

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, May 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.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have with us 15 Grade 9 students of the Sisler High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Yankiwski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. And 6 Grade 9 students of the St. James Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. McAllister. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Attorney-General. And 32 Grade 11 students of McCreary Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Miss Hamel and Miss Boyd. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. And 100 Grade 11 students of the Windsor Park School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Cohen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before I proceed with Orders of the Day I have a statement which I wish to make in response to a matter raised yesterday. During yesterday afternoon's sitting the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party rose in his place on what he termed a question of privilege and then proceeded to ask the Speaker to make a ruling on a certain matter. In view of the fact that the matter was raised before Orders of the Day and in view of the fact that it may affect the proceedings of the House at any stage, I beg the indulgence of the House to hear my statement now.

I appreciate, but generally speaking, the Chair cannot be called upon to rule on a matter which may or may not arise. The practice is either for the Speaker to intervene on his own initiative when a situation arises which in his opinion calls for a ruling by him or pursuant to a point raised by an honourable member. Citation 184 of Beauchesne, Fourth Edition, 1958, states "that questions addressed to the Speaker are not allowed."

May I also refer honourable members to May's Seventeenth Edition, Page 350, which, on the topic "Questions to the Speaker," reads in part as follows: "Questions dealing with matters within the jurisdiction of the Speaker should be addressed to the Speaker by private notice since no written or public notice of questions to the Speaker is permissible." However, I wish to draw the attention of honourable members to the last sentence of the aforementioned citation and in particular to the last clause thereof. "Nor can any appeal be made to the Chair by a question save on points of order as they arise or on a matter which urgently concerns the proceedings of the House for which he is responsible."

In this instance perhaps this could be regarded as a matter which urgently concerns the proceedings of the House. I hasten to add, however, that this is a practice which should be used with extreme caution because it could easily lead to an abuse of the rules by prompting hypothetical questions to the Speaker. Having indicated that I consider this a matter of urgent concern in relation to proceedings in our House, I accept the question.

As I had indicated yesterday, two questions arise in my mind. Firstly, is this a matter within my sphere of jurisdiction; secondly, if it is, what constitutes personal pecuniary interest. I find that Citation 66, subsection (2) of Beauchesne, Fourth Edition, 1958, reads in part as follows: "A member's right to vote on a question in which he is personally interested is one of those matters that must be decided by the House and not by the Speaker. An objection to a vote on the ground of personal interest must be taken by a substantive motion that the vote given be disallowed and cannot be raised as a point of order." Honourable members will also find words to this effect in May, Seventeenth Edition, Page 438, under the heading "Time and Manner for Making Motions to Disallow Votes." Therefore, in my humble opinion, I consider this to be a matter beyond my jurisdiction and one within the jurisdiction of the House.

May I also draw the attention of honourable members to the last paragraph of Citation 66, subsection (3) of Beauchesne, and I quote: "Although a member interested is disqualified from

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) voting, he is not restrained by any existing rule of the House from proposing a motion or amendment."

In conclusion, may I state that having answered the first question negative, I see no need to deal with the second. In fact at this point I feel it would be exceeding my jurisdiction in commenting thereon.

Orders of the Day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question pour le ministre de la Santé et du Développement Social. Some two weeks ago I asked the Minister a question on the subject of mercury pollution to see whether any testing was being done on the residents of the north who had been exposed to it, and I'd like to know if he has any answer on that subject.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Springfield): Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been taking tests on human beings who are exposed, eating fish, say, more than once a day. We have taken samples of hair, samples of blood, of urine on human beings. We've received results of 18 of these cases and none of them have been found to be near the maximum allowed insofar as mercury content is concerned.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, again. I'm referring to an article in today's Free Press by Mr. Steven Riley where he states in the opening paragraph, and I quote: "Liberal House Leader Gordon Johnston asked Tuesday that members of the Manitoba Legislature who have any connection with auto insurance be deprived of their votes on the auto insurance bill."

Further in the article, mention is made that "if Mr. Johnston's recommendation were applied, at least three members of the opposition would not be able to vote." Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not make that statement. I would like to clarify what was said from Hansard of yesterday and I quote: "I think it would be well, Mr. Speaker, if not only for his benefit" - referring to the Member for Assiniboia - "but for the benefit of other honourable members in this House who are engaged in a like business, if you would take under consideration the question as to whether or not any honourable members who have a direct link to this business should be allowed to vote on the question of Bill 56."

Mr. Speaker, I repeat again most emphatically that I did not recommend any such action be taken at all and I hope the gentleman who reported this story will have the courtesy to give as much space to the correction for the mistake that he made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I really do believe that the point raised by the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party is well taken, or should be, even though it may not constitute a valid point of privilege. Nevertheless, I feel that according to the information he has put on the record that there is a basic misunderstanding of his position which he took last evening. I feel that we did discuss it adequately last night and that your ruling today served to clarify it completely, so nothing much more can be said other than that the Honourable Member for Portage I believe has been wrongly misinterpreted.

STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the members of the House that Manitoba has won a significant award for its industrial development efforts. The Manitoba Department of Industry and Commerce received the highest award from the American Industrial Development Council's Literature Awards Competition this week in Kansas City, Missouri, where AIDC is holding its forty-fifth annual conference. The best exhibit award was for the entry "This is Manitoba," a coloured pictorial and editorial presentation about the Province of Manitoba. The Manitoba entry won the coveted award over 345 other entries from most of the 50 states of the United States and the ten provinces of Canada. In making the award of the trophy, the AIDC President, Mr. Henry Bostwick, Junior, from California, paid the highest of

(MR. EVANS cont'd.). . . . compliments to the Province of Manitoba and the Department of Industry and Commerce for this excellent book. President Bostwick said that the book was evidence of the tremendous dedication and ability of the Manitoba Department of Industry and Commerce in the field of industrial development.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the AIDC is a non-profit organized association of more than 1,000 men and women from throughout the United States and Canada who are involved in industrial and related development activities. The members come from the public, civic and private sectors and are deeply involved in all aspects of socio-economic development going on in North America.

Mr. Speaker, I would be one of the first to recognize that this excellent publication was conceived in the days of the prior administration. However, I would further point out we have seen fit, this administration has seen fit to continue the promotion of this brochure and enter it into this international competition. I would pay at this time particular credit to the creative Manitobans who contributed to the design and the production of this outstanding work.

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

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that I'm pleased that Manitoba has received this award and I recognize the fact that the Minister indicated that the book was really published before the change in government. May I say that while the department is entitled to some credit, some of the consultants that were involved with the department at that time I think deserve some credit too, and I think it's interesting to note that from what I'm able to pick up through the press that those consultants are no longer being consulted by the government of the day and may very well have been fired, so to speak, Mr. Speaker, by the government of the day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and the first one is if he would confirm whether or not municipal assessors have been sent to Indian Reserves with the intention of taxing the land despite the fact that the areas are legally tax exempt?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Would the honourable member like to ask his second question or would you like -- you say you have two questions.

MR. CLAYDON: Yes, that's the first question. Would you answer the first question?

MR. PAWLEY: In respect to the question of municipal assessment on Indian Reserves, I'd indicated in answer to a similar question two or three weeks ago in the House that there is assessment on Indian Reserves of -- in fact the Crown land parts of which -- of Indian Reserves -- are rented to neighbouring farmers and the practice under the Municipal Act is that these lands can be taxed. This is an area that I think we will be anxious to take up when we come to assessment under the Municipal Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. CLAYDON: My second question is to the same Minister. Would the Minister repeat for the benefit of this House his answer to the question which he gave on a by-line this morning as to the reason why the government intends to refer Bill 56 to the Public Utilities Committee rather than Law Amendments?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm wondering if that matter could not be more appropriately dealt with at some other point in the Orders of the Day. Has the honourable

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on the same point, may we even get the Minister to advise us in the House as to what committee the bill is going to?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the matter -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon. The matter of determining which committee, which standing committee shall be seized of a particular bill will be determined in the usual way and members will be notified in the normal fashion.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, the question I think that my Leader rose is that the public is already aware of which committee this bill goes to, namely the Public Utilities Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the Honourable Member for Wolseley indicated he had a third question?

MR. CLAYDON: No, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate an answer to my second question which I think was a fair question.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): If I recall correctly, last evening on the introduction for second reading reference was made to - reference of the bill to go to Public Utilities. I may be in error and we'd have to check Hansard. -- (Interjection) -- It wasn't? Well then I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. CLAYDON: Mr. Speaker, there was a categorical statement made on the by-line this morning and I do believe that the Minister should confirm what he said to this House. He has made it to the public. I believe it's a fair question to ask at this time.

MR. PAWLEY: . . . say, Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that it had been indicated to this House that this bill would be referred to the Public Utilities Committee. It will be checked, the form -- in fact the usual form that is forwarded up to yourself, Mr. Speaker, indicated reference to the Public Utilities Committee if it was not so said in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a

MR. WEIR: On the same point, if I may. Might I ask the Minister while it may have been presented to the Speaker, was it presented to the House?

A MEMBER: Check Hansard.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if it requires saying again, I say again that the determination as to where a particular bill shall go, to which of the standing committees it shall go to, shall be determined in the usual way and notification shall be given in the usual way.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, might I ask a question of the First Minister? Could he tell me what the usual way is, because my understanding is that it is presented in terms of the resolution to the Speaker and to the Clerk in terms of distribution at the time the bill is presented, but it might very well not have been given to the House at the time.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, we shall have to check with Mr. Clerk about that.

MR. WEIR: I think it would - if I may ask the First Minister - is it not much more appropriate that we ask the Minister that introduced the bill who is responsible for channeling the bill. It is not the Clerk that is responsible for channeling the bill.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs just finished saying that recommendation as to which standing committee shall be seized of this matter was presented to you, Sir, and through you to Mr. Clerk. It's on record now, and I believe all we need do is peruse the record and in that way formally notify the House.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Minister which committee that the bill was directed to?

MR. PAWLEY: The committee indicated only three minutes ago in the House here.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Minister to kindly answer the question of my colleague as to the reasons why, which were enunciated outside the House.

A MEMBER: Say what you said on the radio.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. WEIR: Is the Minister going to answer my question?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicated clearly as I could that insofar as my knowledge is concerned that it was referred to the Speaker, it was on the form, that the reference would be to the Public Utilities Committee. I'm not going to be cross-examined now as to whether it was actually indicated in the House last night, we'll have to check Hansard for that, but it certainly was on the form and referred up to the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: I have a question for the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, would the Minister tell the House, in view of the fact that this morning Ed Russenholt, who is a prominent Manitoba historian, stated that it was mandatory that the pseudo-historical comic book that was presented to all the students in Manitoba two days ago must be recalled and reprinted. In view of that fact, would he tell the House whether he would consider doing exactly this or seeing that it was done since this went to school children.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I couldn't undertake this. I'd have to see what Mr. Russenholt has in mind and what the costs might be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Would the Minister of Municipal Affairs confirm that the reason for sending the bill to Public Utilities is to avoid a possible defeat in the Law Amendments Committee, that being the reason he gave to the public for sending it to Public Utilities. Would he confirm that he said that to the public this morning?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer this question. I've indicated that over and over again it's been accused of this government that they're attempting to engineer their own defeat. It's not our intention to engineer any defeat but we're going to stand up and we're going to quite honestly give our votes on this matter and we're not -- (Interjection) -- I'm not quite finished. I also indicated that Law Amendments Committee would be interpreted as possibly a way or means by which we would be engineering our own defeat and I was not going to accept that type of accusation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, but before I pose my question I perhaps should also congratulate the department in their achievement in winning the award, and I think the credit is due to all the people who played any part in achieving this award. My question is, has the government made their decision to proceed to develop a convention centre, because this is of great interest to many developers in the City of Winnipeg and other parts of Canada. They'd like to know if the government has made a decision and will proceed to develop a convention centre.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, may I respond to this because I happen to have been involved in discussions with various entrepreneurs and municipal corporations regarding the convention centre. I want to repeat what has been said before, and that is that the government has indicated its interest in the development of a convention centre as part of any large scale development of the centre core of Winnipeg and the government is still interested in pursuing this possibility, but the government has not undertaken to build a convention centre on its own merits without consideration of general development. There has been no request that I'm aware of, and I think I would be aware of, from anyone, and I mean anyone, that we develop a convention centre with any definite plans as part of the proposal as at this time.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The Minister indicated that the government would consider, as part of a large down-town development plan, or intentions of a large development. Can the Minister indicate what he means by a large development in dollars and cents and how many millions of dollars would you consider a large development plan?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this government was informed by the Leader of the Official Opposition that when the former government was in charge of this problem that an indication was made to the developers of Centrepoint that consideration, serious consideration would be given to development of a convention centre along with the development of Centrepoint - and I use that term with a capital C as being a definite proposal. Now that has not proceeded and that is not any fault of this government, it's rather a problem related to the developers of Centrepoint and financing and other matters. It would be foolish, Mr. Speaker, to venture any opinion as to the number of dollars which would justify a development of a convention centre because there are many more factors involved. This government is still ready, willing and desirous of discussing development of a convention centre as part of a large scale development in accordance with good planning for the future of Winnipeg and indeed of Manitoba, and I don't think we ought to get involved any more in this kind of a discussion until we have further proposal.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would I construe by the remarks of the Minister that anything less than \$50 million, the government would not be prepared to proceed with any plans to develop a centre.

MR. CHERNIACK: The member has just mentioned a dollar figure which I refused to name, so that the fact that he names a dollar figure is of little interest to me. I don't think that we are concerned with putting a price tag on the value of a convention centre; we are more interested in seeing to it that a convention centre is reasonable, practical and one which stimulates development.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, might I enquire of the House Leader if it's the impression of the government that it was the opposition of the committee of seven that suggested the make-up of Law Amendments Committee and the 56 members?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, my recollection of the meeting was that everybody felt that this would be a good idea.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, might I enquire of the First Minister if he would place the same importance on the passage of Bill 43 in the House, which I presume will go through Law Amendments, as he would the passage of Bill 56?

MR. SCHREYER: Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind saying to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition that I was rather surprised by the composition of Law Amendments Committee, that is to say in terms of numbers, but the decision having been taken by the Committee on Committees, I didn't feel that there was any particular reason to make any effort to change the numbers. The reason that certain bills are being referred to Committee of Public Utilities or to any other committee is because we regard it as logical that they should be referred to those particular committees. It's not a matter of numbers at all. And let me take this opportunity to reconfirm the statement made by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs that this government is not trying to engineer or fabricate a defeat on a particular measure nor are we going to paralyze ourselves by trying to avoid whatever the consequences of a defeat may happen to be.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, would the First Minister tell me why he would show surprise at the make-up of the committee when he was a member of the committee, a member of the committee to develop the committees. Would he advise me why he would show surprise at the make-up?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I recall, at the time the Committee on Committees met, there was concurrently a Committee of Cabinet meeting and I just wasn't present at both meetings simultaneously.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, could I not ask the First Minister if there wasn't, in terms of it, a delay between the period in which it was adjusted and the period in which it was approved?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this Committee on Committees was constituted of such distinguished and experienced members as the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Mines and Resources and my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, being experienced parliamentarians all, I thought whatever decisions they could mutually agree upon should surely be acceptable to me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Was he in contact or in correspondence with the Prime Minister or the Prime Minister's office regarding agricultural representation on the delegation that just took off to Japan and other countries in the East this past weekend?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MCGREGOR: A supplementary question then. Will a letter to the Prime Minister be issued protesting this, as I understand there was no agricultural representatives on this delegation and I think it's extremely important at this stage of agriculture in Western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a question of privilege, Sir. Because of publicity given a certain matter raised in this House yesterday and the reporting of the facts of the matter, or at least some of them today, Sir, I fear that the reputations of a number of leading Manitoba historians may be unfairly open to injury. And I refer, Sir, to the criticisms of the historical comic book recently distributed in Manitoba elementary schools. Sir, the members of the Historical Publications Committee of the Manitoba Centennial have undertaken many projects, but I wish to advise this House, Sir, that to my knowledge the members of that volunteer committee had nothing to do with either the production of that particular book or with its specific contents. If I find out any differently, Sir, I'll report to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view of the intense interest of Bill 56 in the Province of Manitoba and in view of the responsibility - my question will be posed to the Minister, the First Minister - and in view of the interest of every member in this House in this matter, would he not reconsider the decision to have the bill reported to the Public Utilities Committee and have it go before the Law Amendments Committee which would mean that all members will have a right to participate fully in the discussion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I reply to that question. I would reply to it as follows. I am aware of very important legislation that has been passed in this country that has affected the entire national economy and the entire future of our country, that has gone through committee stage in committees of the size that constituted only 10 to 20 percent of the membership of the Federal House, for example, and I think that there is good precedent for proceeding in the way that we have already outlined.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the comments of the First Minister, but I again ask him in view of the intense interest and in view of the make-up...

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has already stated that.

MR. SPIVAK: It is not possible to reconsider -- (Interjection) -- No, I won't sit down. Is it not possible and is it not correct to reconsider your decision?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, of course it's possible to give further consideration to that proposal and we shall do so. But in doing so, I would like my honourable friend to be aware of practice previously in this House and in other jurisdictions which have some relation to the operation of this House. I would invite my honourable friend to consult with his colleague the Member from Fort Garry, the Member for Morris and others.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the very wet spring and the fact that we have a very late spring, and also in view of the fact that the Operation Lift of the Federal Government plans to pay farmers....

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member place his question now that he's made his speech.

MR. GRAHAM: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I have to explain the whole thing. In view of the fact that the Federal Government plans payment for nurse crops....

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

MR. GRAHAM: ... only if they are cut before the 15th of July, would the Minister make representation to Ottawa requesting that that 15th of July be moved back to the 31st of July?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to answer that question, because if my honourable friend was awake he would have realized that I had made such representation about a month ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. On Page 1802 of Hansard in the seventh line, the word "Nazi" - spelled N-A-Z-I - appears, and the word that I used there and the word that should have appeared in Hansard is "nasty" - N-A-S-T-Y.

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

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to at this time table the Annual Report of the Department of Tourism and Recreation for the Province of Manitoba for the fiscal year 1968-69. And while I'm on my feet I would also like to table Order for Return No. 23 as requested by the Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister indicate to us his intentions of whether or not revisions or changes to the Agricultural Implement Act are contemplated in this session?

MR. USKIW: The Agricultural Implement Act. Yes, this is a matter of policy, Mr. Speaker, which will be brought before the House in due course.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce, or perhaps even the First Minister because he replied to the Order for Return that I mentioned. With respect to the legal counsel for the Manitoba Development Fund on the matter of loans, is the same firm being employed as the Order for Return mentions as having received over \$300,000 in fees?

MR. SCHREYER: Well Mr. Speaker, I believe that the situation is as follows, that the same law firm that is mentioned in the Order for Return has been asked to carry on certain of its work through to completion of particular agreements or contract dates and that it is doing so.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will it be government policy to appoint one only in the future or will the work be spread around?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General can perhaps elaborate further in reply, but to answer specifically to the last question posed by the honourable member, the answer is no, that there is no commitment or undertaking or intention to necessarily restrict all of hiring of legal expertise for MDF purposes, restricting it to one firm. The answer is No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. AL. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, just to give the honourable member further information. As I indicated during the course of the introduction of my estimates, I indicated it will be government policy, where possible, to utilize full-time legal counsel, government legal counsel more often than apparently had been the practice in the past. As a result, an advertisement was placed for the hiring of counsel for the Attorney-General's Department, which counsel would be assigned to the Fund. Applications are being considered and an appointment is expected to be made relatively soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a further question directed to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Is it his intention to introduce any legislation with respect to artificial insemination during this session?

MR. USKIW: It's another matter of policy, Mr. Speaker, that will be announced before the House.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture, supplementary to the question directed by my colleague the Member from Birtle-Russell. In the maze of conflicting statements that he has made in regard to federal policy in the last several months, which statement was he referring to when he answered the Member for Birtle-Russell?

MR. USKIW: Well, I've made several statements to the House, Mr. Speaker, on the subject matter. The matter which is of concern to the Member for Birtle-Russell, of course, was raised in one of the submissions that was presented to the federal people. As a matter of fact, it went beyond his suggestion. It suggested that since the intent is to encourage about two million acres of forage production in addition this year to what we've had in the past, that we ought to in fact allow that crop be harvested. That was the content of that particular submission.

MR. SCHREYER: I didn't hear entirely the question put by the Honourable Member for Lakeside about artificial insemination, but I'd like to advise the honourable member that if he has any advice to give on insemination, artificial or otherwise, we'd be pleased to hear from him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. Is there a maximum placed on any one individual loan that the Agricultural Credit Corporation can make?

MR. USKIW: Yes, there is, Mr. Speaker. It's \$100,000 to one individual.

MR. FROESE: Is that maximum set through the regulations or is that maximum brought in by the Board of the Corporation?

MR. USKIW: No, it's by regulation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Speaker. Reference was made to the possibility of a Convention Centre and the government involvement in a Convention Centre. I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether the Department of Industry and Commerce has a completed consultant report on a Convention Centre for Manitoba and for Winnipeg?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether I heard all of the question. Was the question, have we completed a report or a study?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that a study was undertaken. Has the study been completed?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, can the honourable member assure this side of the House that the study which in fact was negotiated in the previous administration is at least continuing, in the process of being completed and has not been dropped.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I might, because this relates to a period when I was acting in the capacity of Minister of Industry. If the Honourable Member for River Heights is

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.). . . . referring to a study that was commissioned by the previous administration with a Chicago-based firm, if that's the study that he's referring to, the answer is yes.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then I wonder if I can ask the First Minister to table that study for the consideration of the House. I'll file an Order for Return if necessary, but I wonder if we can have that tabled?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for River Heights is well aware of the policy and attitude of the present government. We are not averse at all to tabling reports. If he files an Order for Return, I'm sure that we would be pleased to table it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Resources. In view of the statement of the Minister of Health and Social Development that people who have been eating a heavy diet of fish are nowhere near being mercury polluted, could he tell the House whether he would reconsider or re-examine the ban on fishing in Manitoba?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I tried to indicate to the House when these matters were first raised that they don't know enough as they would like to know about mercury pollution and mercury contamination, and I indicated at that time that because there was little knowledge the tolerance levels were on the safe side and all health authorities will quite properly do this. I know that they are continually looking at these tolerance levels and if there's any change, we will be notified. I doubt whether we should raise any hopes in the House that a change would take place in time to reverse the decision relative to the fishing season.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Railway Commissioner who is out of his seat just now and I'll therefore address it to the First Minister. I note that yesterday -- well, I note that yesterday the Attorney-General of Saskatchewan indicated that when Mr. Jamieson was in Regina and in Saskatchewan he dealt with him with the question of the problems of freight rate increase. I wonder whether -- do we have any indication whether either the Railway Commissioner or the First Minister or the Minister of Transportation dealt with the department minister, the federal department minister in connection with the problems of freight rates during his recent visit to Manitoba?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may answer that question. The answer is that I didn't have an opportunity of meeting with the Honourable Don Jamieson precisely in respect of possible freight rate increases. The railway section of the Department of Industry and Commerce are checking into it and will be making a report to me, and on the basis of that report's information, we'll take action.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder if the Railway Commissioner could indicate whether there has been any communication between himself and the federal department, Mr. Pickersgill, the head of the National Transportation Commission, in connection with the problems of freight rate increases for Manitoba since the beginning of the year.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I met with Mr. Jones the other day, Mr. David Jones, the Chairman of the Railway Section of the Department of Transport, and we had informal discussion on this whole matter which I think was very very fruitful and we will continue our discussions along this line.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I'm wondering if the Minister could indicate to me whether he has taken the responsibility for the ARDA funds that are being allocated to the various tourist areas such as - and I have in mind Rock Lake.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister who is in charge of the ARDA administration is the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. EINARSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does this apply, too, to the tourist areas such as Rock Lake? The Minister of Agriculture has that responsibility?

MR. GREEN: ARDA authority generally falls under that category. There are ARDA programs which fall into various departments, including the Department of Mines and Natural Resources and into the Department of Tourism, but the Minister who is in charge of the planning, administration which coordinates the program, is the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. EINARSON: Then, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could he indicate as to whether any funds were to be allocated for Rock Lake for this year, and if so, what has happened to them - from ARDA funds?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I believe the last of the residual ARDA funds were allocated some five or six or seven months ago. I can't just recall at this point to which areas they have been designated but I can check that for you and bring you the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Youth and Education. Can he advise the House when we might expect the legislation respecting language instruction in the public school system.

MR. MILLER: I hope that that legislation should be forthcoming within the next 10 days.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will information regarding the teacher training facility in French language be provided at the same time or is there a further announcement in that regard?

MR. MILLER: I can't indicate at this time if that information will be available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: If I could help my honourable friend further, I'd like to remind my honourable friend of something that I'm sure he is already aware of, and that is that the establishment of the teacher training facility is dependent in large part on the attitude of the Government of Canada, and until negotiations can be concluded with the Government of Canada, it's not possible to make any definitive statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce is in charge of air traffic in Manitoba and I believe he has had a submission from Lynn Lake in respect to the higher rates being charged for passenger service. Has he made a protest to the Department of Transportation on this?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I should point out to members of the House that the Provincial Government in no way controls the air transportation industry in Canada. However, I will say that the Department of Industry and Commerce has taken a great interest in the promotion and development of air transportation as it affects the province. The department has made various studies with respect to the changes in air fares and we are cognizant generally of what is happening, but we haven't taken it upon ourselves to make any protest or recommendation or otherwise to the Minister of Transport, Mr. Jamieson.

MR. BEARD: A subsequent question. Will the Minister undertake to protest the higher rates in Northern Manitoba?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the matter under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Cultural Affairs. I will ask him whether he would consider having the issue of the comic strip, or the comic magazine "New Nation", recall the 160,000 issues that were issued.

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs)(Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is a supplementary question to the Honourable Member for Churchill to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could he indicate whether any particular group has requested the department or the government to in fact join in a protest in connection with the rise in fares?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the rise in fares, to my knowledge, has been relatively marginal and has not affected all points in Northern Manitoba. Indeed many of the fare changes have been advantageous to the residents of Northern Manitoba and thus far, to my knowledge, there's been no direct request made to join in a representation to Ottawa on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. I have copies of letters that have been submitted to the government, and copies sent to me, respecting the change in rates and the 23 percent difference.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not denying that there isn't concern on the part of the citizens of those communities. I simply stated that there was no direct representation made for us to join in any representation to be made to Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a further question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Was the 100,000 maximum for individual loans in effect prior to the revision of the Act last fall and, if so, did it apply on both individual and corporate loans?

MR. USKIW: I believe that was the case, Mr. Chairman. The position today though is somewhat different in that the corporations or co-operatives that enter into agreement with the province are eligible for, you might say, unlimited amount - no ceiling.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Does the \$100,000, or in excess of \$100,000, take into consideration debts already incurred by a corporation or an individual farmer?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I can answer that by stating that the corporation always takes into account the feasibility of any proposal and has to take into account whether or not one has the potential to repay the loan, and on that basis a decision is made.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned Debates on Second Reading. Bill No. 15. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the indulgence of the House in having this matter stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to this Bill 38, basically I had only a couple of questions that I wanted to ask about it. There is a clause in it which refers - we're not supposed to refer to clauses here - but the Bill makes provision for jurisdiction over structures, water control structures, etc., outside the Province of Manitoba, and of course the question that arises is whether or not the preparation here, is this in preparation for control works or other structures that may in fact be developed in connection with the diversion of Churchill River waters into the Nelson River, thinking specifically of at least one example which would be the Sturgeon River, Sturgeon-Weir River diversion which we've had no indication yet whether or not it has power development facilities or can facilitate power development on it; this has not been indicated to us in any way by the Manitoba Hydro nor by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. And also, could it just conceivably account for structures that may be built in connection with the control of the levels of Reindeer Lake and other lake facilities in addition to diversions.

So basically I'm asking why the provision - quite apart, and I'm quite aware there are studies going on on the Saskatchewan-Nelson basin studies and so on that may involve irrigation, diversions and so on across the prairies - but the provision in here seems to go beyond just inter-provincial studies, it actually goes and spells out the apparent facilitation for the Manitoba Government to operate water control structures outside the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you now call the proposed resolution of the Honourable First Minister on Page 4 of the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, the rather lengthy resolution standing in my name. If it's required that I read it in full I will proceed to do so.

WHEREAS the Special Committee of the Legislature on Professional Associations was appointed at the First Session of the 29th Legislature to examine the statutes and regulations governing professional associations and their licensing, provisions of standards and disciplining of professionals in the Province of Manitoba, and to examine any Bills respecting professional associations introduced in the previous three Sessions of the Legislature and not passed, and to consider the advisability of enacting uniform legislation wherever practical and applicable.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Is it the wish of the House that the entire resolution be read?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think it has been the practice that it be read once, either by the mover or the Speaker himself.

MR. SCHREYER: AND WHEREAS this Special Committee of the Legislature submitted its report to the Legislature on Friday, March 20, 1970.

AND WHEREAS this Special Committee of the Legislature has not completed its work and has requested in its report that it be reconstituted as early as possible at this Session with the same powers and authority as set out in the resolution passed by the House on Wednesday, the 17th day of September, 1969.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Special Committee of the Legislature on Professional Associations be reconstituted and composed of Hon. Messrs. Mackling, Miller, Toupin, Messrs. Allard, Beard, Bilton, Boyce, Craik, Desjardins, Doern, Molgat, Shafrensky, Sherman, Spivak, Mrs. Trueman, and Mr. Turnbull to examine the statutes and regulations governing professional associations and licensing, provision of standards and disciplining of professionals in the Province of Manitoba, and to examine any Bills respecting professional associations introduced in the previous three Sessions of the Legislature and not passed, and to consider the advisability of enacting uniform legislation wherever practical and applicable.

AND THAT the Committee hold such public hearings as it may deem advisable;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund all other expenses of a kind and nature required to assist the Committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution and provided the same have received the prior approval of the Treasury Board.

AND THAT the Committee have power to sit during the present Session and in recess or after prorogation and to report to the House at the next Session of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker.....

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order if I may, Mr. Speaker, I believe this motion requires a message from His Honour, and accordingly I put on the record that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this House has so much other very important work to go on besides this particular committee that I think it would be a mistake to even adjourn this at this time. Therefore, I want to endorse the formation of the committee, of which I am a member along with others, and I'll look forward to its sitting at the earliest possible date.

One comment I would like to make, I note that the member of the government side who was probably instrumental over a period of two or three years in setting this committee up is absent from the roster, the make-up of it, and I refer particularly here to the Minister of Finance, the then Member of St. Johns, who was most adamant about this committee being set up. Now I find again that his name is missing off the list and I wonder if he feels that the committee has lost the importance it had when he advocated its formation and that's the reason that he's not on it, and if this is so I think he should advise us that this is so. If he feels it's still important, then I felt that there should have been continuity provided with his presence on the committee.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I also agree with this resolution and will support it. I rise only to answer the last spokesman. I can tell him that the Minister of Finance feels that this is just as important as it was a few years ago, and this is one of the reasons that he feels that he can't be a member of this committee because he would not like to delay its work. As you know, the Minister of Finance is often absent from the province. Now I know that he intends to -- he asked to be informed, he wants to be informed when the committee is set up. I think he signified that he will make a request that he'd like to be informed when the meetings will be held and if at all possible he would like, and he certainly will try to be present at these meetings.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the appointment of this committee once again. I would hope, however, that the committee will get to work more quickly than it did during the last period, and I'm not being critical in this regard because I know that there were some problems. I know for example that three of the members on the committee were on the Northern Task Force and that that group was particularly busy. They were traveling throughout the northern areas and held countless meetings. It would be very difficult for

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.). . . . them to attend meetings of this committee as well. But there is a great deal of work to be done by the committee and I would urge that the meetings be called soon so that we could proceed with the work. We now have I think all of the documentation necessary, and this was part of the delay, that we are awaiting some of the material from other sources. Now the material is on hand I would urge that the committee become active at a very early date.

I wonder if the personnel on the committee ought to consider as well, if they are going to be involved in other committees and if the Northern Task Force is going to take as much time as it did the last time, whether we shouldn't be careful about the people on the committee and make sure that there aren't too many conflicts, that in fact the committee can get to work. This is one committee that has been carried on for a long time and it carried over from the previous government. There were delays at that time getting all the information. I think we now have to get to the point where between now and the next session this committee should finalize its work so at the next session we can proceed to make the necessary changes in legislation that need be done. There were delays as well in the course of other bills which at one time had been referred to this committee, and I think the whole process was unfortunate but it did bog down.

So I support the reappointment; I would urge that we make sure that we do not have personnel on it who cannot attend and that it get to work very early and that it set itself a target of a finalized report for the next session.

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

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

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

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 31, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, I wonder if we could have this matter stand. (Agreed.)

MR. GREEN: Bill 42, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Government Services. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I did want to have the occasion to make a few comments about Bill No. 42 and to make it perfectly clear at the outset that I have no objections to the bill as it stands. I recognize it as being primarily a matter of housekeeping and tidying up the Land Acquisition Act as it now stands, but perhaps if I could, in a moment of generosity to the members opposite and to the government of the day, indicate to them that the business of acquiring land for public purposes is one of the thorny problems that all governments face - metro governments, municipal governments, provincial governments or federal governments - and while it is often a neglected group of people that do this job, it very often has the capacity or the ability of providing, you know, the public relations image of the government, good or bad.

I believe that I had occasion to make a few remarks - I believe on a private member's resolution - about this respect, that I would have hoped that perhaps this government in their enthusiasm for mending the old ways to what they would believe to be better ways, that they would have taken that occasion on Bill 42 to take more than just a housekeeping look at Bill 42, that is the process of land acquisition, and to in fact bring the manner and the way in which land is acquired for all public purposes under a more acceptable manner, and I would suggest very humbly that this would mean - when I say acceptable, acceptable to the public at large - if the public at large were dealing with a single organization that was acquiring land for all government purposes, be it hydro or be it telephone or water control, highways and what have you.

I have had, Mr. Speaker, reason to be particularly concerned about this matter as my constituency in the last few years has been subject to fairly heavy, fairly heavy pressure in this regard. Both of the major hydro lines coming from the north, that is the line, transmission line coming from Grand Rapids dissected my constituency a few years ago. Then a year or two later the Manitoba Hydro required another right-of-way for the D.C. transmission line

(MR. ENNS cont'd.). . . . coming from the Kettle site. At the same time this was going on, major changes, additions or improvements to Highway No. 6 were going on; and at the same time some of the major drainage projects were being carried on in the south Interlake country such as the Grassmere, Sturgeon Lake to the Long Lake drains.

In other words, I've had an unusual amount of activity on the part of government or government agencies in acquiring land for public use within the constituency of Lakeside or the older constituency of Rockwood-Iberville taking place in the last little while. -- (Interjection) -- No, it's not. All I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that it's drawn very forcibly to my attention the fact, the one single fact that as far as the people are concerned, it doesn't matter whether it's Hydro or whether it's telephone or whether it's water control or whether it's highways, it's the government that's buying land. So if there is a variation in approach, even in the personnel, and I'm saying this, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest amount of respect for all the personnel involved, the personnel that's involved in purchasing land for hydro or the personnel that's involved in the purchasing of land or making the deals for the individual groups, and I have suggested - I'm trying to recall the occasion that I spoke to it, whether it was a resolution, a private member's resolution - one of the failures as far as I'm concerned was -- I know there was an effort made some four or five years ago at the time the land acquisition group was brought together to kind of bring under one roof the process of purchasing public land. We failed at that time -- (Interjection) -- Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Perhaps the member was going to come to it very shortly in any case, but it's always intrigued me that back about 1964 or '65 I seem to recall that some effort was made to coordinate all acquisition of the land or property for the Crown under the aegis of one acquisition branch, agency or whatever, and it never really came to pass although I'm prepared to admit that an effort was made. Could the honourable member advise us why it never came to pass?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to admit - because I think there are more times than perhaps the public realizes we're here in this House to try to help each other - I would suggest to the honourable member, if my memory serves me right - and I would stand to be corrected of course as the First Minister knows I was not in the House or engaged in the, you know, involved with government at that time - but to the best of my understanding we were pretty close to agreement on this but the agency perhaps most responsible for refusing to go along with this at that time was Manitoba Hydro, for reasons perhaps best known of their own. They believe that they are a corporate entity unto themselves and they honestly believe that in keeping their best public image before the people they did not want to endanger their position with the public by, you know, straightforward expropriation procedures when negotiations failed, and in fact this is really the root cause of some of the difficulty that we have; namely, that you have not the same rules applying to all cases. When the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources Department purchases land for a drainage ditch, within half a mile or on the same farm that the Manitoba Hydro at the same time is negotiating for a few acres to string a transmission line, under his department will make an offer, it will be a reasonable offer and they'll take so many steps and then they put it to expropriation if need be; admittedly the last step. The practice with Manitoba Hydro generally has been - and I'm not imputing any motives to Manitoba Hydro - but the practice of Manitoba Hydro generally has been that they will take a longer time in negotiating and very often these protracted negotiations end up in providing an extra \$25.00 an acre that a neighbour just maybe a week or a month or six months before declined or didn't get for the same kind of land from what he considers to be a government agency.

Mr. Speaker, I make these few remarks because I feel an obligation to members within my constituency that have had particularly trying times in this regard. I would suggest that the government of the day should not be fearful of attempting to succeed where we failed and that they should consider very seriously, if not on this occasion -- and as I suggested at the outset it's not my intention at all to hold up the bill. I recognize many good features in the bill - the advance on the purchase price feature that's being tidied up in the bill; agreement for disposal of excess acreage, 10 (2) of the bill; the authority to sell buildings and improvements on the bill. These are matters that I wholeheartedly endorse and concur with and would not for one moment wish to hold up this bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the honourable members opposite and to the Minister responsible that I think it is a situation that is more apparent in the rural parts of

(MR. ENNS cont'd.). . . . Manitoba where the acquisition of land is for a greater variation of purposes, as I've already mentioned - drainage ditch, highway, transmission lines and the likes of such. In the city the rights of transportation are usually, and I say usually, in the municipal hands, either with the Metropolitan Corporation or with the municipality concerned, and the improvements of transit or the improvement of transportation routes are perhaps the more normal or the more often used reasons for expropriation of private property.

I would like to leave that thought with the Honourable Minister in charge of this particular aspect of land acquisition, that there is in my opinion a very very sensitive area here of public relations that can be done by the group of people that administer the Land Acquisition Act. It's one that any government would do well to pay a great deal of attention to, possibly - and I know I don't like to suggest the unnecessary expenditure of funds - but to the point where additional personnel be considered to fully inform the farmer or the individual, the storekeeper or the town resident of what's going on. Nothing makes people more nervous than they wake up one morning and they find a bunch of surveyors out there putting flags out here and stakes up there, and of course nobody telling them what they're doing because it's not their business, that is the surveyors' business to indicate government policy or what have you.

I've had an occasion to look at least recently into the situation during my tenure with Water Control and with Highways and I've often felt that a first-rate public relations man attached to the Land Acquisition Branch - and by that I don't necessarily mean that he need be a professional in that sense - but that at least that it is recognized that it is important that there be some advance notice given, some advance effort at smoothing out the public relations given about the manner and the way government or their agencies purchase land.

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments I endorse the bill before us. There's no effort on my part to hold up its passing but we hope that perhaps in succeeding sessions, or the session immediately following, that the Minister would take to heart some of the comments that I made and would consider seriously the idea of a fairly major revamping of the business of acquiring lands for public purposes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I do not have my bill with me - I'd read it and made some notes on the one that I was going to speak on. However, I think there is some valid and worthwhile changes proposed here in connection with making advances on purchasing price. I think this is long overdue and I certainly endorse that part of the bill. I do not want to delay the passing of the bill and this is why I will have further comments to make when we deal with this matter in Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I would just like to -- I would of course be closing the debate but I don't want to preclude anyone from taking part in the debate. It appears as though no one else wishes to, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside for his contribution to the debate. I think the points that he raised are very very valid, and I want to assure him, Mr. Speaker, and the members of the House, we will be and are prepared to take a very close look at the proposition raised by the honourable member as to endeavouring to bring into one agency the matter of acquiring land for all government purposes. I'm very cognizant of the points that my honourable friend has raised insofar as proceedings are concerned with one agency being next door to the other, and it does seem that on occasions the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing to the consternation of people concerned. And I've seen this, as I say, Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions. The point of public relations and letting people know what is going on is a very very valid one and I can assure my honourable friend that the department certainly will give every consideration to that point.

I may indicate, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend from Lakeside and other members that the government is intending to introduce very very shortly a new expropriation bill which is related to the bill that we have under discussion at the present time, and I think that consideration of the expropriation bill will bring some of the points raised by my honourable friend into proper focus, to some degree, insofar as public relations is concerned, because I'm sure that we all appreciate that nothing disturbs a person more than to have government, or anyone else as far as that is concerned, come along and uproot them from their domicile or from properties that they've had sole control over, sometimes for a considerable period of time.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

So I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks made in connection with this Bill. The points raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, in my opinion, are well worthy of consideration and I want to assure him and members of this House that those matters will be given the consideration of the department and of the government.

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

MR. GREEN presented Bill No. 17, The Manitoba Natural Resources Act, for second reading.

MR. GREEN: I note, Mr. Speaker, it says on the document "Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee." I didn't read that.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this is a piece of legislation that I'm advised has been in the works for some time. The spirit behind it was to create Crown corporations under Part II of the Companies Act to enable the government to initiate enterprises essentially to be operated by people who have not somehow found employment in the natural resource development of our society for one reason or another. An example of the type of corporation which I believe is behind the spirit of this legislation is the Moose Lake Logging Company which is now being operated by the government directly, and I would think that legally the government could continue to be the direct operator of the corporations such as are contemplated by the legislation. However, it is felt that it is more advisable that any such enterprise be incorporated as a corporation under the Companies Act, that there be the flexibility of therefore dealing with the organization in terms of who may from time to time become a shareholder, whether the corporation will continue to exist as a child of the Crown or whether it can change its character. These are the areas of flexibility which I think are available by having the corporations established in this way.

I would indicate that under the Act the Crown is in a position of being able to advance monies to such corporations but this would require, it would appear to me, the approval of the Legislature. It is hoped, Mr. Speaker, that through such Crown Corporations there could be development of the human resources which have thus far not been able to take advantage of the opportunities that exist in Manitoba in such areas as fishing, wildlife, cultivation, hunting lodges and any other form of activity. I would indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is very general in its approach. In my view it's merely enabling legislation. Furthermore, it enables only such things as the Crown could do if it wished to without the setting up of a separate corporation, but it is felt that it is wiser to provide separate corporations so that the administration of them can be separate and so that the flexibility in dealing with them could be available to the government.

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

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this time, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Charleswood, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Call Bill No. 40 please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister, Bill No. 40. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is the bill on the Executive Government Organization Act and I'd like to refer to several matters contained in the bill. I noticed under the matter of rank of Ministers that the rank is according to their appointments, and I'm not sure when we received the sheet from the Information Department whether they were listed according to rank or not. Certainly if the government would care to, I would like to receive a copy of their appointment according to rank so that we would know who takes precedence.

Then also, in connection with the remuneration of Ministers, we find that power is being delegated to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to fix the remuneration of Ministers. I recall several years ago when the now present Minister of Transportation was in front of the building and protesting increases in salaries of the Ministers. I think he's forgotten that by now, at least we don't hear about it that the Ministers are being overpaid, and I feel that this is a matter that should come before the House. I don't think it should be the prerogative of the Executive

(MR. FROESE cont'd.). . . . members of government to fix their own salaries. Certainly it should be sanctioned by the members of this House. I feel that if any increases are being made that certainly they should be made in this House and not sometime in between sessions and then take effect. I feel that this particular section should definitely receive some amendment.

The next point deals with committees of Cabinet, and I recall the appointment of such committees. We have -- I think there's a Committee on Planning, I think there's another Committee on Reorganization that was set up some years ago. I don't mind having these committees but certainly I would like to get copies of the reports of these committees. So far I think they've been kept secret. I don't think they've been made known to the members of this House. We don't know along what line a reorganization is taking place or just what is being planned for the future in government, and I would feel that we at some times as members of the Legislature should have this information available to us. I certainly wouldn't object to having these committees set up from time to time as they are necessitated but I feel that we should be entitled to the information that these committees bring out.

We also know from the bill that it will be possible from here on in that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can establish and dis-establish departments and also change the names of the departments. Up until now this was done by the Legislature. This is a departure from past experience, from past practice, and I don't think that some of these things, these powers should be delegated to the Executive and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council completely. I think it is wise that these matters be referred back to the members of this House. The power to delegate, here too I wouldn't object to those sections because they still require the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or Cabinet, so I don't take exception to that.

But then we come further on and there's a matter here on commuting and remitting sentences. I haven't checked the bills that are being repealed or the Acts that are being repealed under this bill, whether this is contained in any of those bills or not, but I would be interested to hear from the First Minister or from the Minister that will answer on this bill how often has this power been used in the past and how many appeals have been made to them and is this a new power, is this a new matter that they're asking for? I think we should be advised of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, one of the sections or matters that I take exception to most is the matter of tariffs of fees. I feel that we are giving power to tax to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council under this bill and under this particular section, and I feel that any taxing powers should be allowed to the Legislature and not to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and Cabinet. I would like to place the question again here. Does this mean that from here on in none of the bills that will delegate the power of setting fees will be required to have this section in it from here on, that once it is referred to the Executive Government Organization that this would eliminate that requirement? I do hope that we get some information in this connection. I take exception to that because we find that fees are being increased practically every year. Some of these are quite heavy increases and I feel some are much beyond what increases should take place.

Those are some of the points that I wanted to raise on second reading and on principle of the bill. I was going to check the Acts that are being repealed, however I haven't done so but I intend to do that before the matter is being dealt with in committee and to check some of the powers that are being done away with under those Acts and whether all of them are retained in the present bill before us. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not support the bill. At least the support I am giving is qualified. I've raised my objections and I would like to hear from the First Minister on the various questions that I raised.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Call Bill No. 7, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 7. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In dealing with the proposed bill in front of us, Mr. Speaker, we have to realize that the change in the Municipal Act at the request of many people, and this change has not been an easy one, leaves the whole question of assessment to a new Act. Last year I was not the only one that spoke on the need for a whole new look at the question of assessment. The Member for Turtle-Mountain - the honourable member was

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.). . . . Mr. Dow - spoke quite strongly on this on two or three occasions and several other members did, and the time is long overdue for a complete look at the assessment practices in this province of Manitoba. Unfortunately, this Act does not offer that new look. In essence, this Act is just a rephrasing of the portions of The Municipal Act which dealt with assessments and were taken out and set up as this new Act. So I would ask the Minister that one of the top priorities facing us today is a complete look at the assessment practices in this province, and I would suggest that when this Act is passed that it be open for study immediately, because it is one of the foremost questions facing us.

I don't think that the study of The Assessment Act should be done just by members of the Legislature. I feel that municipal people should be involved; school board people should be involved; cities should be involved in this. I think it's too large a question for just members of the Legislature to deal with alone, and it's a big problem, a serious problem, and I think we should get on with that study as fast as possible. So when we're passing this Assessment Act now, I would ask each and every one of this Chamber to think of this. What we are doing is just a housekeeping job now. The work that has to be done in assessment has not been done and this Act will need immediate study and sincere consideration by each and every one of us in Manitoba.

This is further brought to mind by the proposed tax bill, or the White Paper on Taxation by the Honourable Mr. Benson, where the Federal Government is proposing to take an increased \$5 billion out of the taxpayers' pocket. This is going to the Federal Government. This will no doubt leave less monies available to provincial and municipal governments, and the present assessment practices leave much of the load of that revenue to be raised from antiquated practices of assessment, and I think it's essential that we look at this question immediately. Thank you very much.

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

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to close debate unless there are others who wish to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

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

..... continued on next page

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 3, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 3. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, Bill No. 57. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to read the Bill and study the consequences of this Bill, and I'm not wishing to delay it at any length. I wish to indicate, however, that in the Act the authority for purchasing in bulk is being granted to the Finance Board, and there is seemingly no compulsion to the part of the school divisions to accept the purchases of the Finance Board per se. That means that the purchases that are now being made by the school divisions that are non-capital purchases, might still - in my interpretation of this Act - continue to be done the same way. There's no compulsion upon the division to buy school supplies that are non-capital supplies through this particular Act.

One other section in the Act asks that some degree of compulsion be placed upon school divisions to submit to the Finance Board reports that are necessary for their calculations and information. I see no reason why this would not be favourable to most Manitobans because it is important that the Finance Board, in order to regulate educational financing properly, be informed, and in order to be informed they must get it from the school divisions; and therefore, again, I have absolutely no objection to this Act and I plan to support it.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. Bill No. 41. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, regarding Bill 41, I was anxious to examine the amendments proposed in order to establish whether they would have any effect on the deserted wife in her attempts to garnish the wages of a defaulting husband. At the present time, I understand that a woman in such circumstances has to garnish the man's wages separately with each pay cheque, and that it actually costs her \$25.00 on each occasion - this could be every two weeks. However, I've received advice on Section 12, which I was most interested in, and find that it is not going to make her position, this woman's position more difficult, and I have no objection to this Bill proceeding.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 58. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. CLAYDON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member, I wonder if we could have this matter stand? (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education. Bill No. 59. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the indulgence of the House to have this stand. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 60. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. CRAIK: Stand again, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 69. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Could I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, please. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 56. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand?

MR. PATRICK: The Minister just introduced the Bill last night and I'm not quite ready to go.

MR. SPEAKER: Second Readings. Bill No. 65 . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would permit me to speak on Bill No. 56?

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was on his feet. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside stated that I was an opportunist, and again I repeat that I admit to it. But as long as there's no personal gain for me and as long as I can do so honestly, I intend to take every opportunity to serve the people of my constituency and the people of Manitoba and to promote the ideals and principles that I believe in, and I believe that any politician worth his salt would do the same thing. And although tempted to do so, I will not at this time answer any other comments of the honourable member. I consider that this is too important a debate and I promise him that there will be other occasions.

I chose to speak early in the debate, Sir, so that all the members of this House and the general public will know where I stand, and will know where I stand as soon as possible.

On May 2, 1970, an article in the Winnipeg Free Press appeared with the following headline, and I'd like to quote: "Settle school problem here by sane discussion: Enns." I say, Mr. Speaker, that this should not be the only problem that should be settled by sane discussion. I don't know how the other members of this House intend to handle it, and I can't say that the preliminary discussions have been too sane, but I certainly do not intend to try to divide the people of Manitoba or to promote hate in the hearts of any of our citizens on this issue.

When I decided to support a Schreyer government, I knew that the New Democratic Party was committed to a compulsory government-sponsored auto insurance program, but I did not know exactly what kind of a program it would be. Before deciding how to cast my vote, there were some points I had to reflect on and some questions I wanted answered; and here, Mr. Speaker, are some of the points. (1) A compulsory auto insurance plan. (2) Was a change in the auto insurance set-up beneficial to the population and have the insurance companies served the people of Manitoba well in the field of auto insurance? (3) Compensation to insurance companies. (4) Government monopoly or government competing with private industry. (5) Some form of compensation for agents who might lose their livelihood.

I also had to determine what I had stood for over the years and had my principles changed, and if so to what extent. I had looked upon myself as being liberal-minded. I'd fought for equal opportunity for all. I'd felt that we should have no privileged group in society and I believe in true liberalism, that is the liberalism that is concerned with and wishes to protect individual rights.

Let us go back now to the points that I enumerated, Mr. Speaker, starting with (1), compulsory plan. I'd always been against compulsion but in this case it would be compulsory only for those who wish to drive a car and this compulsion is needed to protect and to give justice to all drivers and owners. But we need not dwell on this point too long, as it is quite clear that all members of this House, as well as insurance companies and agents, favour compulsion in this instance.

Number (2), were the people of Manitoba well served or was a change in the automobile insurance coverage needed? This is another point that was easy for me to answer, as most of us in this House would agree that some change has to be made. In fact, my information is that both the Liberal and Conservative Parties of Manitoba had been studying an insurance plan for some time now.

Number (3), compensation to insurance companies. Once again, I had no trouble with this one. Most of the companies had been claiming for years that auto insurance was not beneficial to them; in fact, that they were losing money.

Number (4), government monopoly. This point, I must admit, gave me an awful lot of trouble. When I was considering giving my support to Mr. Schreyer, I knew that I would have to compromise, and I also knew that during the campaign the New Democratic Party had promised a government-sponsored auto insurance plan; it was an election promise. But I also remembered that I had never favoured government monopoly and that I had reluctantly accepted government monopoly in the Medicare plan. And at this time, I wish to say a word about the statement of policy issued by the Liberal Party, and I would quote: "We are unalterably opposed to the establishment of a government monopoly because this would deny Manitobans freedom of choice and would destroy an existing major industry."

I might go along with this if the word "unalterably" was deleted. Let me explain, Mr. Speaker, that I don't like monopolies either. Government monopoly is ordinarily distasteful to

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) me, but other factors must be considered, such as the possibility of having a plan at all without some form of government monopoly. I suggest that the Liberal Party could well re-examine its use of the word "unalterably". Wasn't it a Liberal Government that gave us the Hospital Plan, Medicare Plan, Canada Pension Plan and many others, and these plans are certainly well-known as government monopolies. The Liberal Party might have found government monopoly to be distasteful, yes, but it certainly could not have been unalterably opposed to it if it introduced it.

The federal Liberals refused to entertain my motion that other carriers be allowed to sell Medicare insurance, and by the way, the provincial Conservatives, who formed the government at the time, voted against my resolution also. I do not consider this an unalterable principle and I submit that both the Liberals and Conservatives, when in power, had to accept the responsibility of making their legislation work and at time employed certain means normally not acceptable to them.

The members of the Conservative Party have made much noise about this. They have tried to place themselves apart from both the government and the Liberals in this House by saying that they did not favour Medicare and the rest of these plans, but Sir, this is simply not true. Not only did they introduce Medicare in Manitoba, but their friends, the Conservatives in Ottawa, all voted in favour. In fact, all the members of the House of Commons, except two members of the Social Credit Party, voted for it. I must admit that the Honourable Member for Morris and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, who were then members of the House of Commons, seemed to have missed or ducked the vote, but the following members from Manitoba, Messrs. Churchill, Dinsdale, Forbes, Mandziuk, Muir, Stefansson, all voted for the bill. In fact, Sir, the members of the federal Conservative caucus could not wait; they even introduced an amendment to change the effective date from July 1, 1968 to July 1, 1967, and I note here, Mr. Jorgenson voted in favour of this amendment.

Let's not play games. A plan does not become a Socialist plan when introduced by the New Democratic Party, nor a free enterprise plan simply when introduced by the Conservatives. It doesn't work like that. It is high time that the honourable members from Morris and especially the one from Fort Garry get off their high horse.

I'll admit that I would much prefer to start with a compulsory plan but let the industry operate it. Then, if after a few years it is found that it is not improving, then the government could take it over. I admit right now that I would much prefer this, and I admit that by accepting this point, the point that I'm talking about now, this is one of the compromises that I would be making to remain with the government caucus in order that other priorities that I have can become realities, and I admit that it is difficult for me to accept, but I would not be ready to cause an election on this point. I could accept the decision of the government caucus of which I, after all, accepted to be a member. As I said earlier, the New Democratic Party during the last election campaign had stated that it would bring in a government-sponsored plan, and it is obvious that it is ready to stand or fall on this with or without me. This is indeed a difficult compromise for me to make, but it is not a question of conscience, Mr. Speaker. Therefore I could accept this point and would be ready to accept full responsibility for my actions.

Let me quote from a speech that I delivered to my supporters last July 8th after having made a certain decision. "My friends, I have no illusions that my task will be an easy one. I will have to respect the caucus secrets and solidarity of the government. You will not always know the fights I will put up in caucus because I do not intend to be unfair with Mr. Schreyer's government. I know that I will not always win every point and I do not intend to take my bat and ball and go home if I can't always have my own way. I'll have to swallow my pride, and I know that the members of the Conservative opposition will be waiting, eager to jump on me. The members of the Liberal Party, my friends, people I have worked with for many years, might even decide to nail me to the wall. And what is worse, although you might give me a vote of confidence today, at times you might even have your doubts."

Mr. Speaker, if you wish to imagine what went on in caucus and the part I took when this point was discussed, it is your right to do so but I'm not at liberty to divulge caucus discussions.

And now the last point, my last point, Point Number (5), if the government had a monopoly, should there be some form of compensation for the agents? This is also an easy point for me to answer. There is no way that my conscience would permit me to say, "To hell with these people; let them take care of themselves." Without revealing what happened in caucus, I think that you can be reasonably sure that this is something I argued for, and I can assure

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) you now that I'm committed to this principle. On this, Mr. Speaker, there can be no compromise. No matter what, this to me is a question of conscience and I believe it is the same with the First Minister and many others. But if there has not been a clear declaration of intent to do so made in this House by the First Minister himself, between now and third reading of this bill, I will have no alternative but to oppose the bill on third reading.

Again let me quote a paragraph from the speech, the same speech, to my supporters. "It was often said that I was an enemy of radical socialism. It was true and it is true, and if there are any radicals, any radical socialists in the New Democratic Party, and there might be, well then no doubt they will try to change my mind, to orient me to their way of thinking; but what in the hell do you think I'll be doing? The New Democratic caucus, knowing all this, is still ready to accept me as a full member of its caucus."

Mr. Speaker, if I'm ready to compromise on the question of monopoly and compulsion, it is because I place people above every other consideration of public policy, and for the same reason I cannot compromise on the last point. I might even say that if I was responsible for this plan, and if this plan was to be a compulsory plan and the government was to go into the business, if these two points were predetermined - now you understand, if these two points were decided - well then I would not allow anyone else to compete - and I might be shocking people here - because I say that it should be strictly a public plan if the government is going to go in.

I believe that the government lacks a bit of courage in this respect. If no carriers were allowed in the Manitoba Medicare Plan to make it more effective, it stands to reason that an auto insurance plan would be much more effective with only the one carrier. The government is leaving itself open to all sorts of complaints and the plan will not be half as effective, simply because it feels that politically it would be more palatable if the industry is not killed outright. I'm ready to face the music on this. I can't see why the government isn't. This is also being cruel to the agents, by leaving them have a few crumbs, and this is all that they will be left with. Take them over completely now, if you really believe in this plan, I say to the government. But then compensate them for their losses, even if there should be no saving of cost of premiums for a few years, for ten years if need be. Eventually you would have a cheaper plan and, according to you, better service but you would have considered all the people of Manitoba. Certainly the agents would still be the losers but at least none of them would lose their homes or go into debt for something they no longer have, and if they are as creative and aggressive as they say they are, they would at least have a chance to readjust.

I am disappointed, Sir, in some of the members of the government side, and their attitude has disturbed me greatly. This is the biggest hang-up of all, the biggest hang-up that I have on this bill. They are supposed to be humanitarian but you can practically feel that they have very little concern for the agents, and for that matter for anyone who has made a success of the business. I reject this attitude completely. And I know that it is not the attitude of most of the members of the government. I admire the people who came here as a delegation a few weeks ago and, contrary to the Member from Elmwood, I was impressed. It was an orderly demonstration; they had a message to give us and they did it democratically. They have as much right to express their feelings as any member of any union has during a strike. And if this government wants to stay in power, and certainly if it wants to keep me on its side, it will have to try to be representative of all our people.

Now, if the government was to follow my suggestion, it would serve all the people, the different classes of people. It would be criticized, the same as I expect to be, but it would know that it was fair, that it had been fair. And more important perhaps, it would establish a pattern. It would not make it as easy to nationalize certain businesses if these people have to be expropriated, in a manner of speaking. The small businessman would not live in constant fear of thinking maybe he'll be next, and immigrants would buy the statement that Manitoba can still be a land of opportunity. And the prophets of gloom on the other side would not be able to scare the public, because the public would believe in you and would know that it is not your intent to nationalize every business for the sake of socialism.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that my speech will be criticized. This is why, as I said, I spoke early in the debate to give my opponents a chance to get at me, to know where I stand now. But let them be fair and not misrepresent what I said here today. Let them not say that I haven't made up my mind, that I don't know what side I'm on; if I have the courage to explain my position as clearly as I've tried to, that is that I'll support the government on a

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) compulsory government-operated plan, even if it doesn't allow the industry to compete, providing there is satisfactory compensation. But without compensation, or at least a clear commitment, my vote on third reading will certainly be negative. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have three questions to ask the honourable member. They are not related and I wonder if I . . . deal with them first. This is not meant in terms of entering the debate, but I may ask how he reconciles his statement - and before doing this may I suggest that I'm probably touching a sensitive area; it's not for the purpose of touching a sensitive area that he would be concerned with, but for the purpose of at least clearing the principle that he's enunciated today - how would he reconcile the principle that he has expressed today with the right of a parent who has freedom of choice to have their child taken out of the public school system and to be educated in a private school?

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't quite get the question. Maybe you'll have to explain yourself. I certainly feel that there should be parental rights in education, if this is what you are getting at.

MR. SPIVAK: My question again to the honourable member is that there is freedom of choice in connection with education where a child does not have to take the public school system. He in fact, at a cost, can go to a private school. Now how does he reconcile that principle with the lack of freedom of choice for automobile insurance as a result of a government monopoly?

MR. DESJARDINS: First of all, the education of a child is a question of conscience. This is something that you don't play around with, and this is not the same thing at all. This is the -- (Interjection) -- Just a minute. I'll answer all your questions but one at a time. I feel that as far as I'm concerned that you cannot . . .

ROYAL ASSENT

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly at its present Session has passed several bills which, in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these bills.

MR. DEPUTY CLERK: Bill No. 4 - an Act to amend The Chartered Accountants Act.

No. 20 - an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Cooperative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.

No. 33 - an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Portage Industrial Exhibition Association.

No. 45 - an Act to incorporate Seven Oaks General Hospital.

No. 46 - an Act to incorporate Club de Golf St. Malo.

No. 55 - an Act to incorporate The Investors Group.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

GOVERNMENT BILLS (Cont'd)

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I was endeavouring to answer the question when His Honour appeared. I'm saying there is no doubt that I believe in parental rights in education. I don't see where the comparison is too close. For compulsion, I think that all the members of this House feel as I do, or maybe not all feel as I do but I think that everybody is agreeable that we should have compulsion, because the Leader of the Opposition stated that yesterday, that there should be compulsion; that's the first thing, and members of the insurance and so on. But I think that the honourable member is talking about the choice of where to buy your insurance. I think this is it. And I'll say this: that I've always fought for the freedom of the individual also. That doesn't mean that a man is free to throw a rock in somebody else's window, because by this freedom he's stepping on somebody else's freedom. Now I stated very clearly - I'm not hiding behind anything - that if it was my way I would prefer making it compulsory, changing the laws and saying to the insurance companies, "Now go ahead. You see what you can do. If it can't work we're going to step in. But, and if there's no other chance it's the only way that it's going to work for the good of everybody; you need certain social reforms." And I said the same thing . . . on the other side. And my friends, I've tried to show you in my speech, voted for this when they voted for Medicare, and I am the one that brought the amendment asking that other carriers be considered and this was refused. -- (Interjection) -- You asked me your question, now wait for my answer! And all the members on this side that were here voted against it.

MR. SPIVAK: My second question to the honourable member - I wonder if he can give us an opinion as to whether he's satisfied with the way the present government has executed its obligation to give compensation to the fish processing industry, who became redundant as a result of the operation of the Fish Marketing Board.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not too aware of this. I don't know exactly what is happening. I intend to find out. But if you remember, in committee, or even in this House in third reading - and I'll dig that one up too - I'm the only one that talked about that. Nobody from that side of the House -- and I'll dig that out too, Mr. Speaker, if you want.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, just as a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I think you'll find that I introduced the amendment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't believe that the honourable member has a point of privilege at this time.

MR. SPIVAK: The third question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do not believe that at this stage the honourable member has a point of privilege in asking a member for clarification of points made in the course of debate.

MR. SPIVAK: The third question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the honourable member can tell this House that he is satisfied, based on all the facts and figures that have been presented to him, that the government monopoly, if compensation is given or without compensation, will in fact insure a 15 to 20 percent saving to the people of Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: That, Mr. Speaker, I can't answer. I've been dealing with principle more than anything else. I hope that the government, during the debate on this bill and in third reading, will be able to show that it can show this saving. If not, the only thing that I said on this question of if the people are not compensated, I will not vote in favour of this. There's no way that I can. I don't like some of the other things; I accept it to be a member of the, not of the New Democratic Party caucus but of the government caucus, and therefore, as I said, there was a question of -- there was a lot of things, there was an awful lot of things that this government has done that I like, but like any members I'm sure that you don't all agree on everything. There's certain things - and I say so openly - that I don't like, but it doesn't only work one way. You don't just take and take and then run away whenever the going gets rough. I'm going to be blamed; I'm going to be criticized; I'll accept these responsibilities because I still believe that this government has given us an awful lot of good legislation.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the comments I have only one other question. Will the honourable member be in a position to tell us that in the event the government does not prove either to his satisfaction, prove that there is a saving of 15 or 20 percent, is he still prepared to vote for the bill? Well, the honourable members will come . . . there is no proof of any saving other than the statements that have been made -- (Interjection) -- Yes. My question to the honourable member is that he indicates he does not have the facts at this point. If facts are not presented which would show the saving of 15 to 20 percent, is he still prepared to vote for the bill?

MR. DESJARDINS: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that this Bill, if passed, will go to committee, and it's not going there just for no reason at all, it's there to find out certain things. I will be listening as much as any other members and the information will be given to me as well as anybody else and then I'll decide with my own conscience, without being put on trial here today, because I'm one fellow with one vote. I'll decide what I'm going to do at the time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I listened intently to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface's remarks on Bill 56. I don't know why the other side of the House -- and I say that in all respect to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, beyond the other side of the House I know the remarks he was making -- keep referring to other bills which are consistently related to federal policy. If you want to really talk about Medicare, you talk about the amount of money that was taken out of this province by the Federal Government and wouldn't be put back in the province unless we had a Medicare program; you talk about the plans that were presented to Ottawa by the government at that time that were turned down and what have you; but to relate automobile insurance, the Bill that we have in front of us at the present time, to Medicare, is not really relevant. It's not going to be something that is going to be a good argument in this House because it's just not there.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would let me just make a correction? I'm not relating auto insurance, I'm relating "monopoly". I think this is comparable; this is what I'm talking about.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, again I repeat, that the Federal Government said You don't get the money back unless the plan is satisfactory to us and it had to be put in in that respect.

I also like to say to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface that he has got concern for the agents of this province, that he says he demands compensation; and if it takes 10 years for the plan to pay if we give compensation he's willing to go along with that. Really I don't think that's a very good argument at this time to say that if it takes 10 years for it to be paid back, that the compulsory automobile insurance plan of this province would take that long to be paid back or start to make money, is what the words are, is a very good argument at all. It's known for a fact that the Saskatchewan Government plan has lost money on many years, so if you could double your 10 years into 20 years - and I say to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface that if he agrees with a compulsory government insurance plan in the Province of Manitoba, I say to him he's given up everything he's stood for for many many years and he ought to think it over a lot more thoroughly.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs Howard "in Saskatchewan" Pawley, stood up last night and we got a statement that was basically "in Saskatchewan, in Saskatchewan, in Saskatchewan". He went along continually, he said we sat for two or three years, 2 1/2 years is the time that he keeps mentioning that the government spent on insurance committees, etc. This is probably quite true. They spent two years; it was brought in for the third time, it was elected for the third time in 1969. That committee had sat for two years, slightly over two years. They were waiting for the Wootton Report to come in from B. C. so it could be studied, etc. But the Honourable Minister fails to say that the minute the government changed, he eliminated the committee completely and set up a committee that was comprised of himself, the man who set up the government insurance in Saskatchewan and two others. This is the type of -- (Interjection) -- well, thank you, -- democracy we're speaking of; but this is the type of information that we have been getting. The information that we have been getting from the honourable member and the people of this committee are strictly their opinions of what went on in Saskatchewan.

He mentions reports in United States. I say to the government at the present time I can pick up reports from all over United States which clearly state the insurance problems in United States, but I say to you this, the insurance problems in United States are far greater than in Canada. The insurance companies in Canada are regulated by an Insurance Act and the insurance companies in Canada provide a lot more than many insurance companies do in United States and they do it because there is regulation, there's superintendents of insurance which do not exist in United States. You know, any of us can pick up a report. You know, I can find a lot of reports on pollution; I can find a lot of reports on anything that are bad so why not start reading some of the good ones.

MR. TURNBULL: Why don't you.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, I have. If you'd like to come and read some of them, fine. I'm sure you haven't read the good ones.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister also keeps talking about Saskatchewan didn't get out of the plan. The Liberal Government came into Saskatchewan and they didn't get out of the plan. Never once has he ever mentioned why they got in the plan. Back in 1946 I think there was probably in the whole province about 300,000 people or 400,000 people. There was no industry in Saskatchewan; there was no insurance in Saskatchewan and it became necessary, there was no industry there and it became necessary for the Saskatchewan Government to go into an automobile plan.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, come on! Give us the facts!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It's absolutely true; it's true. Give us another reason. That's the very fact. They went into an automobile insurance plan, they worked on it and the Province of Manitoba during that time built an industry, built an exceptionally good industry, and at no time, if the Minister wants to argue about it - he gives me comparisons of rates that go on in Saskatchewan, he continually does this and he continually gives us rates that are always higher, and in the same breath he admits that probably there are rates that are lower if we want to look at our books. We couldn't get into an argument on rates but I would ask him sincerely if he checked with the insurance companies and insurance agents before he quoted the rates he quoted last night to see if there were any better in this province because I tell you this, there are. But we didn't get those quotations from him.

MR. SCHREYER: Will you permit a question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No. No. Mr. Speaker, my figures are not 100 percent wrong. Mr. Speaker, I would only say to the First Minister if he wants to continue with his question, does he know any more than I do about insurance? Do you know any more about insurance than the insurance industry in Manitoba? Answer it.

MR. SCHREYER: The honourable member has given me an opportunity to ask him a question. I would ask him, does he realize that the population figures he gave are exactly 100 percent incorrect? They happen to be 100 percent incorrect. He said three to four hundred thousand population. It was 800,000. If his other figures are no more accurate than that there isn't much point in listening.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I will admit if my figures are no more accurate than that, I suggest that the honourable minister's figures on insurance are no more accurate than what I have here. And I agree with you; I will grant the correction of the Honourable First Minister; if there was 800,000 people. Fine. But they had many more miles of roads. And I'll tell you this, Regina wasn't more than about 80,000 people and neither was Saskatoon and the people were spread out continually all over the province and there was no way you could put an industry in there satisfactory and the Saskatchewan Government had to do it. And I don't blame them for not doing it. But I'll tell you one thing they did. They really grew; and now for the Honourable Minister I would say they really grew. I would say that they have done a fantastic job with insurance but they don't offer anything better than the Government of Manitoba, the gumples in Manitoba. Not one thing better do they offer.

The rates that have been quoted and what have you, I assure you that there is a situation where the young driver, the young driver does pay a penalty in the Province of Manitoba. There is a situation whereby at times when a man has children driving under 25 that he pays probably 10 or 15 dollars more than he pays in Saskatchewan. And you may argue that. -- (Interjection) -- Fine. Fine. I say that your tables are wrong. Prove mine wrong. But anyway -- (Interjection) -- That's fine. Prove mine wrong. -- (Interjection) -- Okay I've only said, Prove mine wrong. All we've got is the Minister's say so and he hasn't yet stood up and said did he consult with the insurance companies and agents of this province before he quoted those figures last night? That's all I'm asking.

Now we turn around and we say that the Province of Saskatchewan has a very good plan, but they're not that much better. But it's a funny thing, it's a funny thing, Mr. Speaker, that here we have a government that stood up on Medicare and says we're going to use the ability-to-pay concept. We say those who earn more will pay more. That's what he said. -- (Interjection) -- Yes. Fine. Well doesn't it stand to reason that those who have more accidents will pay a little more? Is this the driving ability? Are you going to put it all across one person or are you going to say the good driver and all of this is going to pay more now to pay for the bad driver? That's what you're basically saying.

MR. GREEN: Should the sick person pay more than the healthy person?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Socialism. That's all I say to you. The only answer I have for the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources is Socialism. The only answer I have for you.

All right. So where was it; where is this great ability-to-pay concept or the people that have the most accidents. Let me tell the honourable minister this, and prove me wrong, 75 percent of the people in Manitoba can purchase automobile insurance cheaper or as cheaply as can be purchased in Saskatchewan. The driver, the driver with cars, the people that are driving cars under the 25 year mark and the people that are businessmen are going to make up the other 25 percent - and there's a little bit of a statistic here. The boy or girl that owns a car, 16 to 17 - out of every 100 policies bought, 23.6 have accidents to the tune of \$800.00 on an average. The man in the 75 percent group I'm speaking of, out of 100 policies bought, seven percent have accidents to the tune of maybe \$600.00. So what are we talking about? Now I agree Jim, I agree Jim, I know what I'm talking about. I'm saying the teenage driver has a pretty bad time in Manitoba, but if you're going to lower his rates, you're going to raise somebody else's. And you fellows just don't agree with that. You haven't got the ability to agree with the fact that if you're going to let anything lose money, it's got to come from the people and one of these days, one of these days you're going to find out, you're going to find out the hard way that the money just isn't there. It's just a continual subsidy type of thing. The 85 percent figure that he says goes back into the province; you know, this is quite a figure

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) in itself.

In my own little research, I don't know whether I'm right or wrong, I ask the Minister to prove me wrong. In Saskatchewan they estimate 85 percent, but that can change any time at all if they have more or less accidents. If it goes to 90 percent then their 15 percent overhead becomes 105 percent, they've lost five percent, and what do they do the next year? The rates go up. They compensate any losses, and the Saskatchewan Government Insurance has many losses and the rates go up continually. And it's right here. Get your little blue books out, all of you. You've probably all got them over there. Your little blue books all show you right through for the last five years, Saskatchewan Government has gone up. -- (Interjection) -- right, right. So the 12 percent . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . have gone up here too.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: So the Minister is talking about -- (Interjection) -- you're going to get increase next year in Saskatchewan Government Insurance because their accident rate goes up as their cities get bigger, there it is.

MR. GREEN: Nobody said you wouldn't get an increase.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Do you argue with the fact that several insurance companies, put out by the Superintendent of Insurance 1968, the Province of Manitoba, has two or three or five or maybe ten companies in here; in 1967 and 1968 returned as high as 90 percent. One of them returned as high as 122 percent? And you're telling me, you're telling me that Saskatchewan Government is fixed at 85 percent! There's no way you can fix it. And by God the only way you can say you can fix it is because you have no knowledge of business. It's as simple as that.

The only knowledge you've got of the whole insurance industry is what has been given you to you by a man who started the insurance industry in Saskatchewan, and to my knowledge is making about \$26,000 a year presently in the Province of Manitoba; and I say this to that government, if that man ends up in a job with the Manitoba Government Insurance Corporation after he wrote the report, to say that it should be compulsory insurance, I think you've got a lot to answer for and you should search your conscience about it. -- (Interjection) --

Let's take another reason why the Saskatchewan people didn't get out of it. The Saskatchewan Government all of a sudden found that they had an insurance business going along and they found that there wasn't that much more of a benefit between Manitoba and Saskatchewan. So they say to themselves, well, we would like to get out of it, we can't get out of it, we can't see many more benefits, and actually if the private companies come in they could probably do more for the people.

But I'll tell you what the Saskatchewan Government had, Mr. Speaker. They had a lot more heart than the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the First Minister, because they didn't want to see five or six hundred people out on the street, and this is the same type of thing that we are getting right here. You're taking an industry, and he argues, there's 1300 more insurance agents in this province. Oh, he says, they don't all sell just automobile insurance. Well come down to my constituency, Mr. Minister; come down and answer to a man whose 40 or 50 percent of his income is automobile insurance and tell me where he's going to live after you take that away from him. Come down and tell me what you're going to say to a man who has been 25 years in a business, or 15 years in a business, that has to go out on the street or go to another province and find a job or find a job in Manitoba, and probably without an NDP card. I'll tell you -- (Interjection) -- And now, Mr. Honourable Minister of Labour, you ought to be ashamed of yourself, because I say to you this, for the better part of the Honourable Minister of Labour's life he's fought for people, you know, and I've always admired him for it. He stood up and he fought for people in this province from the day one; and there aren't many Manitobans who don't realize it. And he says to me, "What about the railroads that are paid off?"

The Honourable Minister in his statement last night turned around and made the statement, who cared when there was automation and people were laid off. And you're saying, you're almost saying because it happened then, you seem to have some malice in you that you want to have it happen again. The Honourable Minister of Labour has more responsibility to the workers, the typists, the girls that work in insurance offices, the men that work in printing rooms, the men that work making paper clips, the janitors who sweep the offices, and what have you. And what have you done? You should be camping on his damn doorstep every day, every day of your life. You, the man who fought for people in Manitoba; I say something has

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) gone to your head since you got on that side of the House, let me tell you. Now you want to turn around and you want to talk about labour, you want to talk about the 4,000 people, the girls and boys, one or two agents support three people. -- (Interjection) -- Yes. All right. How would you like to be part of a typewriter company that sells them typewriters? This is killing of an industry. This is a \$30 million industry that you're killing in Manitoba right now for no reason at all, and we don't need this unemployment. Socialism is all I say to you. All I can ever say is bunk.

MR. PAULLEY: Poppycock. Absolute poppycock.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Bunk socialism. The Minister of Labour can keep talking poppycock, and when he said poppycock to me when I first came in this House or ever listened to him five years ago, I respected him, but I'm damn well not respecting him on this. It's as simple as that.

MR. GREEN: What a phoney.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Now Mr. Speaker, the NDP government comes along and they say, oh very nicely, oh, very nicely, this is just the most marvelous thing they've ever come across for the people of Manitoba. Compulsory government insurance, and I say, I say that I would remind my friend from Lakeside has asked the question and said, "Is not compulsory government insurance a socialist action?" Nobody has ever given him an answer. Why don't you give him an answer to that? -- (Interjection) -- I told you about Medicare.

MR. DESJARDINS: They don't like that.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Larry, please.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's the same thing and you know it.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from St. Boniface thrives on the fact that he just chatters away when people are speaking, and if I talk back to him it would only get him up and have him make another speech, and I really don't want that. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, will you inform the member I'll buy him lunch tomorrow and we'll have a little talk about it. No problem at all.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Larry, you're invited for lunch. Please, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I really don't know how big I've got to make the bones. I've asked him to shut up; I've bribed him by lunch and what have you. Please, be quiet. That's all there is to that.

Now you bring out a bill. Oh you bring out a dandy bill. You bring out a bill and the honourable minister says part of his bill is, you know, the decisions. The decisions, he says, are made in the board rooms of insurance companies and we're going to fight that - in Toronto or some place. Yet the bill says the decision will be made in the caucus room down the hall down here - in the Cabinet room down the hall; sorry, Cabinet room. A quorum of Cabinet will make all the decisions. I'd like to ask the backbenchers over there and the honourable members who've been elected by people of this province, how they feel about that.

MR. BOYCE: Wonderful.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I'll tell you how I feel about it. Wonderful? I hope it's recorded. Say it louder please, Bud.

MR. BOYCE: Wonderful.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Fine. Now we've got it on record. You think it's wonderful that the people elect you and you have no say in the regulation of insurance.-- (Interjection) -- Yes, the people have a say. But oh, that's not the way the bill reads. That's not the way the bill reads. Say it. "It's wonderful that I have no say in the regulations of insurance." That's absolutely marvelous, really. I really couldn't go back to my constituency of Sturgeon Creek and tell them that I feel good about not having any decision about the regulations as an elected member. They'll tell me. They'll tell me it came from down the hall - seven men or whatever quorum is as far as the government is concerned. The Saskatchewan people, the Saskatchewan wrote regulations and passed a bill - you know, right in here. Everything you want as far as regulations are concerned about government insurance.

MR. GREEN: Would you vote for that bill?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No. But I'll tell you this, Mr. Minister. It says compulsory automobile insurance that I wouldn't vote for in any way shape or form, but I can at least . . .

MR. GREEN: It doesn't matter what the bill says. You wouldn't vote for it anyway.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's right. That's right. But I'll tell you this; there is no discussion with you fellows. There is absolutely no discussion. It's coming from down the hall.

MR. GREEN: A week ago you were saying there's too much discussion.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Oh, don't give me that nonsense.

MR. GREEN: A week ago, the Member from Fort Garry said we were discussing it all over . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, all the members from the other side of the House - you know, I sometimes know that, I feel that the honourable fellows sitting up in the back benches there, they get up and they have something to say now and then and time and again and what have you, but it's pretty well decided right now; it doesn't matter what they say, the decisions of this government are made in the Cabinet. It's just as simple as that. And they've spelled it out - they've spelled it out.

Now let's just get down to a little matter again where we've got the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. You know, this is the man that's supposed to build up cities. This is the man that I asked in the first session, I said, "Really your responsibility is to the cities and municipalities. You're their representative in the government. You're the man that's supposed to work for them." Most of his time has been spent with the kangaroo court on automobile insurance, the pollution problems, everything that goes with it, and here's the man that is supposed to -- he should be camping right down on the First Minister's door step saying, "You can't do that to Wawanesa. You can't do that to Portage la Prairie. You can't hurt the people in the City of Winnipeg. You can't kill an industry." But no. What does he do? But the funny part of it is, Mr. Speaker, he goes out the other night and he fights like hell for Selkirk could they get a fish plant, but he doesn't give a damn about Wawanesa. This is a minister that is completely concerned with his own damn constituency. "In Selkirk Pawley" - that's about what it works out. No shame. No shame. He did it; it's on the record.

MR. GREEN: Do you want the fish plant in Wawanesa?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, there are times that you probably feel that every time I get up to speak that I get worked up, you know, and I really don't want to leave that impression. I really don't want to leave that impression. But there's nothing, there's nothing going to kill this province more than the government walking into automobile insurance and other businesses. The province can't support it. The province can't support it. All right. To the honourable member over there - what are you going to do? Have you got anybody over in your constituency or in your parish that might be out of work over this, and what are you going to say to them?

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): They will not. They'll get jobs.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: They will not. They'll get jobs, eh? I think that you above anybody else should have a lot more concern than you may have for people that are out of work.

Mr. Speaker, all I'm saying is this. You can't let the Minister kid you on the fact that oh, nobody will be hurt; they're left with fire insurance. The fire insurance policy on the average house, \$110.00 for 3 years and what have you. The Automobile Insurance is probably the living of 500 men. Those 500 men support about 1,200 people in offices. The insurance companies who are working in the province are supporting people who are working for them. Then again you have the men who have other types of insurance, that may have 30 to 40 percent of their income cut off. And it'll happen. Well come on out to my constituency, Mr. Minister; I'll introduce you to a few. -- (Interjection) -- I'll come to yours. I know where your constituency is and I'll introduce you to a few there. Let me tell you . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. There is a rule in this House that if a member wishes to make himself heard, there's only one seat from which he can make an attempt to do so.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I'd like to thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's probably why I get worked up quite often the way I do. But I'd like to go back now, Mr. Speaker, and I'd just again like to read the -- I'd like to read the -- (Interjection) -- the Dark Ages. Mr. Speaker, I'd love to go back to the dark ages that the Honourable Minister of Labour used to believe in. You know, I really would. When he was concerned about people more than he is in this issue.

Mr. Speaker, we've read the rules; the record was read, it's been read in - \$30 million industry. Investment of Manitoba. Insurance companies are controlled by the Investment Act of the Federal Government. They have to invest money. But the provincial government insurance, they won't have to invest any money in the province. They don't have to do a damn thing. It's all run down there in the Cabinet room. And it is. The bill says so. How many of you read the bill in the back bench? -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that's right. It's pretty obvious not many of you have.

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to close now because my blood pressure really can't take an awful lot more, but I'd like to say this. There's a little quote that seems to have been around for years that the Progressive Conservative government doesn't believe in, but it's very obvious that the government on the other side of the House firmly believes in the statement that goes like this: "Ours is not to question why - ours is but to do or die." Thank you.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if the honourable member would allow me to give him a couple of questions? -- (Interjection) -- It's up to you. I think the honourable member said that it was understandable why this compulsory monopoly form of insurance plan was brought in in Saskatchewan, that there was nothing else they could do. In other words, he's saying then that it is not an unalterable principle, that on certain times it is all right. I wonder if he could tell this to the member that asked me a question because that's exactly the question I was asked. And now, I wonder if he can show me why he feels that it's perfectly all right to have compulsion and monopoly on a plan brought in by his party but the same compulsion or monopoly is socialism and is wrong if it's brought in by members of the New Democratic Party. How can he justify himself in saying that?

MR. BILTON: What are you referring to?

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm referring to Medicare. And I'm not comparing Medicare to auto insurance; I'm comparing compulsion and monopoly and one carrier in one with the other.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, I'm getting a lot of advice back and forth from my own side here and what have you, but I only go back and I say to you this, the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, that the Federal Government had a plan that basically took millions of dollars out of this province and it had to come back into this province on a medical plan. And I know that you were one that made an amendment, but also the previous government went down with a plan that was completely thrown out and there had to be another plan put together, and I don't say anything against the honourable member for making the amendment that he made - and I can't look it up right now but he explained that he did it and I give him credit for it - but you cannot compare going into compulsory automobile insurance with Medicare. There is an industry here now.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . is he aware that -- he seems to think that the former government had no choice. Does he know all his federal friends voted on this? You don't like that, fellows. You don't like -- that's a question: does he know - it's a very good question - how his honourable members voted? If not, I can show him. They wanted it one year before. You don't like that, eh?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I want to make something plain to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, that I made plain to the Honourable Member from St. Matthews and a few other honourable members over on that side of the House. I'll disagree with who I want to disagree with any time, any place, anywhere, and I don't agree with that, and that's all there is to it.

MR. DESJARDINS: You also call socialist those that you want to call socialist when it's good for you to call them.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I never called anybody a socialist if he wasn't a socialist.

MR. DESJARDINS: You haven't got the guts to be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member submit to a couple of questions from me?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm just wondering if the honourable member supports those colleagues of his in the federal House who voted for the Canada Pension Plan, which would have and did put a number of people who sell life insurance and pension plans out of income? Does he support that?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, what was the date of that Canada Pension Plan?

MR. CHERNIACK: I believe it was 1965. Does that help the honourable member?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: In 1965 I was not as close to government as I am now. I'm not too sure whether I would have or wouldn't have, but I can assure you of this, that I would be very careful as to people that went out of work. I had no part of a vote. And Mr. Speaker, it gets a little boring answering questions as to whether I'd agree with the federal members or not.

MR. GREEN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would permit me a question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, entirely without reference to the honourable members, do I take it from the honourable member that -- (Interjection) -- yes, I'm asking the question. Is the honourable member telling us that if he had it to do, if he were the government, he would not have put in the Hospitalization program, the Medicare program and the Canada Pension Plan program?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I give him credit for a better question than that. You know, that has got to be the most leading lawyer type question that wants yes or no that I've ever heard in my life, and you're not going to get an answer.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm . . . the honourable member that if he had the power in the years, that those programs would not have come into existence.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I'll answer the question this way, and anybody else that wants to ask me one about federal plans or anything like this, and I'd . . . up by this. There is no reason, and you'll hurt this province, and there's no way that I'll agree with a compulsory automobile insurance plan in the Province of Manitoba. Fine. Let's leave it at that.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the honourable member if he will -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if I could ask the honourable member a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I understand that the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek will allow the question. I wonder if he would indicate, because I think there may be some misunderstanding of the remarks he's made, whether he would accept the principle of compulsion for a child to attend school up to a certain age?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to take that question as notice.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, having asked the question, may I then address a second question? On the assumption that you . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . .

MR. SPIVAK: I have a question that I'd . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: The honourable member said no.

MR. SPIVAK: No, he said he'd take . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I heard him say no.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, let me explain something, that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said that the insurance agents of Manitoba were redundant . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. On a point of order. I was watching carefully. The Honourable Member for River Heights said, "I wonder if I could ask a second question" and the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek clearly said, "No." And I just wanted to make sure that the Honourable Member for River Heights wouldn't transgress the rules of the House. I wanted him to be aware of that.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder - and I'll ask the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek. Would you yield to another question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. SPIVAK: Accepting the principle of compulsion for a child to attend school, I wonder if the honourable member would agree -- (Interjection) -- Yes, well he took it as notice -- but on the assumption that there would be acceptance of the . . . Does the honourable member . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, can we not have order in this House? I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, can we not have order in this House on a question, a reasonable question which the member back here cannot hear?

MR. SPEAKER: If we have a state of affairs where . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: I can't even hear the question here for the static that's coming from over there . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. MCKENZIE: . . . and I have no idea of the answer, and I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MCKENZIE: . . . to get some order in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When we have a situation where we have only one member on his feet there'll be much better opportunity to have order.

MR. MCKENZIE: I appeal to you . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the assumption that there is an acceptance by him of the principle of compulsion for a child to go to school, does the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek agree with the principle of freedom of choice of the individual as to whether he attends the public school system or attends a private school?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: -- (Interjection) -- No I'm afraid I can't take that as notice. Look, let's make it plain to the Honourable Member from River Heights and to the government, that I am not opposed to compulsory insurance any more than I am opposed to compulsory education at certain ages. I am opposed to government monopoly run compulsory insurance and I am for freedom of choice, any way shape or form.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Oh there's an adjournment in the name of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

A MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, The Honourable Member for Wolseley . . .

MR. CLAYDON: Oh no. Has he got the adjournment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. CLAYDON: No I want to adjourn it. -- (Interjection) -- Oh well you take the adjournment then.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, while this is going on, on a point of order. I believe we should remind you that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia has asked that the debate be held in his name.

MR. SPEAKER: It is -- I'm waiting for some semblance of silence in the House.

MR. FROESE: . . . to stand?

MR. SPEAKER: It had been agreed to some time ago. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I note that there is five minutes left. Perhaps it would be a good time to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 5:30. The House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.