

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 o'clock, Thursday, August 13, 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 Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I would like leave of the House - I want to make a correction and in doing so, a very short explanation. Do I . . . (Agreed).

STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: In the Minister's reply to some questions laid before him, the day before yesterday, he came back in the afternoon with the answers - The Minister of Agriculture. I think it's reported precisely as the Minister stated it, on Page 7 of the Free Press, Page 33 of the Tribune, and it's very misleading. I was phoned this morning at ten to six by a very irritated farmer, he was not my constituent, but he tried to get me last night and he was unaware that I was up here; he thought possibly I was out on the town I suppose, but which is no longer the case. But the question is, the last line, and without going through it all: "12 bushels per seeded acre of barley," and then it goes on to say: "He said the Wheat Board will investigate individual complaints where a farmer hasn't been able to deliver up to quota and if the complaint is legitimate the Board will let him deliver up to his quota limit on that last year's quota schedule."

Well this last paragraph apparently only refers to the four bushel in wheat and you may wonder where the 16 bushel of barley comes - there was a normal six bushel per seeded acre, then because of shortages of supply at the Lakehead they added a ten special bushel to Manitoba and Saskatchewan, but not to Alberta. This particular farmer has got this ten special out but he has not delivered the normal six; but in talking to the Wheat Board this morning he completely clears it, that in no way have they pledged to have cars to fill this extra quota and I think - I spoke to the Minister yesterday and I thought possibly he would make an announcement to keep us from being badgered by people who don't understand. It is very easy to interpret this and there's no fault to either the Tribune or the Free Press. I hope I've made the point clear that this 16 bushels in not correct. If there's space available they would get it out, but there's no special efforts made to fill that 16 bushels.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac Du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure - I have to take the honourable member's word that he's correct, although the answer which I gave to the House the other day was quoted verbatim from a document which my department provided for me after having consulted with the Canadian Wheat Board, so if there's an error - there probably is an error, Mr. Speaker, obviously - but I would undertake to check that error and make a correction.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, would you call third reading of Bill No. 56, please.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Third reading, Bill No. 56. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that Bill No. 56, the Automobile Insurance Act, be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, having arrived at this point in the consideration of Bill 56, as far as I'm concerned the majority of the debate that could take place probably has and I don't intend to extend the period of time at this stage, but I did want to just take a moment to re-emphasize or underline the fact that I believe that the bill was presented to the House in the first place without the proper proof of the fact that it's the right action, and without any real consideration of what the economic impact on the economic

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) climate of Manitoba would be as a whole. So, Mr. Speaker, without going into any further debate, I want to make a motion which is intended to emphasize the fact that I believe, and we believe, that this matter has still been premature.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for River Heights, that Bill 56 be not now read a third time, but be further considered in three months' time.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Before the vote is taken, I, too, do not intend to go through the whole debate that we've been through for some months now. I want to restate the position of our group which has been consistent from the very beginning on this subject. We are opposed to the bill as it is because we are opposed to a government monopoly in the auto insurance field. We have said from the outset that we supported government going into the auto insurance business, but on one basis only, and that was in competition with the free enterprise, or the private companies that were in the business previously. In our view this would have meant a minimum of disruption; it would have provided the competitive and control features on prices by having a government company; it would have meant that there would be no need for expensive and difficult compensation for agents; it would have, I think, have protected the interests of the motorists of Manitoba.

I'm happy to see that that position has been accepted apparently by the official opposition which as I understood their stand started on the basis of being opposed to any government entry into the field at all. So our position remains the same, Mr. Speaker, as it did at the beginning of this debate and nothing that has been said on the government side convinces me that this could not be done. The Royal Commission in British Columbia is most explicit on the subject, studies it at great length - I am not going again to quote from it, I already have in past debate - I note that the government says whenever we quote from the Wootton Commission the sections that we quote they say is judgment; the sections they quote they say is fact. Mr. Speaker, the facts are that the Wootton Commission studied the cost features carefully and after an economic study - not a political study, an economic study - concludes that there are no significant economies of scale and that it is not a natural monopoly; so in my view the decision of this government to proceed on a monopoly when a major royal commission, after lengthy study says that there is no need for a monopoly, is an indication that the government is proceeding not on the basis of fact but on the basis of political ideology.

I must say that the speech by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources earlier this week shocked me. I think it was unfortunate that the First Minister was not in his seat when the speech was made. I would strongly commend to him the reading of the Hansard containing that speech, because the statements were to me alarming. The statements made by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources were to me a clear indication that this is just the beginning. I know my friends will raise their hands and say, oh you're trying to scare people. Mr. Speaker, all they need to do is read that speech, and if they believe in freedom of enterprise, the rights of the individual, then they're going to get a shock on reading that. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the government will not be able to stand the conflict that is obvious within its own ranks. The bill apparently is going to pass now. That has been decided apparently by enough members in the House to pass the bill. I don't think the government will long survive the internal conflict which is evident there.

I would hope that the First Minister will read carefully the comments of his Minister and assess carefully the direction in which the province is going to go. My concern is Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? -- (Interjection) -- Oh, that could well be. Conflict is a normal state of life, I recognize that, but I would strongly recommend to the First Minister that he read that speech carefully, and knows the stand of his colleague -- (Interjection) -- He's heard it before? Well, then maybe my honourable friend the First Minister isn't the reasonable individual that I had thought he was and which a number of people in the province think he is. Maybe my honourable friend does subscribe to the views of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. If that's the case, I shall wait to hear.

But, Mr. Speaker, I remain convinced, I remain convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the course advocated by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is not the good course for Manitoba and I intend to fight it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to prolong this debate. It's been one of the most lengthy debates, of course, probably in the history of this Legislature. I do know of the concern and the problems that some members have had in this Legislature with respect to this particular legislation; I would like to, for the record, refer to - because the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose just completed speaking - the Toronto Daily Star which is a newspaper which is well known across Canada for its liberal views and has to my knowledge generally supported the Liberal Party, wrote an editorial on August 6th in that paper in which they have dealt at great length in respect to the Manitoba Automobile Insurance program that is being proposed in the Manitoba Legislature and I would commend it. I don't want to use up the time of the members of this House in reading that editorial this morning, but I would commend it to all members of the House as excellent reading from a very fine Liberal newspaper in Toronto, the Toronto Daily Star.

I would -- (Interjection) -- well the last paragraph, no, because we'll get into the question of a general election. The Toronto Star predicts that a general election on the question of automobile insurance would sound well for this government, but they have referred to the system that we have enunciated and are proceeding with in Manitoba as a humane one and one that makes good sense. I want to read one paragraph because it relates to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. "The private insurance industry, of course, doesn't see things that way" and this is in reference to the public plan. "It argued that the government should compete with it if rates are too high, rather than implement a compulsory plan, but that misses the whole point of a public system - the cost reductions you get by ending the duplication of services. The private industry makes a more valid objection, though. Many insurance agents would be badly hurt by the government take-over and the NDP's original compensation offer for them was inadequate." Then the article goes on to make reference to the proposals that were enunciated by the First Minister about 10 days ago and finally reasons their approach, further on in the editorial. "It was a careful and humane approach to the problem of transition from one system to another. The insurance industry, however, will continue to oppose the plan because if Manitoba adopts it, the writing may be well on the wall for private systems in other provinces. But will the Opposition MLA's continue to block implementation? If they do an election will be forced."

Yesterday's newspaper, there was another very interesting commentary. This is an issue that seems to evolve day by day with developments in other parts; certainly we can learn by the experience of other people and other jurisdictions. An article in yesterday's Tribune in respect to the very sad experience in the State of Massachusetts, in which they've been attempting to - the legislators in that fine state also concerned about the problems of compensation for the injured on the highway, have proceeded with new and drastic changes in their automobile insurance legislation there, and I supposed if we think we have problems in Manitoba in automobile insurance in our Legislature, we should look to the situation in Massachusetts, because according to yesterday's paper, because of opposition by the insurance companies to the reform legislation in the State of Massachusetts, three companies, three of the largest companies in the state, have announced that they will discontinue writing in that state in their criticism and opposition to the legislation being passed there.

So I think all that I would like to say is that this is a piece of legislation, and I know that a large number of members in this House have grave reservations, but I want to say this: I feel very firmly that this legislation will go down in the history of this province as one of the most social, most humane pieces of legislation that was ever passed in this House; and I do feel that those that have participated in this debate and have supported this legislation, will in the years that lie ahead, be proud that they have participated in the passing of this legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if I could ask a question of the last speaker, if the member is going to speak? I'd like to ask a question of the last speaker. He quoted from the Toronto Star editorial, Mr. Speaker. Would he consider that the Toronto Star editorialists are better informed on auto insurance than the gentlemen on the B.C. Royal Commission who have studied the subject and who state on Page 286: "Unless it can be shown that there are strong indications of substantial economies of scale in the insurance industry, it must be judged against the standard of workable competition. There is evidence that some such economies exist, but it is clear that they are quite limited and do not warrant treating the industry as what the economists term 'a natural monopoly.'" Does my honourable friend believe that the Toronto Star editorialists are better equipped and more knowledgeable to make a judgment on this subject than the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) B.C. Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, in my few remarks I would just like to speak certainly the truth and right a possible wrong. Through my own admissions and in other contributions, I seem to leave the thinking that I must be the poorest driver in Manitoba, and that's not the case and I'd like to prove it; that I do own a truck; I refuse to put any kind of collision insurance on it. I'm in my third truck and I've never made a particular scratch on it but since I last spoke I mentioned that I was going out to harvest, which I did. Through that process my truck caught fire - it's a little too detailed but we've talked of fire and water around here and there certainly was. Within a week my truck was back on the field ready to go. This is private insurance; this is good. We hear the people, especially the Minister, of great huge corporations, money-gouging and yet at the same breath we read where Saskatchewan admits there's no money to be made in this program, so I'm assuming the government now is going to gouge; They say about the huge corporations - well, Wawanesa and Portage are only owned by the policyholders and I've never really felt where government participation in an economical measure. I said it before. Some of these remarks are repeating and I still feel that same way.

We have heard a lot of the level of our Legislature is certainly lower, lower than I ever hoped I would ever see and I hope in the future, Mr. Speaker, your ruling will upgrade this low ebb that we may have been at the other day. We hear things thrown at our party, that we have a leader that somebody's knifing, etc. Well, our name is Progressive, we are Conservative and as long as history shows the group of Conservatives, they're always after the Leader's job, that's what progress is all about and I think that I would not belong to the party if that was not the case. My Leader is my Leader and I respect him.

I do appreciate the amendment that's come in by the two members that are given credit but also all the Opposition and the understanding of the First Minister because these amendments are to the good of all; they're not as good as we would liked to have seen them but in this case we have to accept them. I'm sure as I went through my constituency, I said I would not stir up trouble for this program, I simply was asked. I said, what do you want? Do you want auto insurance or do you want an election? Certainly insurance they flew up and "no, no no." but do you want an election? And they're almost as sure that this was not the case though that has changed in the last month, I really feel. If an election had been called, I would feel on solid ground than ever I have felt before on this particular issue.

We hear, and I appreciate something for a change moving out of Winnipeg and I think this is encouragement for rural Manitoba. It didn't go as far rural as I would liked to have seen and I would just bring you up-to-date of a situation that the First Minister certainly knows, the situation at Rivers. We have beautiful homes, immaculately kept, many of them. We have schools and would it not have been a good idea for the First Minister - I wish he was in his seat - but in any case the Minister to think of Rivers when considering your head office because there you could get that for a dollar undoubtedly. When the final - while the note is not there but it's very discouraging of the continuation of the operation at the Rivers Airport. We have a school, we have an up-to-date fire hall; we've just everything to accommodate a small group of people, near highways, railroads, main lines, everything that would need to work in conjunction, as well as in Brandon, and I'm not trying to slight the Honourable Member from Brandon or the City of Brandon. I'm just saying what I believe to be true. We are spending the taxpayers' dollars and we should be looking for every saving in that regard.

And referring to changes and amendments, I do remember being here, many have referred to that fateful Cabinet Pension Plan and I do not hide the fact, I walked out of my party over that issue. I went home and I never did come back -- (Interjection) -- on the Cabinet Pension - and as the Honourable Member from Swan River knew well, I kept him posted by phone as to what I thought on it. That was withdrawn and I think it was a credit to the party in power at that hour to withdraw it, and I think it's just as much a credit to the First Minister when he's brought in these amendments. They're not enough. I can't buy it because I'm here not to support necessarily a party but to support the feeling, the thinking of my constituency, and for that reason it's why I've been fairly quiet but certainly opposed to this auto insurance plan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RUSSELL DOERN(Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I have not participated in this debate before and I would like to say a few words because I think that the many members of the

(MR. DOERN, cont'd.) Legislature who spoke on the Bill on second reading and those who view the Bill on third reading, have seen a certain number of improvements and changes which I think have strengthened the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who sat through the auto insurance public hearings that we conducted in the Public Utilities Committee went through an experience that they will never forget. All of us, I think, are a little wiser as a result of those hearings and all of us, I think, are considerably older as a result of the length of those hearings and the manner and the tone in which they were presented. I, for one, resent very much the manner and the style of presentation of many of those briefs which were masterminded by a group of advisers who, I think, encouraged people to come out, encouraged them to speak at length and in effect suggested the kind of presentation to make, and there was great similarity in many of those briefs.

But, Mr. Speaker, underlying the slander and underneath the heat and beyond the heat, the case, I think, was made for compensation or for dislocation allowances in the event of the Bill proceeding, and I think the government has clearly accepted the principle of fair and equitable compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this has shown that this government, under the guidance of the First Minister, has grown considerably and that the experience of carrying this Bill into this Chamber and presenting it before the public has had a salutary effect on members of this government, because I think that there are hang-ups in both parties. I think that the problem of the Opposition parties is that they too often fail to understand or appreciate the problems of the average person and, in many cases, the problem of the worker, and I think that in criticism - (Interjection) -- Perhaps you should hear me out. I think that the problem of this party, the hang-up of this party, too often has been that there are members in it who do not fully understand and do not fully appreciate the problems of the businessman, so I say that each of us has something to learn and each of us has something to correct.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the First Minister has clearly led his party and this Legislature and this province to show that when people are hurt by the actions of private industry or government or individuals or groups, that there is a responsibility that this should be corrected so that when people are thrown out of work by private corporations, that some action should be taken to protect those people and to assist them. Similarly, when through the actions of government people are hurt financially and socially and in other ways that the government has a responsibility to ensure that dislocations or transitions should be eased.

So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of the actions of the people who were affected by this legislation and in spite of their method of attacking, or if you like, counter-attacking, that the government did not, in effect, take a more rigid position as a result of this, which they could have. They could have become bitter; they could have, I think, dug in and they could've rammed through the original legislation, but the government did not adopt that approach but rather, I think, improved and strengthened its legislation so that it was fair to the people who were most affected by it, namely the agents and the employees of insurance companies. But I also think that the legislation is fair to the people who ultimately must live under that plan and ultimately must pay the bills, not only of their own individual policies, but in terms of any payments out of the Fund established by the Public Automobile Insurance Corporation. In other words, the compensation must be fair as well to the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, just another moment or two. Some of the insurance agents believe that this issue should be thrown before the public in a general election. I have never taken that position personally. I think that they may have believed that their problems were paramount to the province and that therefore the entire legislative process should grind to a halt and that the public should be brought in, and should make a decision on that issue. I think that there are many problems faced by this government and faced by this province and this is only one of them. I think there are many other priorities that must be dealt with and that this government will undertake to tackle in the next session and beyond.

And finally I would say that although there has been a great deal of heat in this Chamber, I don't think that the members of the Legislature should be faulted for that because in a sense we are really people who are in effect the representatives of viewson the outside and as a result, the ultimate positions are put in this Chamber and the clash takes place here. This is the democratic process and I think that people too rarely understand it. So in short, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Bill before us is a better Bill because of the democratic process and the parliamentary tradition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I haven't spoken on this Bill since the early part of the second reading. I've done a lot of listening and I feel that we've now arrived at the moment of truth. It's been a long road, it's been hot and tempers have flared, but all of this is now behind us and we are faced with making a major decision which will reach into the lives of all Manitobans for years to come; and while I was not a member of the Public Utilities Committee, I considered the importance of Bill 56 to be such that I made it my business to attend the committee meetings and in this way personally to inform myself on the subject.

It was not always easy for me to come to these meetings although I am gaining strength daily, but there are times when one must see and hear for themselves to believe. It was my hope, and my sincere hope, that after that impassioned performance by the Minister of Labour -- and he really was in labour on Thursday morning last, I thought it was his swan song -- it was my hope that sanity would return to this Assembly. Oh, he put on a dandy performance, the Minister of Labour. In fact he should be recommended for an Oscar award and it was reported by the news media that he had tears in his eyes. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that they were crocodile tears for he blew the whole thing with his tirade -- that venomous speech on Thursday night.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I say that the honourable member is imputing dishonesty to the Minister of Labour. I would suggest that he withdraw those remarks.

MR. CLAYDON: Mr. Speaker, I sat through this whole session and I've heard similar remarks coming from the government benches and I don't feel -- this is my opinion -- you may not like it. I sat and listened to you when I didn't like it and I'm asking you to extend to me the same courtesy. You listen to me for awhile.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I believe some reference to a talk that I made the other day. I don't mind him saying what he is now saying; I understand the situation of my honourable friend.

MR. CLAYDON: As an elected member of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I don't come here to be shouted at, screamed at or pointed at by what appeared to me to be a person going out of his mind. Thursday night was certainly not a good night for Manitoba in this Legislature. It was reminiscent to me of an infamous wartime figure who plunged the world into a catastrophic war. I remember those days, I remember them clearly and it was reminiscent to me of that time. The events of this last few days have written a dark chapter into the history of parliamentary procedure. They are dark days for Manitoba and on these occasions I would prefer to be well removed from the scene. Certainly nobody gains by such a display.

Now it's not my purpose at this time to thresh old straw, Mr. Speaker, for all has been said that can be said, but I want to lay before you some observations which to me warrant comment and our concern. As a result of listening to all of these presentations, what did I find? I found individuals coming before committee revealing personal facts in the presence of a public gallery. Such humility! Why? I found people begging for survival. I found cities and towns begging for survival. I found people trying to hold together their family units; father and son relationships in jeopardy. Why? Pension plans in jeopardy. Why? I found men who had spent a lifetime building up a business valued at anywhere from 10,000 to 75,000 dollars facing the possibility of receiving the grand sum of \$85.00 per year for a maximum of 26 years or approximately \$2,000.00. What a deal after a lifetime of work!

I tried to find out what all this disruption would mean to the province and to the City of Winnipeg in particular. I have come to the conclusion that Manitoba is on trial, not Bill 56; the whole structure and fabric of our parliamentary and free enterprise system which over the years has been the foundation on which our prosperity has been built. Not only is it our duty, it is our obligation to ask why? I want to quote from Professor Bellan's address in the city in late 1969 -- and I should tell you that Professor Bellan is in the Department of Economics at the University of Manitoba and he was also the NDP nominee to the Winnipeg Police Commission a couple of years ago. I have great respect for this man and he's doing a wonderful job for the city on this Commission. But here's some of his quotations from his speech: "The private enterprise system is working better today than it has ever worked before. The material standard of living enjoyed by the people who live under this system is higher than ever before and continues to edge upwards." Then he goes on to say, "First of all, it is absolutely false that with government ownership of the means of production, the country's economy would necessarily be directed to serve the best interests of all the people." And he goes on further and says:

(MR. CLAYDON cont'd.) "The advocates of Socialism in Canada themselves mercilessly assail Canadian government for being stupid, inefficient, unfair and in the next breath, vociferously urging that the power of government be enormously enlarged; that this organization which they have just condemned as incompetent, mindless and soulless, be given total power over the national economy. They might do well to bear in mind the story of Stalin on his deathbed. He was informed that he would have to go to hell but could have his choice of a Socialist hell or a Capitalist hell. 'By all means let it be a Socialist hell,' he gasped. 'There's bound to be a fuel shortage.'" And he goes on at great length in this - "A system of free enterprise offers a sure safeguard for individual freedom, for genuine democracy, for the ultimate realization of the kind of society that everyone of us would, I am sure, regard as the ideal, a society in which every man stands squarely on his own two feet and is able to make his way effectively through life without having to depend on a variety of crutches provided to him by the community in which he lives."

I thought this was an excellent speech and I asked him for it and he sent it to me. I gave you these quotations for that reason.

And yet there is the apparent desire on the part of some individuals to destroy some of the good things which Manitoba enjoys. Why is it necessary to disrupt an important industry which has contributed so much to the family life and economic prosperity of Manitoba over the years? I ask, who will compensate municipalities for the loss of the tax dollar which will surely be an offshoot of Bill 56? In the City of Winnipeg an estimated direct loss in taxes will be somewhere near the \$1 million mark. It has been suggested to me it could go to a million and a half, but I'm being very conservative in my figures by offering \$1 million as the figure.

Where is this loss of revenue to come from? Will it come from the taxpayers in the form of realty taxes or will the government offer grants in lieu of these taxes? I conclude that there will be an increase also in unemployment. Why is it necessary to add to the employment situation at a time when employment is already a serious problem? To all of this I ask, Why?

So now we are asked to compromise all these things and yet the government refuses to tell us exactly what we will receive in exchange. What will automobile insurance cost me or my neighbour under the government monopolistic plan? How can we evaluate the value of Bill 56 when there is nothing to evaluate? How can I equate lost jobs with a mythical saving in Bill 56?

The government indicates a 10 to 20 percent saving. From what? I've got a government news release that says that the saving will be on the average of 20 percent. Where is the proof? When I was in committee, I tried not to interrupt the committee, but I attempted to table a photostatic copy of an actual insurance policy for which the premium was \$45.00. I was at that time prevented from doing so and I now wish to table it in the House. I do this with the expectation that Bill 56 will be rammed through regardless and later on we will be able to compare the savings which the government is promising.

Now if an agency closes down -- there's 54 companies in Winnipeg. I don't know exactly how many agencies there are but I believe there are 1,350 agencies in the province -- then the city will lose business tax, and as I asked before, will the government subsidize this loss of revenue to the city? The city will lose the sale of electricity - and I want to point out what the profits from the City Hydro mean to the City of Winnipeg: in 1969, \$1,795,000 was contributed by Hydro to offset taxation in the City of Winnipeg, and that represents a little over three mills at the present rate of assessment.

Who will offset these profits, or the loss of these profits and the taxes in the city of Winnipeg? For every dollar lost in wages, that loss becomes \$6.00 in turnover. The province will lose telephone revenue, they'll lose taxes on automobiles and gasoline taxes and licences on the vehicles and all of these losses, important as they are, are nothing compared to the personal losses which will be experienced by so many individuals living in Manitoba.

And at this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my extreme displeasure at having to hear a member of this House tell us that his family is receiving dirty phone calls and threatening phone calls. I would hope that politics in Manitoba has not been reduced to such a low level. I wish these yellow dogs that get on the telephone in that manner would come forward and reveal themselves so we could handle them. This is, as I said, Mr. Speaker, this is nothing more than the tactics of a yellow dog when he will phone up a Minister's family. They can phone up the Minister, they can curl his hair if they want to, but leave the families and children alone, leave them out of it. I was very distressed to hear this yesterday.

There are people, there's some 3,000 of them, they certainly have my sympathy, and that's the insurance agents. I wonder if many members of this House know what it is like to live under

(MR. CLAYDON cont'd.) the threat of insecurity? To have an axe held over your head? I do, because 20 years ago I was employed with the Engineering Department of Air Canada, when that department closed and moved to Montreal; I watched the employees in that department while they were awaiting their fate, indeed their doom. I will never forget the gloomy atmosphere as the supervisor of that department stepped off an aircraft on his return from Montreal. In his pocket he carried details of those persons who would be released and those who would be transferred. Each employee was called in turn to learn his fate. I was fortunate, I still had a job if I would transfer to Montreal. . Now this was a difficult decision to make as it meant breaking family ties and personal acquaintances. In the end I decided to remain in Manitoba. Yes, I know very well what it is like to live under a blanket of insecurity and I can assure you it is pure hell and it is hell for one's family. I sympathize with those people of Wawanessa, Portage la Prairie and other locales in Manitoba. My heart goes out to them for I know what they're going through, and I ask again, why is this necessary? And when you turn around and tell me that you're going to extend the date to June 30th, I ask, Why? If you have it in your mind to commit this act, then do it now; don't keep these people dangling on a string for another six months. If you've made up your mind to do it, why don't you come out and be honest with these agents and tell them you're going to do it, there's no fooling around about it; let them know now so that they can plan their actions than rather hand on with a thread of life.

The New Democrats along with the other parties fought to retain Air Canada and you will remember the argument at that time that was presented by the Federal Government was that there would be an economic saving. Now these same New Democrats are fighting to destroy an industry in this province for what they believe is a possible saving. Where is the consistency; and why are they giving pretended support to the Labour Movement of Canada? There was a charge made from the government side that we did nothing; what did we do when it came to Air Canada's move? Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Government of the day led innumerable delegations to Ottawa on the matter and as a matter of fact, although I was not a member of the government here, I was a Conservative and I always will remain a Conservative and I won't switch around, I went down to Ottawa at my own personal expense; so there were some of us who had a dedicated interest to this province.

Now in an effort to gain support -- and this is my opinion, you can disagree with it if you will, but this is my opinion -- in an effort to gain support from the Social Democrat, the Independent Member, the First Minister put forward certain amendments to Bill 56, which are nothing more than putting cheese in the trap. That's today. But what about tomorrow? No cheese, but the trap is still there or perhaps it has been sprung.

The First Minister is asking this House to pass the Bill and we will look at it later. That's like telling a man he's condemned to death and the trial will take place after the hanging. Well, Mr. Speaker, it will not be long before Christmas is upon us. Thinking forward to that day, I wondered what my Christmas message to my constituents should and would be if Bill 56 is passed. It didn't take long before I knew exactly what I would say. This, then, will be my message: "Merry Christmas. I'm sending this card to tell you that the New Democrats are taking away the things that I've really needed, my workshop, my reindeer, my sleigh. Now I'm making my rounds on a donkey; he's old and tired and slow, so you will know if I don't see you Christmas, I'm out on my ass in the snow."

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

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): I was waiting for a moment to see if the Member for St. Boniface was going to rise, in which case I was going to wait to get up till he did, but apparently the floor is mine at this point, Sir.

I want to say one or two things. I'll try to keep them brief. I think nearly everything has been said on Bill 56. Certainly the time, Sir, for statistical comparisons is past; the time for rate comparisons, the time for argument and debate about lost jobs and differentials has passed. Nearly everything has been said except what is implicit, what is said in the motion proposed by my Leader, and that is the appeal to the First Minister of this province and to this government and to this House, Sir, to withdraw Bill 56 at this time, to at least shelve it at this time, if not withdraw it, for substantial further examination and consideration in the interests of the unity of the people of Manitoba.

Much has been said about the economic impact of the Bill. My Leader referred to it in

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) the motion that he proposed, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that more important than the economic wounds and the economic impact are the social wounds and the social impact that the divisiveness of this debate and that the implications and the import of the Bill itself have contained for the people of the Province of Manitoba. The wounds on the body of this province will be a long time healing, Mr. Speaker, as a consequence of the passion and the acrimony and the bitterness that has accompanied the sincere positions put forward on both sides, by both sides in this debate. Those positions were sincerely held, they were deeply held, and they were oftentimes expressed in bitterness and in hostility that has had, I am sure, great impact for all of those people in Manitoba who have followed the debate and certainly for everyone in this Chamber and everyone who attended any of the hearings of the Public Utilities Committee.

The Honourable Members for St. Boniface and Churchill, Mr. Speaker, have said that one of the rationales for the positions that they have taken with respect to this legislation at this stage is that they believe, in the heat and passion generated by the debate, that this would be an extremely unfortunate time for Manitobans to go to the polls. This would be an extremely unfortunate circumstance and atmosphere in which to hold a general election in Manitoba. Well I think it can be said with equal fervor and with equal validity that this is a most unfortunate time and a most unfortunate atmosphere for legislation such as that contained in Bill 56 to be introduced into Manitoba society. Now, in the opinion of the Honourable Member for Churchill and the opinion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, is not the time to hold a general election in Manitoba. Well, now, Sir, in my opinion, is not the time for public monopoly automobile insurance to be introduced in Manitoba. The atmosphere, divisive and embittered as it is, is too supercharged with emotion to permit a reasonable and rational and an objective kind of acceptance and assessment of any such legislation, any such legislation, with so many ramifications for so many individual Manitobans, can only be harmful and further divisive at this time.

The First Minister of this province has talked at some length on numerous occasions in this debate and many others about the good of Manitoba and Manitobans, about what he hopes to do for Manitoba's good. Mr. Speaker, I say to him with all the sincerity I can muster, and all the humility that I can muster, that the greatest service that the First Minister could do for the people of Manitoba, could do for this province, which he wishes to serve, is to withdraw this contentious and divisive proposal at this time. Were he to do that, were he to initiate through his own boldness and his own courage, a cooling-off period, a hiatus, a re-examination period, were he to give the body social of Manitoba an opportunity for its wounds to heal, I submit, Sir, he would long be remembered in gratitude by his fellow-citizens in this province and he would be remembered much longer and in much greater depth of gratitude than he will be as a consequence of the legislation itself, for all the merits that he believes it to have.

So, in a sense, Mr. Speaker, at this juncture in the debate, I must say that I feel sorry for the First Minister because I think he's boxed into a position from which there is no avenue of escape short of one that he feels would constitute a serious loss of face and at this time, surely with all the tortuous, soulful examinations that all of us have gone through in this Chamber and all who appeared before the Public Utilities hearings went through, surely we're past the point of worrying unduly about the preservation of face. The important thing is the preservations of the unity and the fraternity of Manitoba's society. But I think that the First Minister feels himself to be in a position where he cannot withdraw the Bill because the hawks in his Cabinet won't permit him to do it; I think that he finds himself, along with those in his caucus who share his particular views as to the wisdom of this legislation at this present time and as to the feeling and mood of Manitoba electors at the present time, I think he feels that he dare not go to the people on this issue because the present government would lose a general election in Manitoba if one were held at the present time and in the context of this issue.

Certainly that estimate is open to question and debate from my friends on the other side of the House, but I say, Sir, and I'm not the only person on this side of the House, and I dare say I'm not the only person on any side of the House - and I'm certainly far from being the only person within reach and earshot of these halls and these walls - I say Sir, that if the government of the First Minister of this province were to go to the people in a general election at this time it would lose and I believe that the First Minister believes that. I believe that he knows that and I believe that some of his closer colleagues in terms of philosophy and ideology in his administration share that view with him, and so far, that particular element has been able to

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) survive and resist the approaches and the strenuous efforts made by other elements of the government caucus to put the question to a test and to go to the polls. I don't think enough emphasis in fact, Mr. Speaker, has been put on this particular aspect of this issue in this debate.

My honourable colleague, the Member for Lakeside said last night, and I reiterate, that we in this party are not, we're not, and never have been pushing deliberately for an election, but we have been pushing deliberately to defeat Bill 56 because we believe that it will injure the social and economic fabric of Manitoba and if it means an election, we're ready for one. The opposite view does not prevail on the opposite side of the House. It does in certain quarters and I believe that in those quarters the membership of those particular quarters has been sincere and honest about its position. I believe, for example, that for one, that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has no fear about going to the people on this question, has been honest and open and candid about it and would be prepared to go; but I do not believe that that's the predominant feeling in the administration. I believe that the First Minister fears defeat on this question, and as a consequence, the one thing that should have been done, Mr. Speaker, is not being done. The people of Manitoba are not being given an opportunity to express directly their opinion on this contentious and divisive issue. The only fair, the only honest, the only equitable and the only sound procedure in the circumstances in which we in this House and the province in general have found themselves, at the end of this long and acrimonious battle, is the position that would find the government putting the question to the people of Manitoba for an answer. In effect, it would constitute a request from the people for a vote of confidence in the government.

I believe, as I said, that the Minister of Mines and Resources and certain others believe that they would get that vote of confidence. I don't happen to believe they would get it but that's really irrelevant. The important thing is that the First Minister obviously doesn't believe that they would get that vote of confidence; otherwise this is the procedure that would have been followed.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): That's your assumption.

MR. SHERMAN: That's my assumption. The Minister of Health and Welfare has stood in his place and offered us his assumptions in many debates in this session - I have the floor at the present time and I'm putting forward my assumptions. I don't suspect that I would get much argument on it from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and certain others in the administration, either.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the debate I think it's nothing less than a parody of what has gone on for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to say what he said a few minutes ago about this piece of legislation being a great humanitarian measure. Surely he cannot be serious after listening to the testimony to which all of us have been subjected in the past three or four months, surely he cannot be serious when he described it as a great humanitarian measure. If it's such a great humanitarian measure, why have we had the very gut of Manitoba ripped asunder on this question? Why have we had the agonizing and the self-torture and the humiliations and the confessions and the tears that we have had, if it's such a great humanitarian measure? The most humanitarian measure, as I said a moment ago, that this government could undertake, would be to withdraw the Bill or to accept the motion proposed by my Leader and to give all Manitobans a chance to come together again, and then to look at the question in reason and in light and in cool temper, not three months hence, in my view, but six or twelve months hence. But it is a parody of what's gone on, if not an insult to the feelings of many sincere people who participated in the Public Utilities Committee hearings for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to try to describe this contentious and, to many people, repugnant legislation as a great humanitarian measure. Surely, surely, Mr. Speaker, that brings this long and arduous and tortuous debate to a point where it winds up now, not with a bang but with a whimper.

At least the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has had the honesty to be frank and candid about his position on this legislation, about what he thinks it'll do, what he thinks in essence, it pragmatically and practically is and constitutes, and he's never made the mistake of trying to cover up his belief in the practical efficacy of the legislation by attempting to confuse the Opposition or anyone else into thinking that it's a great humanitarian measure. It's no such thing; it's a great practical measure as far as the Minister of Mines and Resources and some of his colleagues, the Minister of Transportation and others are concerned, and they've been

(MR. SHERMAN con t'd.) frank and candid and honest about it. And for anyone to stand up and say it's a great humanitarian measure, I say, parodies the whole debate.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone, I don't think anyone but a pragmatist or a doctrinaire socialist, could have sat through those Public Utilities Committee hearings and still remain favourable to public monopoly automobile insurance in Manitoba in 1970. Two classes of thinkers could have done so: a pragmatist or a doctrinaire believer, but -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? -- (Interjection) -- Or combination of the two, that's right -- but nobody else could have sat through those hearings and still believed that public monopoly automobile insurance in 1970 in Manitoba was a good thing.

It may have been a good thing in Saskatchewan; it may have been a good thing in 1946 in Manitoba; it may have been a good thing in Puerto Rico, and areas of Australia and elsewhere, where in certain social and economic situations it met the problems of the day, and as I've said, it may well, in another era in Manitoba, in the twenties or the thirties have been a practical and a good thing; but I submit, Sir, that in 1970 in Manitoba, no such argument can be advanced, no such argument is valid and nobody other than the type of thinker that I've mentioned and described a moment ago, could argue in the wake of those hearings, and in the wake of the agonies of those hearings, that in Manitoba circa 1970 that monopoly public auto insurance has anywhere near the validity, the legitimacy or the usefulness that it did have in the situation and in the circumstances and in the climate in the Province of Saskatchewan in which it was introduced approximately a quarter of a century ago.

Mr. Speaker, one other note before I sit down. That is one referring again to what the Minister of Municipal Affairs had to say a moment or two ago when he described an editorial in the Toronto Star and cited it as authority for proceeding with Bill 56. Mr. Speaker, the Minister described the Toronto Star as a very fine liberal newspaper, which I'm sure it is, but I wonder if his admiration for that newspaper extends to other articles that appear within it, to other stories that appear on news feature pages, such as this one, Mr. Speaker, from the Toronto Star of just a few months ago featuring pictures of the Honourable Minister of Transportation at his desk and outside the building and carrying the headline: "Foot in Mouth Trouble in Manitoba Cabinet". The story goes on at some length to describe the difficulties that this administration is having in holding itself together in reasonableness and unity. I found it to be an informative and interesting and rather colourful story, as I'm sure the Minister of Transportation has done, if he's seen it; if not, I'd be glad to give him a copy. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, certainly.

As my closing note, Mr. Speaker, I just pose that question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He apparently takes great pride and pleasure and satisfaction out of the editorial which he quoted from the Toronto Star and I agree with him, it's a very fine liberal newspaper; but I would hope that he would therefore be prepared to extend that kind of respect and admiration to the news and feature pages which carry articles such as the one to which I've just referred.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, it may be that some of the members of this Chamber want to hear what I have to say on Bill 56 and it may be that some of the members of the press want to hear what I have to say on 56; it may even be that some people in the gallery would like to hear. It is my opinion that 100 percent of the members of this Chamber would just as soon that I said nothing on it; I therefore shall say nothing on it, and take the opportunity to wish each and every one of you a happy and fruitful period between now and the next session.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): I don't think it will be very fruitful for myself or the people of Wawanesa. I hope you weren't referring to them, the people of Wawanesa when you mentioned that.

We have had about four months of debate on this subject matter. The people of the Province of Manitoba are well acquainted with the issues. The insurance agents and other interested people came in and gave their statements to the Public Utilities Committee, but this is a sad day for the Province of Manitoba; it's a sad day for the Village of Wawanesa; it's a sad day for the insurance agents of Manitoba and it's a sad day for all businessmen of Manitoba, and I mean every word of it. I hope the Minister of Industry and Commerce is concerned about this. How can he go to other parts of the North American continent and tell them what a

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) wonderful economy we have when one of the largest industries in the Province of Manitoba has been destroyed by him voting for this very bill, and other members, such as the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Is this the kind of economy that we want in our Province of Manitoba? Well, I should say not and the people will say not, if they had the chance. The Minister of Municipal Affairs smiles, he thinks this is the greatest thing on earth. Well, I want to tell you that you won't last long in public unless you realize what the people, what they built this province for and what they hoped they would have from the hundredth birthday on. -- (Interjection) --

We have celebrated our hundredth birthday and we don't need any remarks from you because you've been no asset to this House this session. I mean every word of it. Any man that talks in the language you talk should start to understand yourself and grow up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, now what are we doing here? Have we wasted all our time? Did the government want to listen to the people of Manitoba? I say no. Their philosophy was such that they couldn't listen; they're too deeply imbedded in this philosophy of socialism, and I don't even consider it socialism nowadays because I know Socialists, they're not radical as the bunch across the way. I think it's far greater than that. I would consider it one of the most tragic things that could be inflicted upon any society; because this is not the last thing that's going to happen in our province if you people stay in power and I'm sure of that right today. There are many other things that are going to take place.

What have you done to the business people and to all the individual citizens who are working for these businessmen? You are chasing a lot of them out of the province, and I mean it. You're chasing them out of the province. And why is the Province of Alberta and B. C. so good - as the Member for Rhineland? Simply because they encourage initiative; they want people to be imaginative; they want people to work extra hours in order to get ahead and they encourage this. And what are we doing here? We say, Well don't work longer; we want you to have the quality of life. Well, I want to tell you right now the people of Wawanesa are not going to have the quality of life, because I can tell you right what's going to happen to their town - and as long as I represent that town, if there's anything left, I will continue to talk about it. It's one of the most tragic things that ever happened to a community, which is known all over Canada, there's no town or city in this Dominion of Canada that - you always see a sign "Wawanesa". They don't know where Wawanesa is but we in the Province of Manitoba know where Wawanesa is. But will it be there, will it be there I wonder, one year from today? This is my concern; the lack for people who are trying to do something for themselves and you and the government here, come along with a Bill that's going to destroy everything they've worked for.

Now we've seen lots of tears in this House and I don't think in all my 13 years I've seen anybody cry in this House. And who should be crying? Who should be crying? I tell you who should be crying: the people who are getting hurt, not you people. You shouldn't be crying. We've heard four people crying lately in the last two weeks. What kind of performance is this for a government who are holding down the administration of this great province? If they feel so bad about it, is their conscience bothering them? Well, I should say. Go out in the hallway and cry but don't come in here with your tears.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the statements of the Honourable Ministers, and there's about four Ministers been trying to pilot this Bill through. There has been no evidence yet to support the claim that the Province of Manitoba should have a compulsory monopoly insurance, and I mean this. The very fact that the Ministers over there piloting the bill don't know anything about insurance, and I mean this, I mean it; you don't know anything about insurance, is a very good reason why you should have held off for about two years so you could have had a short course in insurance. You don't know what it means. You're talking about no-fault. You don't know what it means. You're talking about accident benefits; you don't know what it means. You're talking about every other thing and you don't know what's involved. You say you're going to stop litigation. I'll tell you what you're going to stop. Instead of your corporation paying litigation I know who's going to pay it - the individual policyholder.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the honourable member is aware that remarks during debate are to be directed to the Chair and not directly to any honourable member of the House.

MR. McKELLAR: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I get off the . . . , I'm really concerned and I mean it. If I overlook you, Mr. Speaker, it isn't -- because I know the rules of the rules of the House, nobody knows them better than I do -- but I'm really worked up about this. When

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) two free enterprisers in the Province of Manitoba stand up and vote for the government, destroy free enterprise, that's just about enough, and I mean it.

Now what's going to happen to the investments? You can clap all you want; you can clap all you want. I want to tell you what's going to happen to your regulations and I want to tell you right now because your lack of experience, you should have known you're never going to . . . to regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. May I refresh the honourable member's memory on the rule which I'd drawn to his attention less than a minute ago?

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, every speech that's been made has been referred to another member here and I mean that and when I'm speaking to them I'm speaking through you. I don't have to look in your eye every time I make a speech. Nobody else does so why should I start at this last day of the House in session.

Now what's going to happen in the Province of Manitoba? What's going to happen? The insurance companies have over \$50 million invested right today in the Province of Manitoba through provincial, municipal and other school boards. Do you expect these companies to keep this investment in the Province of Manitoba? I say no. Do you expect our three Manitoba companies, base companies to keep their head offices in Manitoba? I would say no. Why should they? They've been chased out, with the passing of this Bill, they've been chased right out of the Province of Manitoba. Now who's responsible for these companies, the Wawanesa and Portage? The policyholders are responsible. And who are the major portion of the policyholders in the Province of Manitoba for both companies? The farmers of the Province of Manitoba. And who's going to get hit by the passing of this policy? The farmers of the Province of Manitoba. Every farmer will pay more for his insurance and why should he? And why should he, with the conditions of the farming economy such as they are? And for the Minister of Agriculture, who is not in the House at the present time, to stand up and vote for this Bill to cause further expense to the farmers of Manitoba is an insult to them, and they realize it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've heard a lot about the Minister of Industry and Commerce so happy that the head office is going into Brandon - in the Bill it stated Winnipeg - but what about the agricultural complex which was announced by the Minister of Agriculture about four months ago? What about it? Where did it go? It was a natural for Brandon. A natural for Brandon. A million and a half dollar building, right in the heart of the agricultural area in the Province of Manitoba. And where did the government put it? They put it in the university, right in the Winnipeg metro area. If that wasn't an insult to the farmers of Manitoba, nothing was. So they're happy about it going to Brandon. And what's it going to do for Brandon? Seventy employees, a million dollars in salary. As I mentioned before, the salary of the Wawanesa Mutual was \$977,000 which you're wiping out in one breath and adding a million on in another. So what did you gain? What did you gain? Nothing.

What about the insurance agents who are not able to sell their agency? I asked the Member for Assiniboia this morning, if he could sell his agency and he said, No. You wonder why? Because there are no buyers. There's no buyers. Unless there's a buyer and seller you can't get a price. This is what's happening to all agents, and this is why they're so concerned. Many of them have large families, children going to university. How do you expect those people to carry on? This is one of the sad things about it. These people are going to be left for the next 11 months worrying about this, wondering what they are going to do.

I think we've witnessed in this session a philosophy, an ideology, by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and supported by the Member for Crescentwood, supported by the Member for Crescentwood, an ideology that they think that they must have power so that the people can be well looked after in the Province of Manitoba. The government must do everything for the people and the people will accept it. This is their freedom - complete takeover, complete takeover. This is what they've told us. And if anybody in the Province of Manitoba wasn't scared before the Member for Crescentwood and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources spoke, they should be scared; and I think it was the Member for Ste. Rose, that mentioned it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what else I can say, other than to say this, that some day, I don't know if it's this year or next year, the people will speak, the people will speak and they will let you know and I mean it. They'll let you know what they think of your plan. They will come out in large numbers; they will express themselves to an issue that's never been

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) actually an issue to compare with in this province by any government; no government has actually endorsed an issue of such magnitude. So what will happen? You divided the province like it's never been divided before, class against class, brother against brother, friend against friend, and I'm telling you it'll never be united for a long long while because once you've broke that ribbon, it can't be tied together. So what will happen? The province will suffer and suffer greatly, all because a few people in the Province of Manitoba thought that they knew what was best for the people of Manitoba. Let me tell you, your troubles are only starting if you pass this Bill; they're only starting. If you think insurance agents don't work hard, let every MLA in this Legislature be concerned right not because they are the insurance agents. If you think you're not getting enough phone calls right now, your phone will be ringing off the wall with claims, with trouble, with problems.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): . . . phones I suppose; you're admitting it . . . You just said that, our phones are going to be ringing.

MR. McKELLAR: That'll be the day, when I make a phone call. I don't have to. I've got a voice right here. I never made a phone call -- (Interjection) -- Yes, with problems, insurance problems. You think we don't get problems all day and night? Every day we get them; people in trouble, they want an interpretation, they want claims settled, they want different things answered, they want endorsements, they want everything. I never said anything about phone calls, so I won't ask you to retract it because it wouldn't mean a thing if I did. Simple fact of life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, nobody's been listening anyway, but there'll be another day to remind you, there's always another day, there's always another day in this place; never fails. You can't end all by closing off the session. There's a platform everywhere in the Province of Manitoba - I mean a platform - and it'll be used, I will tell everybody myself about the . . .

Now where do we go from here? We go home. Where do we go. And I do hope you people have a damn good sleep, and I don't like swearing, but I hope you have a good sleep. I hope your conscience doesn't bother you for 40 hours so you get rested up. Then I hope you start thinking, thinking about the people of Wawanesa, thinking about the people of Wawanesa, because I tell you, they'll be in to see you, and I know they'll be in to see you. I hope they get treated in a fair and courteous manner such as they've never been treated in the last three or four months when they asked for a request.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that's all I have to say. I'm just going to close and say I'm disappointed in the First Minister in this province because everybody thought he was a real quiet, nice socialist, but everybody knows now he's not, and that's the way I'm going to end.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question - on the amendment? The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'm not rising to speak. I wanted to ask a question. The question is with reference to the Advisory Committee that's being set up. In the explanation of its responsibilities it wasn't clear to me.

A MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member asking a question or speaking?

MR. CRAIK: Well, okay, I'm speaking then. Whichever way you like. I'm speaking but I'm not speaking. My speech is a question.

I presume it's to the First Minister since he announced it. Perhaps before the debate is closed he would answer it or the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It's with respect to the Advisory Body. Will the Advisory Body have within it the powers to make recommendation as to whether the government insurance scheme will be monopoly or competitive in addition to the other matters referred to it?

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): If it's in order, and I suppose it is in order now that the member has in effect made a short speech, in the course of which he asks a question, I can speak very briefly too, and in that way answer his question, and indicate to him, as I've indicated a number of times already, that there is the specific term of reference there which enables the Minister to refer the matter of the Annual Reports of the Superintendents of Insurance Office, and therein lies the basic data and figures with respect to the relative cost ratios relative to premiums, etc., and in that way can take under consideration the matter of the relative merits of the two approaches to automobile insurance.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I think people would be very interested in the fact

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) that I have undertaken to make a visit to Wawanesa and to explain my position to them as a free enterpriser. This has been done on a voluntary basis on my part and they have wholeheartedly accepted my offer; they say come, we will welcome you, we will wine and dine you, we would like to hear the other side of this story that has not been told to us and that has been coloured in fact, and they say, come and we will welcome you here. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the people of Wawanesa that I will be in fact in Wawanesa and I will reserve it not for a political debate but for my night in Wawanesa to give them my idea in respect to why I have supported Bill 56.

I still remain a free enterpriser and I think that I can give them the assurance that I am not a fanatic, nor am I one who will make up his mind before they've heard the whole story at any other issue that is ever brought in this House in the future.

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

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Chairman, would the member permit a question? Did I understand him to say that he had been out to Wawanesa? -- (Interjection) -- He's going. Would he permit another question, then. Is he going to go out before he votes finally on this or after . . . ?

MR. BEARD: Would the member wish to sit in this House until I took my trip out to Wawanesa for two or three days?

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, the member has asked me a question. I just want to tell him that I'm prepared to sit in this House just as long as it takes to kill Bill 56, if there's any way of killing it. If it takes till next Christmas.

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I think the motion before us is a valuable one and I think should be given consideration at this point in time. In my opinion the need for this government insurance corporation has not been brought forward to my satisfaction; in my opinion they have not made a case for it, in fact it's the other way round, I think the case is that it is not needed and that we have been and are being served by the industry as such to date. I don't want to dwell on that point at length but I state on that case alone Bill 56 should be rejected.

There are one or two other things that I think should be drawn to the attention of the House, especially in connection with the motion before us that third reading be delayed, because yesterday there were amendments brought forward by the government to set up an advisory board to advise the Minister on various matters and if this information came forward it could be considered at that time. There is another thing, the advisory board's report probably will never come in the open. We as members may never know what this board does recommend to the Minister because all the clauses in there state "to advise the Minister", not this government or not this House, but the Minister, and I rather presume that those recommendations may never see daylight in this House and that we can as a result consider those very recommendations that they might make.

This becomes part of the regulations under Section 29 (1) and we know that regulations as such never are being considered by the House as a whole, at least not the last couple of years; the regulations are being referred to Committee to be dealt with. Therefore, I also rather suspect that the regulations may not be available even at the next session, because we are now delaying the effective date until June 30th. This House will probably not even know what the regulations will contain just before the Bill goes into effect and that the Members of this House will not know what is in the regulations by the end of next Session, so that we may be unable to consider them even at that time. And how are we then to consider the regulations? I take it if they were prepared and tabled this would be a different matter. But even to bring them as a subject matter before the House, I think it only could be done by bringing in a bill to repeal Bill 56 at that time so that the whole bill and the regulations, if they were out at that time, could be considered. I think this is the only avenue open to us. And surely enough this would not be done by the government, they would never consider repealing their own legislation, so the bill would have to come from this side of the House in order to bring the matter before this House. So with all due respect to the amendments brought in by the government, I think it says very little to us on this side of the House as to what we will be able to say and what we will be able to do at the next session.

I rather had hoped that the two independent members - and I'm not saying this to annoy

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) them at all - had hoped that they would support private industry in this province. It never really occurred to me that they would not do so, but that is their choice; they have a right to vote on the issues as they feel is necessary and they feel it is for the good of the public and as they see it. I don't quarrel with that; they have this right, they have the right to make up their mind on the various legislation that comes before this House.

Then, too, the government certainly has determined its course by bringing forth legislation of this type at this session. We know where they stand and I think the people of Manitoba will know better where the New Democratic Party stands in connection with Crown corporations, in connection with socialistic measures that will be brought forward. I certainly feel sorry for the people of Manitoba today in that this bill will now become law. I have stated this before and I don't want to go into detail again because I don't think that it will rest with Bill 56.

Now honourable members have stated that they will support the government in this case because they do not want an election. I don't think the government would have called an election, not at all; because I'm informed that Len Stevens, one of the union members, an official, had discussions with members of the government side and that he very strongly advised them not to go into an election; not only advised, but almost to the point ordered them not to go into an election. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'd be happy to hear if this is not correct, if they can inform me otherwise later on I'd be very happy to hear -- (Interjection) -- This is the information I got and if it's not true I'd certainly like to hear from the government members and the front bench to state otherwise, because we've known since 1966 the type of members in the New Democratic Party. There's a decided change, that we have more union people in their particular party than we had prior to that. We used to have more the CCF, the co-operative people, but now it seems that we have more union people in that particular party, and I think as a result there has been a change, I certainly have noticed a change over the years sitting in this House. I think there is definitely more - well I wouldn't say - yes, sure you have more lawyers now, I think you have people there who have promoted the cause of unions and what they stand for, I'm sure that this is the case. -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm not saying that this shouldn't be done but I'm just pointing out the difference within your own party over the years and I think this is one of the reasons why we see the type of legislation coming forward. I don't think legislation of this type would have come forward probably 7 years ago or 8 years ago when I first entered the House. I certainly don't think that would have been the case.

Mr. Chairman, another reason why I feel that this motion that is before us should be accepted is that we wouldn't have to call an election, we could call a referendum in the meantime, have the people of Manitoba decide on this issue without calling an election and then we would know where they stand on this particular issue alone. We have heard of various surveys that have been held in some constituencies; I have not conducted any in my riding; I haven't conducted any one at all in the province, I only have heard of other surveys that have been taken, and to me they indicate, and they have told me so, that the people, first of all, don't want this insurance and also that they don't want an election. So if they don't want either, I think the only recourse is to have a referendum and let the people decide on it. The motion to delay the acceptance of the bill on Third Reading for the time being, I think would be ideal for that purpose - to have a referendum in the meantime and let the people decide on this matter alone.

So, Mr. Chairman, these were some of the points that I wanted to raise at this particular time. I know that members will now be able to vote on it once more and no doubt then the measure will go into the Statutes as the law of this province.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

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

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, G. Johnston (Portage la Prairie), F. Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Molgat, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas 27; Nays 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The same division?

MR. WEIR: The same division is satisfactory with us, Mr. Speaker, if it's satisfactory with everybody in the House.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . say, the same division in the obverse.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, that's not what I would claim the same division, so we'll have to be counted again, I'm afraid.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . in order that there be no mistakes, the division bell should be rung, if only for a few seconds.

MR. SPEAKER : Call in the members.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Molgat, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 29; Nays 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the adjourned debate on the motion of the Member for Ste. Rose standing in the name of the Member for Riel and then just follow the Order Paper.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTION FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member . . .

MR. GREEN: Page 1 of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: My apologies. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Riel. Orders for Return.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite the matters of the House at a stage when I think we're all prepared to not get into other business at this time, I would let this be my only comment and sit down.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: On this motion, Mr. Speaker, the same comments apply as to the last one.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. GREEN: . . . to complying with this address.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of speaking on it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. GREEN: . . . the usual reservations; no objections.

MR. SPIVAK: Fine, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of speaking on it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assinibola. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): . . . table the correspondence between the Manitoba Development Corporation and the companies named herein. I believe that correspondence pertaining to other various agencies and commissions may be rather irrelevant. I believe it's agreeable with the member who is requesting this particular information, and on that basis we're prepared to provide the information.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to accept this motion, subject to the same constraint, and that is that it relate to the Manitoba Development Corporation and the companies referred to.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, as this is the last of these motions on which I will have the opportunity to speak, I just want to make a point regarding the Return of the Addresses and the Orders that are outstanding, because there are a number of them that have been passed already, plus these that we are passing today, the replies have not come in. I would hope the government will expedite them as quickly as possible and forward them to the members. There were a number from the last year's session, that is the last summer session, which were not tabled by the time the session began this year and I would hope that would not be the case, that all will be supplied to us before we next meet in this House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . indicate whether they'll be accepting this; if they are, . . .

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe we commented on this some weeks ago. We are prepared to accept it. I did mention previously that in some cases the objective of the trips spelled out in detail could be harmful to negotiations that may be underway but I believe the honourable member understands this qualification.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate, second reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose . . .

MR. GREEN: No, no.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a motion in the name of the Honourable the Member for Kildonan. I'm sorry. I believe the Minister of Labour has that in hand.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood that the House resolve . . . No, no, this isn't the right one . . .

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Report of a Special Committee on the Rules, Orders, Forms of Proceeding.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that it was necessary for us to go through this procedure in order to dispose of this matter on the Order Paper and if, as I understand it - the Clerk can correct me - if no one wishes to pursue this further, a simple motion that the Committee rise and report, and then subsequent to that would be a motion to concur in the report from this Committee. This is necessary in the process of democracy, as I understand it. So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, if no one wishes to make any further comment on this, that a motion that the Committee rise and report would be in order. I would so move.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before that motion is put, would the government not consider delaying action on this matter until the report from the committee that has been established, when that report comes in, consider them together, because there might be some changes. I would prefer that we not deal with it at all, just report back no action so they can be dealt with in total then.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may say to my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, this is pretty well precisely what we're doing; we're just concurring in the report itself, that is in the receipt of the report and insofar as changes are concerned, I'm sure that there will be no changes until they're taken in conjunction with the subsequent report from the committee that will be meeting in between sessions. I believe this is the point of my honourable friend. I think that we can give him that assurance.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

So I would move, Mr. Chairman, the committee rise and report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, your committee has considered the Report of the Special Committee on the Rules, Orders, Forms of Proceedings and begs leave to report same.

IN SESSION

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that this House doth concur in the report of a Special Committee of the House appointed to give consideration to the Rules, Orders and Forms of proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba received by this House on April 1st, 1970.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate, on second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend at this time to debate at length all the arguments that were presented against Bill 114. I must say that I do not agree with most of them. I think that the reaction to the proposal by both honourable friends on my right, honourable friends on my left, is indicative of those who are opposed to reform. They say there are problems, there are problems. Well yes, if you're going to reform something it usually does create some problems. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I've known that a long time ago - my honourable friend says I don't have a corner on that market. I recognize that the bill would present some problems but I submit that there are problems in the present system. What I want to see is some improvements in the system. I still hold to the point of view that this Bill would, in fact, make the House itself a more meaningful part of government. One of the things that amuses me in the whole matter, Mr. Speaker, is that while there has been general opposition to my proposal here in this House, I can tell you that I have found no opposition whatever outside of the House. In fact, very much to the contrary. I have had a number of people phone me on the subject, a large number of people stop me to discuss it with me when I did not really think that there would be that much interest outside of the House because it dealt with really an internal matter.

I find in the general public a real desire to see more independence on the part of members of the Legislature. People saying we want our member to be able to speak freely. Stand up for the things that he believes in - not be so much under the domination of the party leader, the Premier, the Cabinet or the party itself - we want our members to be there as representatives of we, the constituents. This reaction is one, I think, is one that members of the House should pay attention to because our job is that of representation. It seems to me that we may have got ourselves too much involved in the structures here instead of really looking at the over-all picture.

So, Mr. Speaker, I regret that the attitude of the House has not been more favourable towards the Bill. I'm not going to oppose it going to committee because I'm hopeful that maybe at the committee stage we can change some minds. I would hope that those who spoke against it will go to the committee with a more open mind than they've indicated in the House, because unless that is so then the committee is merely a stall and a procedure of the House to ensure that no decision is made. I accept, as I say, it going into committee on the basis that that is not the attitude of the members of the committee - that they will give the proposition an open and unbiased consideration and see what improvements we can make in the operation of the House itself.

I was particularly surprised that the Premier took the reaction he did to the bill. I had thought that he was one of those who wanted to see reform in parliament - in fact, one of the reforms he talked about a year ago goes far beyond what I was proposing. He was suggesting at one time that we should look at the American system of having fixed dates for elections. This, under a British Parliamentary system would be a very difficult system because it would really mean that the House could no longer vote confidence or non-confidence in a government, which is one of the elements that to me must be retained by a House under our system, and a

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) fixed date would prevent that completely. So I'm surprised at the Premier who indicated some interest in such a measure, which I find most difficult to make work, would now be opposed to my measure which does not go anywhere near that distance . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. GREEN: . . . ask a question.

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. GREEN: Are you referring to the First Minister's suggestion that he would not call an election for four years unless defeated in the House, which is the position I think he was taking on many occasions?

MR. MOLGAT: No, I'm referring to something more than that. I'm speaking now from memory, but it seems to me that at the time that he made that proposal he was asked a question - "Would he consider the American system of fixed terms" and he indicated yes, this was something that he might consider. I don't think that he put it forward as a proposition but he was open to the consideration of that type of reform and I submit that type of reform goes much further than the one I'm proposing, and in fact I don't know how it could possibly work under a British Parliamentary structure of a Cabinet responsible to a Legislature. But be that as it may, my proposal, I think, would in fact mean that the private members would have a much greater role in government. Mind you, they'd have to do a lot more work, they'd have a lot more responsibility, they could no longer say I follow the party dictate; they would have to do their own work and arrive at their own conclusions on matters. Along with the opportunity, would go more responsibility.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those comments, I'm not going to oppose the bill going to Committee. I ask two things: that the members of the committee deal with it with an open mind; don't start off on the basis that because it's a reform and it's going to cause problems that you shouldn't look at. Because there are problems in the present system and it needs to be improved. Secondly, I would appeal to all of the members who may not be members of the committee, to appear before the committee, particularly the private backbenchers - those on the government side as well as those on this side, but maybe even more those on the government side -- because they are the ones who by and large under our legislative system don't get an opportunity to express their point of view, who are not heard of sufficiently in my view in the House, who are under the thumb of the Cabinet and I would like to see them freed and have an opportunity to speak more openly.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates. Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Osborne, and the proposed amendment thereto of the Honourable Member for Crescentwood. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's really regrettable that this debate is taking place at this time because I know that honourable members are usually, at this stage, very anxious to leave and I know that there are so many people who have so much to say on this particular subject, including myself. It's not an issue that I'd like to see dealt with in such a way that there is a top of the head vote without a full discussion. So that's a circumstance which apparently we can't avoid. It appears that the honourable member who put the resolution would certainly want to have it canvassed to see what the members of the Legislature think. And therefore we have no choice, Mr. Speaker, but to continue the debate, and at this stage it would be trying the patience of honourable members to deal with this in great depth - and I make that statement as a warning that nothing too much should be expected out of the remainder of this debate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when we last were discussing this issue, I indicated that many members who believe that the public should aid private and parochial schools think that they do so in the interests of parental freedom and in the interests of the state assisting all groups who want to maintain an educational system, but when questioned on it, Mr. Speaker, and the various members that I did question who favoured the proposal - the Member for Churchill, the Member for Fort Garry - it became apparent to me that no Legislature would maintain a free mind on this issue, that it's very dangerous to put this kind of thought support, or support

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) for the financial state support, state financial support for a belief, into existence, that invariably what the state will do — and, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation to admit that in this area I do fear state control, I do fear government power when it comes to the area of thought, when it comes to the area of freedom of thought, when it comes to the area of freedom of speech; and I say that the members that I spoke to that came out in support of this program, each indicated yes, they would support a Catholic school, they would support a Jewish School, but they wouldn't support a Marxist school; they wouldn't support a Fascist school. Of course, those are the ultimate extreme positions but what inevitably happens is that they will start saying that they are going to choose as to which type of beliefs they will support and which type of beliefs they will not support. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that although I know that no system can be perfect, that the only hope that we can have is to have a public school system which will reflect, insofar as it's possible — and I know the weakness of my own position because it's not possible — but insofar as it's possible, to reflect a secular view on things rather than teaching the indoctrination of one or another belief.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that the people who propose this type of resolution think that they do so in order to aid a particular situation in a particular school or a particular group of schools. That's not what will happen. The passing of this type of resolution will result — we talk about division of our community on Bill 56; a far more significant division will take place on this type of resolution, in two areas, Mr. Speaker, the first one not quite as harmful as the second. The first one will be on the basis of religion, that it will be — we will make it easier and we will therefore facilitate the people in our community being broken down into schools on the basis of their religious beliefs. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation in saying that people who want to have their child obtain a religious indoctrination — and there is nothing wrong with that — that certainly people should be free to do so, but that if they want that, Mr. Speaker, then it's something that they should be prepared to support, and I say that — and I know that they won't believe it — but I say that for their good as well as for the community good, because once a religion has to start depending on the communal support, on state support, Mr. Speaker, maybe they have it now, but a new state will come in and talk about what religions will be supportable and what religions will not be supportable, and the only people who can protect their beliefs are the people themselves. And that's not so unusual, you know. The state can support recreational institutions or the state can support parks and everybody will have to pay for them, and the people who say, well, we want our children to be oriented in a park where they have a religious orientation with it, or a camp, there's nothing unusual about saying that's fine. The public has a responsibility to everybody and you have to pay for it, and if you want something in addition, you have to pay for it yourself. It's not an unusual thing, and I say that it's for the benefit in the last analysis of the people themselves that that's continued. If it doesn't continue, then we will facilitate and divide the community on the basis of religion.

Now that's one feature and I think that people can learn to live with that and they should be able to learn to live with that. That's not the most important problem. The next problem is that you will divide people on the basis of class, because if you say that the state is going to aid schools, private schools, the logic of that position will ultimately lead to the person saying that "if my child doesn't go to the public school, I should be able to direct his taxes to the school of my choice." That's the logic of the position and that is the position that the people who pursue this say that it should be extended to. They would like to get a little bit now but that's the logic of the position.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that continues, you know well, Mr. Speaker, what would happen. The top echelon in our society, the upper income group, will say that we will send all our children to the private schools, we will withdraw our money from the public school system, and we will have our children, the money that would otherwise have gone to taxes will go to support a private school. Now, members say, well, that's really not what's going to happen; it's far fetched, what I am proposing. Mr. Speaker, it has happened. It is exactly what has happened in the southern states. When the public schools were desegregated in the United States, what the white community said is that we will not send our children to the public schools, we will stop voting money to the public schools, we will set up private schools and let the Negro children go to the public schools and they won't get very much education there. And that's what did happen. It happened in the United States. It happened in the southern states.

MR. BEARD: . . . end result of them withholding their money.

MR. GREEN: The end result was that they set up a private school system which the white

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) children attended, and they said to hell with the public school system, and less and less will they support the public school system because their children - and I'll refer to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek and others, that the people who make things move and the important people in society, who also have a great deal to say about what the government does, they sent their children to the private school system and as a result the public school system must and will suffer.

MR. BEARD: Could I ask one more question, then, of the Honourable Minister? What is the situation now, today, in those areas in which they tried to do that? What position did the Federal Government take?

MR. GREEN: The fact is that the white communities in certain areas of the United States now send their children only to the private school system, it's a fact that the public school system has become a Negro school system and the private school system has become a white school system. That is what has happened. And, Mr. Speaker, I say that it can get worse.

MR. BEARD: . . . a question then, please, of the Honourable Minister? Is there any area in which the integration has taken place?

MR. GREEN: Oh yes, there are areas in which it hasn't taken place, and I say that in a more militant area what I have described has taken place. And I say that what is being proposed here facilitates two breakdowns of society, two dividers, one on the basis of religion - and I say that that is not healthy but some people think that it's very important and it's not unhealthy; I won't argue that - and the other on the basis of class, and I say that that is definitely unhealthy.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that people who wish to strengthen a belief - and I think that there is nothing wrong with that - they have to accept the responsibility that they are working to do that and that it involves sacrifice, and I can tell the Honourable Member for Churchill that all my life I have been involved in the same type of sacrifice. The Honourable Member for Churchill or other members of this Assembly may think or have said - and I'll leave it to them - the Member for Roblin has said that I am a good debater; I must have had a successful law career. I can tell the Honourable Member for Churchill that when I left Law School I graduated with a gold medal, that because I was articled clerk in a Communist law office, because I was considered to be a left-winger, not only did my gold medal not do me any good but I couldn't get a job. I couldn't get a job with a lawyer in Winnipeg. There were no lawyers who would take me. I couldn't get a job for the government. I came into this government where everybody's supposed to be able to get a job, and you know, they often complain that the Attorney-General's Department can't get the good lawyers, but, Mr. Chairman, I, who was supposed to be - and I'll let the honourable member judge; he thinks that I'm not bad - I couldn't get a job with this government in 1955. And there was only one reason for it. It was because of certain so-called beliefs, certain beliefs attributed to me. And, Mr. Chairman, I worked; I worked to further what I believed in. I didn't, as a result of the fact that it was not being helped financially, I didn't say, well, I don't have any finances, therefore I have to give up. I worked to further what I believed in. I didn't what I could easily have done, I could have -- you know, the Liberal Party have such much greater prospects than the New Democratic Party. I didn't go to the Liberal Party and try to run for them because it was easier, because they had more financial support. I worked with the group that I believed in, and there's nothing wrong with that, and not only will it not weaken a religion that it does not receive finances from the state, but I say in the long run the religion that does receive finances from the state is weakened and the one that fights its way, because its ideas are more powerful, will be strengthened.

Mr. Speaker, I have very strong views on this question and I know other members have, and I say that it's regrettable that certain members in this House are going to be able to think that they can vote for this because it says "consider the advisability of" and they'll smile at me because they'll suggest that it was my wording of the other resolutions that makes it possible to vote for this one. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Boniface gave them the clue. All that that means is that you agree in principle with the proposition, and let nobody think that it will be regarded as otherwise if this proposition is passed. It will be accepted as an agreement with principle. I won't accept it that way because I know I've spoken to various members and they say, "Well, we could get off the hook by relying on the words 'consider the advisability of'." I ask them not to get off the hook by looking at the words "consider the advisability of". I am voting the way the Member for St. Boniface said this thing should be voted on, on the basis of: do I agree with this proposition in principle? If it's agreed with in

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) principle, we should see whether the money is available.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am voting, and I have no call on other members but I ask them to vote the same way, to say that if they don't agree with this thing in principle, they should stand up and say so. If they agree with this in principle, they should vote "aye" but they should not say, well, I can ride two horses, or straddle the fence, by relying on the fact that the words "consider the advisability" are in there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the resolution if it gets to a vote. I want members to know that there are two amendments that come previously and if we do get down to the main resolution, whether amended or unamended, I intend to move an amendment which I feel will deal more adequately with the problem. I intend to move an amendment which would ask that the public school system look into the question of how matters of religion - not the teaching of religion but matters of religion - because I believe the public school system should teach those things which are important to our way of life and I believe that religion is an important ingredient of our way of life, and therefore I think that the public school system should accommodate itself to dealing with reality, and it should accommodate having a system in the schools dealing with matters of religion, not teaching people what to think, not teaching people to seek a certain religion, but to have the whole question of religion and the various religions and their effect on mankind to be part of the public school system as well as enhancing the program in the schools of teaching what the cultural background of various groups in society is, because I believe that as much as I say that we should have a secular school system, the fact is that the existing school system is not secular. The existing school system is one that perpetrates the Protestant ethic - I hope nobody gets angry with that. That is what we get in the existing school system. I'm not being critical and I'm not being bitter. I'm trying to say what the fact is, that that's what the existing school system perpetrates, and therefore this system should be looked at, and the question of religion and how it has affected mankind should be considered in the public school system, but I say that this is the only place, and if we let down our efforts to improve the public school system, then I say that we can only go in a direction which would be very divisive for the community.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that I've prevailed on honourable members longer than they would like to have been prevailed on but it's a resolution that we can't just deal with on the basis that "it's the last day and we have to get it over with." At least I can't, and therefore I will, when the time comes, be moving an amendment if we get to that point - I'm not certain that we will - but if we do, that I will be moving a resolution to amend the main motion so as to give members an opportunity of reflecting what I would consider a positive study of the school system rather than seeing whether we can give public aid to private schools.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, the last speech of the Honourable Minister for Mines and Natural Resources, I'm sure, is not one that will cause the members of the House to say that he's a good debater, or maybe it is the point here that he has a weak case. He's covered the waterfront but he's never developed any one point, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister has stated that you should pay for a privilege, and right away I guess we could have a debate on what a privilege is and what a right is, and he gave as an example that he was persecuted in his youth -- (Interjection) -- Well, I say that he was persecuted - I listened to him and I say that he was persecuted in his youth because persecution is just that. Persecution is when you can't get a job, you can't get any advancement or anything because you have a certain belief.

Now, if I understand right, he condones such actions and he condones that we encourage prejudice because he's saying you've got to pay for certain rights; you have to pay. Well, I don't condone this. I say that they were wrong when they treated the Minister as they did and I say that we have been wrong for 100 years in denying people certain rights; and let's just get away from religion for awhile because we've had enough emotion for awhile and I think this will just serve to have probably a little more emotion and drama.

Let's get on the question of rights, everybody's rights, and the things that I'm concerned is here parental rights in education, and the Minister a couple of times said, "Well this is what I think." This is fine. This is fine for him, but not to impose his wish on other people who do not agree with him, and I believe in parental rights in education, Sir, and I believe in equal opportunity for all children, and I don't consider this a privilege but a right, and if there is something wrong, I think that the -- I'm not saying that the -- maybe I should say that the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) Minister is confusing things purposely because he is such a good debater and he knows this question inside out, but I won't make this accusation, certainly not at this time. But I am saying that he's brought in other of divisive nature about how difficult it would be, how divided it would be, and I say to him, I'll venture to say that right now there is not one province in Canada that is more divided than Manitoba at this very instant, and it is one of the only provinces that do not recognize the right of parents in the field of education.

Now, the Minister also is trying, in fact, to get it both ways. He is right. I will say to him, "You called the shot, Sir. You said 'consider the advisability'." Well, let it be exactly the way we treated other amendments, other resolutions in this House. He has his mind made up; I have mine made up. There is no question, no doubt where we are going to go, but there's other people who might not be quite so sure, who might want to know a little more about this, and I don't know if this was purposely the scare tactic but I don't think we should leave it at this, this example that the Minister talked about in the south. This is a different problem and a problem that has gone into the economy, the schools, the culture of the people of the United States. It is the cross that they bear. It is that unfortunate problem that they have between colour, between race, and I don't think that this is a good example at all. They'll use all the angles, that's true, but nobody, nobody is suggesting here that we should not keep on helping and working and supporting and making sure that first of all the public system is strong. Nobody has denied that.

Another point that the Minister has brought in is the question of, well all right; you want a school so carry it all the way. You want a school to teach a different religion, to teach this - and this, by the way, is the wrong attitude of private and separate schools. This is not the reason of these schools, I'd like to inform the Minister. But he's saying this: well, why not a school for Communists? Why not a school for snake charmers, for holy-rollers or something? Well, I would say that we have protection there because we want to keep our public school system intact. We want this, and we will not do anything that the people do not demand. But there's the question of curriculum now. That has nothing to do with the school if the school is in the public school system or the separate school system. It's a question of curriculum. If a different division wants to teach history, this is fine. Now does the Minister say, well, if you want something extra, you pay for it? I have the same right as anybody else, as all . . .

Now to my honourable friend it is not - and I don't say this in a derogatory manner at all - this is not important to him, but it might be important to me; it might be important to the Minister of Transportation; it might be important to us. And we have the right -- the Minister said, well all right; let it not be that you're going to teach a religion - and he has a good point. He's certainly free of thinking that. "Let us not talk about the question of teaching religion but teaching about religion." Well, that is like the . . . but have I the right to teach my son, my children to be good Canadians, or should I say, "Well, I'm not going to tell you to be a Canadian, I'm not impressed in that; you can be a Canadian if you do this and you can be a German if you do this and you can be a Russian if you do this"? By choice, if nothing else, some by birth and most of us by choice, even if we are born here, we are very proud of being Canadians and we take the right to teach our people to be Canadians.

Now if some of us, for any reason at all, wish to teach and to try to bring up their children in a certain way, in a God-fearing way, in a way that they think is the right way, why should we deny this? And if it's so bad why are we - and this is hypocrisy, I would say - why do we keep those separate schools open? Is it because maybe we're saving a million dollars to the people of Manitoba? And that those people, for that great right, for the great privilege, must pay? We have heard so much - and I'm certainly not going to start the debate of Bill 56 - but we've heard so much of these things, so much of compassion, we've heard so much of this and what is the score now? What do we say? We stand up straight and proud and we say, "This is the freedom; this is the province of freedom. You have the right - oh yes, you have the right to educate your children the way you want."

Well, let us dwell on that. Let us study this for a minute. The honourable friend who's across, and he wants a Coca Cola, and if I say, "Yes, but you must take the Orange Crush first and you must pay for two," is that a right? Is it a right that you have the right to mortgage or lose your home for something that you hold dear? Is that a right? Or is a right putting you on the same footing, putting your children . . . ? Forget the parents. I said parental rights. Maybe you won't agree with me on this, on the question of parental rights, but surely,

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) surely there's not one member here who will deny that the children should be placed on the same footing, that they should have equal opportunity. Now does that exist in Manitoba? Oh, no, it doesn't, because my child might want to go with the pal of my honourable friend here at Kelvin; he might want to go there but I say, "No," - and I'm still the boss - "you're going to go to St. Paul's College or you're going to go to another one." Has he the same opportunity? Don't talk to me about parental rights. Let's say that you deny this, but has he the same opportunity as my friend's children? No. And this is it. And if these schools are bad, well let's close them. Let's close them. I would say that there is no need to transfer your taxes and so on. Let's treat Manitobans like Manitobans. Let's treat all our children the same.

And this could be very easy. If nothing else, we should treat these recognized teachers, who are teaching the curriculum approved by the Department of Education, we should treat these people all the same, and therefore give the ordinary grant to all the teachers that are teaching in all our schools - all our schools - maybe not teaching a religion, teaching a religion. That might be - I would agree with that, but any other subject. Because my son, if I had a son, would be in a school that is supposed to be a separate school. Is he any different from the son of my honourable friend when he is taking history, when he's taking algebra, when he's taking anything else? Is he any different? How can we say, how can my honourable friend say that he's afraid of too much power of the state? This is what exists now. This is what exists now. You follow the dictates of the state and you go to that school or - well, mind you, you have a great privilege and you must make the sacrifice. How many more sacrifices do the people of Manitoba have to make? How many more? The ordinary people that are sending their children to the public school system are complaining because the cost of education is practically half the budget - the homeowners - more than that. The tax . . . is more than that. And they say make that sacrifice; be a man of principle; send your children to the school that you want to; mortgage your house, you have the right to do so; maybe you won't keep the payments because we have to raise the taxes to help the education of the other children, but you have the right to mortgage your house if you want. Take that right. You live in Manitoba now and you must have this right.

I would say that surely, surely, if my friend has any compassion at all and if he is interested in treating everybody the same - and I'm sure that he is - let him look a little bit. Let him look and let him realize that he should not look at all the problems of Manitoba all the time through his eyes. Once in awhile he's got to come and try to look at the problems the way I see it, the way somebody else sees it. I know it's quite difficult. I agree. I agree. Yes, once in awhile, because I try to look at it through your eyes. I try. - (Interjection) - Well, this is comical, this is funny, but not to me, Mr. Speaker, not to me. There is nobody here that should deny the right of the other people to their belief, and this is a question of belief. Now, what is it that we're asking that is going to destroy the whole school system, that probably has destroyed that in so many countries? Because so many countries and so many provinces have that. I don't know what it is. What are we asking? Two very simple things. Parental rights in education - and if we ever lose the rights of the parents, God help this province - and then equal opportunity for all our children, be they black, be they white, be they Catholic, be they Jewish, it doesn't matter. The fact that they are children, the fact that they are students - this is what we're asking. We're asking for what? That our teachers, our teachers who are ordinary people, if they qualify that they get the same grant as the teachers in other schools.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also would like to appeal to the members to remember, and if they are as sure as the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that I'm not reasonable but for 100 years the people of Manitoba have not been reasonable and that all the people in the other provinces are misguided, well then vote for the proposed amendment or vote to defeat this. Now if you're as sure as I am that you're just fighting for certain things that are yours, that are rightfully yours, that was given to you not by the state, but that was taken away from you by the state, well then I say that you will no doubt vote the way I will, and if you're in the middle, well then, there's no other way. The Minister himself, with my help - apparently we called the shot; we said all right, from now on "consider the advisability" will mean just that, and you should be guided the same as you would on second reading of the bill. If you're sure that you accept the principle, you have no doubt; if you feel that there's no way you can accept the principle, no doubt; if you're not too sure, if you want a little more information, if you want to be convinced, if you want to listen, if you want to study, if you want the facts, or if you are

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) ready to maybe work a compromise to accept certain principles, for instance, but not the principle of destroying the public school system, the way I feel, well then I think that you have no alternative but to support the general principle, which is what is meant by the original motion of the Member from Rhineland. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the sub-amendment?

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member has spoken on the sub-amendment.
The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs) (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong the debate any more than necessary and will get down to one or two final points that I would wish to make. In presentations earlier in the debate on this particular question, an accusation was made that the secular schools were irreligious, God blessed, that they teach atheism and so on, to the disadvantage of the religious community. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when teachers or students come to school, they bring their religion with them, the religion that they have been taught; that they do not discard it or take it off at the door the same as they do their overcoats or their overshoes, and they are guided by the same religious principles in the public school as they have been guided in their respective churches; and the teachers who have a religious background, and most of them have, they continue to be guided by the religious teaching that they have been brought up in, or have inherited.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a short extract from the writings of a man, L. P. Jacks, in England, an English philosopher; for a long time, for many years, he was the editor of one of the foremost philosophic religious journals in Great Britain, and he speaks of this very thing, about religion in the public schools and how people who attend the public schools bring their religion with them, and that religion, in a sense, is being taught in the public schools through attitudes, procedures and so on, although it may not be specifically timetable. He says here - this is taken from a book written by him called "A Living Universe" - he says:

"Not long ago I met one of our great schoolmasters, a veteran in that high service. 'Where in your time table do you teach religion?' I asked him. 'We teach it all day long,' he answered. 'We teach it in arithmetic by accuracy. We teach it in language by learning to say what we mean - Yea, yea and nay, nay. We teach it in history by humanity. We teach it in geography by breadth of mind. We teach it in handicrafts by thoroughness. We teach it in astronomy by reverence. We teach it in the playground by fair play. We teach it by kindness to animals, by courtesy to other people, by good manners to one another, and by truthfulness in all things. We teach it by showing the children that we, their elders, are their friends and not their enemies.'

'But what,' I said, 'about the different denominations? Have you no trouble with the parents?' 'None at all,' he replied. 'We have half a dozen denominations but we treat the children not as members of this church or that, but as members of the school, and we show them that as members of the school in work and in play they are members of one another.'

'So, do you talk much to them about religion?' I then asked him. 'Not much,' he said, 'just enough to bring the whole thing to a point now and then.' And finally he added a remark that struck me - 'I do not want religion,' he said, 'brought into this school from outside; what we have of it, we grow ourselves.'

And this, Mr. Speaker, seems to me should be the approach that we take. The public schools are not anti-religious; they're not God blessed; they're not atheistic, or any of the accusations that have been made against them; and they are not setting themselves up as opposing religion. The Honourable Member from St. Boniface suggested that there should be parental rights in the bringing up of their children, and I agree 100 percent with him in that, but then he says that they should have a right to have a school of their own in which their own religion is taught. But there are minority religious groups and there are majority religious groups in the community. If the majority religious groups are to be enabled to set up schools and have public support, what of the minority religious groups? What of, let's say, the Baptist groups in Winnipeg - I understand that there are about six, or nine churches among the Baptists. Are they then to be, if they can't establish a school, a private school, to be supported by the public purse? Should then they be subsidized in some way so that they can propagate their particular religious doctrine? I belong to the Unitarian Church. There is only one in the city. Are we to be subsidized so that we may . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please.

MR. PETURSSON: . . . so that we may propagate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I remind the Honourable Minister it is now 12:30.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the 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 Thursday afternoon.