the whole wide world who's got government monopoly automobile insurance that's working satisfactorily - nowhere, but Saskatchewan. That's the only example they've got - Saskatchewan. I was born in Saskatchewan. I've great faith in that province; but that's how we're selling the agencies of this province down the drain, comparing to Saskatchewan. Like comparing apples to oranges.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, let's sit down and talk before you do this ruthless thing to these agents of this province. Let's take another look at it, let's take another look at it without doctrinaire philosophy mixed up in the works. I think, Mr. Chairman, as an agent over the years I gave my clients the best possible service that they could ask for. They've done business with me and they're continuing to do business with me today and they have been satisfied. I'm not known as a parasite at home but when I get in these socialist communities, boom, right away they start to label me "that parasite agent walking around with that 1500 dollar bill that he got from the insurance people to help him battle this Bill 56." I say I provided the people of my area with the cheapest insurance in the world and I challenge anybody over there to stand up and say that that's not true. The Prairie Mutual provides for the rural people of this province the cheapest insurance you can buy any place in the world and I defy anybody to stand up

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd.) and say that's not true. They can't do it, because it is true, it's a fact.

Can I stand up here as a rural member in my right senses, Mr. Chairman, and support this bill and tell my people back out there, you're going to get some changes out there, but I don't know what they're going to be, I don't know what they're going to be, but I don't think they're going to be good, because how can it be any better than it is today. Rural Manitoba today enjoys the cheapest insurance rates in this world. What more do we want? Leave us alone. Leave us alone. We're happy, because we've done a good thing. The agents in the country have done a good thing for their people. They've provided them with the cheapest insurance in the world.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, give the agents of this province the tools, the proper regulations added to our existing Insurance Act of Canada and of Manitoba and we'll do the job. No compensation will be required. No sleepless nights. No heart attacks. No charges of bribery or mismanagement or discrimination. Let's drop Bill 56. Let's study the problem for one more year and let's bring the agents into the discussion and let's bring the industry in. I think all Manitoba will be most grateful for our efforts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm not participating in the debate of Bill 56 and I hadn't intended to until I listened to the laughable humanitarian that just spoke. You would think he was the conscience of Manitoba - he's the only one that was concerned about agents or he was concerned about the people of Manitoba. He dwelt at length about compensation and how cruel and heartless and unfeeling we were in the way we're going to treat the agents.

I'd just like to bring up a couple of things that happened in the previous administration to show that they can't possibly be serious when they say they're so concerned. And I'll mention the first one as Highway 59 relocation. I have a letter on file showing where a half a million dollar business has lost 60 percent because of the relocation of Highway 59. All the businesses along there signed a petition, and they're worth several million dollars. They spent a lifetime building those businesses up, garages, barber shop, hotel and various other shops. That government not only expropriated their property but by-passed them so today they're getting half of their income. That same government, or the opposition who was the government at the time had not provided five cents worth of compensation. As a matter of fact, had never met with them, never discussed it, until this day, even though they're in the opposition they have never met with this committee that has been formed and has gone to Ottawa and talked to the Board of Transport Commissioners to delay the closing of Highway 59. Not a penny of compensation was provided, no concern has been shown or is shown at the moment.

The loggers at The Pas when the CFI agreement was signed, they had to give them timber rights, they did give them the timber rights, all the way up, as a matter of fact north of Thompson. There was many loggers were displaced. Some of these loggers were second generation loggers that have spent a lifetime building up their businesses and their logging operations. Today they have no logs to cut because they're all given to CFI; and CFI wouldn't even buy the logs from the small stands of timber that were left from their old permits. They wouldn't buy that from them. There wasn't one penny of compensation paid by that government who made that deal; and not only that these Canadian, these Manitoba loggers when they did cut the logs they paid the government, the taxpayers of Manitoba, \$2.00 per cord. You took those logs away, that timber away from those loggers, gave it to CFI at 37 1/2 cents a cord. That's the great humanitarian Conservative Party when they were in office. This is the way they treated the people, this is the way they compensated them.

And the last item I'd like to bring up is the Beltway. They have frozen the land, \$11 million worth of land in the Beltway. They have said to these people we're not buying your land because we haven't decided where we're going, so this land is frozen. You can't sell it, you can't develop it, you can't build, you can't do anything, but you must pay taxes. We're not buying it. We just froze it. That situation has existed, Mr. Chairman, for three years. That government that's so concerned about people - and these are businessmen, these aren't working people. I can understand you not giving a damn about working people. You never did. But these are businessmen. These are the guys that built the city. You have frozen their land, you've forced them to pay taxes and you tell them, you sit there buddy until I decide when to build the Beltway, whether it's five or ten or fifteen years from now; but that land is frozen, you can't do a thing about it. That's the great humanitarian phonies that are criticizing us for

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) the way we're treating the agents, which I think is very generous.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: On a point of privilege. On a point of privilege. The Honourable Minister has made a statement that I don't give a damn about the working man and I'll put myself up to him and my record with his any damn time he wants. Secondly, I'm no phoney about it. He has just said I'm a phoney and I don't care about the working man.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, members in this House have said that we don't give a damn about a lot of things, and it's a . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I didn't call you a phoney.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would hope again that since certain points were made by the Member for Roblin and certain points were answered by the Minister of Transportation that we're now not going to do a separate debate on the past records of both administrations.

I would remind members that we're dealing with Bill 56. I would remind members that we're dealing with Section 6 (1) and I think that we should attempt to stick to the topic and not get off on tangents, and not since one side has spoken and the other answered, therefore this should go on another 10 or 12 times. I think that we should attempt to be limited in our comments rather than ranging into other issues and old debates.

The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the dilemma that some of us continually put you in, but I would ask you to also appreciate the dilemma that government spokesmen put past administration members in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no solution to this, once it starts to escalate, other than attempt to - I mean no side will be satisfied until they have had their say and this goes on forever and I would attempt to restrain members from not getting too far away from this bill.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Transportation has again made a general blanket of charges against the past administration and I would beg to your ruling whether he would permit me to make a two or three minute statement on a point of privilege, if that can be made on a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not going to restrain the member if he feels that it's essential that he has to answer certain points made by the Minister, but I would ask him not to stray too far afield and not to speak at length.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly will accept your will and your dictate. The question, and I'll try to relate it to the bill.

The response that came from the Minister of Transportation came as a result of some question as to who was being ruthless with respect to compensation and confiscation of property and so forth. He raises the question of highway matters, Highway 59. I would ask, I would ask, simply ask if he can document one case, one case where persons owning private property in the development that had to be expropriated for one reason or other by the former administration, or this administration, that was not, that was not amply - amply compensated for the loss of that property. -- (Interjection) -- Not loss to that property. He speaks about, he speaks about land being frozen. Well, Mr. Chairman, what we're really talking about is hopefully bringing some planned - and the word planned shouldn't bother members opposite surely - some planned development into certain areas of our province -- and I would have to ask him what's he doing about it, or what's his government doing about it? Is the Minister of Municipal Affairs prepared to lift the blanket off all the kind of land that is being frozen for particular use in the Metropolitan area? Is the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources prepared to lift today or tomorrow because the Minister of Transportation made the statement, all frozen assets of any Crown lands that he holds under his jurisdiction in this Province? Certainly not. Certainly not. He will, I'm sure, as developments dictate release certain lands as sound plans are brought forward for development, will release these lands just as the past administration did. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't - and I do want to abide by your admonition that we shouldn't continue this thing but to merely point out, to try to indicate a degree of ruthlessness and who's being more ruthless in this particular case - there may be other cases, there may have been more other valid cases that the Minister of Transportation could have picked on, but certainly not in the examples that he chose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to thank the Member for Lakeside for taking the advice of the Chair and setting a good example to the other members. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I can also sympathize with your position with the debate that goes back and forth in this House over this issue, and I, too, want to concur with your remarks and also the fact that the statements made by the Minister of Transportation that you granted my colleague from Lakeside to make the comments he did, because I think this is very important. It certainly doesn't leave, whether it be the other side or this side, in very good taste, insofar as the facts are concerned to have the proper perspective related to the people of Manitoba.

I do want to say a few words in regards to Section 6(1), that is, the Objects and the Powers. I think that in this section it is probably one of the most important parts of this whole bill, because when we're talking about the powers of any corporation, whether it be private or whether it be a public corporation, that is a corporation controlled by the government.

I speak for a few moments, not as an insurance agent, not as one who has any vested interest in insurance companies in any way, shape or form, but one who is a customer; who has been served by two insurance companies in my part of the community, and I think served well. And if I recall the comments made by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources the last time he rose to speak, I believe he was referring back to my colleague the Member for Souris-Killarney in that the member from Souris-Killarney was concerned about the Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company, and he says why be concerned, if I interpreted his comments properly, because we're going to have a monopolistic Crown corporation that's probably going to take its place. -- (Interjection) -- I believe - yes - I understood him correctly, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GREEN: . . . be concerned.

MR. EINARSON: Yes. So we did not have to be concerned.

There's another point that comes to my mind that has never been mentioned by anyone here in this House in this whole debate, and that is, Mr. Chairman, I'm a customer of automobile insurance with that company and with another company as well, but you know, Mr. Chairman, I also have fire insurance, and I relate this, if I may, with the powers that how it can have its effect in our future as we see it ahead of us. And assuming that the government's going to take over the automobile insurance business, which appears in all likelihood this is what's going to happen, and if the Wawanesa Mutual or the Portage Mutual should decide that what is left for them is of no good to them so they're going to leave the province, then I also have fire insurance and then what's going to happen to my fire insurance?

MR. GREEN: . . . hard, you won't have fire insurance.

MR. EINARSON: Where am I going to get my fire insurance?

MR. GREEN: I'll sell it to you.

MR. EINARSON: Ah - the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says, I'll sell it to you. So, Mr. Chairman, the question arises that has not arisen up to this point, and many people are asking me "who's next?" And I say to you, Mr. Chairman, to every member of the government side, they should give serious consideration of that fact. They should stop and think, go over their own conscience, because many people are wondering how far is this government going to go before they stop.

If I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, just for a moment to digress in another matter, and people's memories sometimes become short lived, and I relate this fact to what happened in Saskatchewan . . .

MR. CHERNLACK: There should be permission to digress. Surely we're - we've talked about not digressing and then the honourable member wants permission to digress.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go on.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might point out to the honourable members, in answer to that point just being raised, that we've spent three hours on this section, and so far I've heard nothing that the honourable member said which I think is not in order, so I'd ask him to proceed. But I would ask all members to realize that we've spent an entire morning on this section.

MR. EINARSON: Fine, Mr. Chairman, I shall do it in this way then. People have been told in this country of ours of what happened to private business that were taken over by a Crown corporation. We've seen the results and we have yet to see one that has succeeded. We have yet to see one that's succeeded. I think that the members of this government are probably the same calibre and I venture to say that the powers that are going to be put into the hands of this government, and because of the debate that has gone on this side of the House

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.) . . . where we have asked, and I know in my own speech when I presented my case to the government, I gave some facts and I related I think fairly the farmers' position under the Saskatchewan Insurance Corporation, the farmers' position in Manitoba and the Minister of Municipal Affairs did not disagree with them - mind you, the one area he said that there was one rate in Saskatchewan but possibly we're going to have two rates and they did not indicate that in the first place, and I felt that I had a good case here and the people, and many of them in my constituency are concerned about the power of this section. . .

MR. PAWLEY: . . . on a point of privilege. It just is not correct to state that we did not indicate this in the first place. It was said in my introductory remarks arising out of the bill itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just for information, that is not a point of privilege, but the Minister could enter the debate if necessary and make that point.

MR. EINARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was not aware of it when this thing was first brought out, when it was decided the government . . .

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the Member for Rock Lake is intending to be a few minutes longer or if we should adjourn now. Suit yourself. If you're going to be short, I think the House would be willing to sit, but if you intend to speak more then the committee should rise.

Move the committee rise.

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

IN SESSION

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Cultural Affairs that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Tuesday afternoon.