

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, June 11, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources beg leave to present the following as their Second Report. Your Committee has considered, among other matters: Bill No. 38, an Act to amend The Water Control and Conservation Branch Act, and has agreed to report the same without amendment. All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

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

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point, I should like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have with us 40 Grades 7 and 8 students of the Gouling School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Campbell, Mrs. Richards, Mrs. Watts, Mrs. Kenny and Miss Shwaluk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli.

Also, there are 90 Grade 6 students from the Angus McKay and Snow Lake Schools. Angus McKay School is the host school, and all students are under the direction of Mr. Bennett, Mr. Henther and Mrs. Brown, all from the host school. Angus McKay School is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, Snow Lake School is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

And 80 Grade 6 students from Athlone School, Ste. Rose Elementary School and Flin Flon Elementary School. Athlone School is the host school. All students are under the direction of Mr. Groff, Mrs. Giraedin and Miss Young from the host school. Athlone School is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, Ste. Rose School is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and Flin Flon School is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here this afternoon.

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

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask leave of the House to move one bill, a Private Members' Bill, from the Private Members' Committee to the Law Amendments Committee. I ask if I may have leave to do this.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): We have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has leave? (Agreed)

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, that, by leave, Bill No. 48, an Act to incorporate Souris Golf and Country Club, now referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library, be withdrawn and referred to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

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

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and ask him if a decision has been made regarding the amount of compensation that will be paid to insurance agents in the event that the government bill will displace them.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) matter of compensation paid insurance agents is presently under review and when we are in a position to make a statement in the House it will be made, and it will be made shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON. McBRYDE (The Pas): Mr. Speaker before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could explain the nature of the proposed public housing development in the Ness and Sturgeon area of St. James-Assiniboia.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation had received a proposal from a developer for the construction of 75 units of public housing in the area referred to by the honourable member. That land in that particular area is zoned R3(b), which means that it can be used for multiple housing purposes, apartment blocks, town houses, etc. The area covers a 5.5 acreage portion in the City of St. James and the approximate value of these units is comparable to the value of other units in the same vicinity.

MR. McBRYDE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether any work was done by the Housing and Renewal Corporation to explain the nature of the project to the people living in that area to avoid the type of backlash that has since developed, and what action is now being taken by the government since this backlash has developed.

MR. PAWLEY: The honourable member is referring to objections raised by a number of residents in the immediate area. The personnel in the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation did meet with the representatives of the St. James Council; discussed the project in its entirety with them; the St. James Council supported this particular project. In fact, it's my understanding they were quite impressed with the nature of the project itself. There has been no communication with the actual residents themselves in the area except through their representatives on the St. James Council.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas . . . a question?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question on a similar matter for the Attorney-General. Is there any legislation which would prohibit the prejudiced and bigoted type of advertising that appeared in the June 10th issue of the St. James-Assiniboia Chronicle under the sponsorship of the Woodgreen Place, Emerald Grove and Prairie View Homeowners' Association. The question is, is there any legislation to prevent the type of slander against people who live in public housing projects?

HON. AL MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I have glanced at the advertisement; I haven't had any study of it by a department. I don't know whether it is in violation of any of the rights of anyone. I don't think, from my quick glance at it, that it will likely offend against any provincial statute.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minneapolis): Mr. Speaker, on the same subject, might I ask the Attorney-General whether this might be asking for a legal opinion?

MR. MACKLING: I'm happy to answer that, Mr. Speaker. I don't think so. I think that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is aware of the fact that I am responsible for a Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs which deals with advertising in some respects, and we have a continuing interest in all of these fields as a matter of consumer interest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Was the decision made to proceed with the low-rental housing, prior to consultation with the City of St. James-Assiniboia?

MR. PAWLEY: There was a call by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation for proposals re the construction of low-rental public housing units in the Greater Winnipeg area, and a number of proposals were accepted because they were better from the point of view of design, price and others, and this was one of them. Upon realizing that this was one of the preferable proposals because of the bid itself, the officials then met with the St. James Council because it was the realization and understanding that we would attempt to work hand in hand with the municipal people. Our officials were pleased, from the reports given to me, at the reception that they received from the St. James Council. The St. James Council is not opposed, or did not give any indication of opposition to this project, and with this expression of endorsement, and Mayor Hanks indicated in the press that they approved the project in principle, then we proceeded from there with the view of proceeding with this project.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, one supplementary question. Can the Minister tell us when the meeting was held with the members of the Municipal Council?

MR. PAWLEY: I'm unable to tell you exactly the date; I would simply have to say approximately two weeks ago, but I couldn't tell you the exact date. I would undertake to find out the date. -- (Interjection) -- I am informed that there is an alderman in the Chamber that could give us the exact date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Well, I . . . up to ask a question. Mr. Speaker, does the Honourable Minister know that it was approved in principle in the St. James Council, not unanimously, but if St. James Council does not approve of the final plans which are coming forth, what will be the reaction of the government then?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that would be a decision that would be made at that time, but I would like to point out to the honourable member that the final decision in respect to, and the responsibility for, does rest with the Provincial Government. We hope and we very much expect to have the co-operation of the municipal areas in order to proceed with a very much needed housing program this year. We've received these proposals. Now, the very reason that the government agreed to pick up the operating losses from the municipalities was in order to remove the possible widespread prohibition of the proceeding with housing development in the Greater Winnipeg area by municipal units - councils - so that we can proceed on our own because we've agreed to assume these operating losses, as long as we abide by the zoning regulations within the particular areas in the municipalities in which the low rental units are to be constructed.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question on the same subject, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister's department done any surveys on population density in that area - community clubs, schools, etc.? And further to that, are they intending to hold any meetings with the people?

MR. PAWLEY: Insofar as the question of holding meetings with the people, certainly this would be taken under review. Certainly insofar as the study of the area in question, population make-up, certainly the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has looked into these various areas in which proposals for construction by developers has come from, so we're quite aware of this and we're also very much concerned about the misconceptions that some people do appear to have in respect to public housing, and it's for this reason that I would hope and would trust that we'd be able to embark on an educational program in government in order to better acquaint the public and eliminate some of the misinformation that does appear to be abroad in respect to this particular housing type of project.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister's department believe that creating a community within a community is a good policy in planning?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking for an opinion. I do not accept the implication that this is the creating of a community within a community. In my very first remarks I indicated that the value of these particular units would be comparable to the value of other units in the area. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, no more than, for example, the Courts of St. James in the City of St. James created a community within a community, and I think it's high time, Mr. Speaker, that we got away from this view that public housing units or apartment blocks create a community within a community. The people that want to live in those communities, the people that we want to house in those units and need housing -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, if I could complete the answering of . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, am I getting a speech or an answer?

MR. PAWLEY: If the honourable member doesn't want to hear my answer -- they are just as entitled to housing into these parts of the community as anybody else in that community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if he was reported accurately in today's press as having charged the insurance companies with practicing racial discrimination in selling insurance policies.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I think the point that my honourable friend raised is in connection with remarks that were made at a meeting in the Town of Pinawa wherein the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I had some lengthy debate with the automobile insurance industry, and at one point during my speech -- (Interjection) -- yes, it's in the constituency of Lac du Bonnet. At one point in my speech I outlined one of the reasons why we find many motorists having to go to the license authority with

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) a \$25.00 fee in order that they may get their license. The reason, I explained to the meeting, was that there were various inhibitions within the private automobile insurance industry which prevent, or to a degree prevent people from getting insurance, and that is that certain companies - all companies, I assume - devise certain type of rating systems, rating systems which determine the rate for each individual, which determine the eligibility for that individual to be insured with their company.

A MEMBER: This is right. This is right.

MR. USKIW: Now I also said that this was my experience during the time in which I had been involved in the insurance industry some four or five years ago, or something in that area, and that I didn't know whether this is still the same pattern but this was my experience during the time that I was involved as an insurance agent, and that it was not surprising to me, Mr. Speaker, I suggested to the audience, that companies do devise very sophisticated means of rating procedure so that indeed they will enhance their profit picture, that they indeed will be most selective in the marketplace trying to get the least risk within their company . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Where does the discrimination come in?

MR. USKIW: All right. Where does the -- my honourable friend wants to know where the discrimination comes in. I had stated -- just let me get to that point.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I asked the Minister a very simple question and I ask you to determine whether that kind of an answer is proper in replying to questions in this Chamber. I never asked him for a repetition of the speech that he delivered last night. I simply asked him if the report that was contained in today's press accurately reflected the statement that he made last night. All I want to know is whether it did or not.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . in the process of concluding his remarks. The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: I think it's fair to say that one must put my remark in its proper context. -- (Interjections) -- I stated, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't think that's at all the question. The Honourable Member for Morris asked a question as to the authenticity of the press reports of a statement attributed to the Minister. Now it's not a question of his remarks being in or out of context. It's a question of the press reports being accurate, and to that question a yes or no answer is all that is needed.

MR. USKIW: My honourable friends opposite don't like what they hear. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is not in order to ask a controversial question. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it is in order to give a controversial reply.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, I'm not aware of any rule which prohibits the placing of a controversial question. I really don't know what my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. Controversial questions are the order of the day in parliament and I hope always will be. If the honourable member is referring to argumentative questions, well that's a different matter entirely, but in any case, Mr. Speaker, I think that there can hardly be a point of order when the Minister of Agriculture rises to answer a question and, in doing so, attempts to put a newspaper quote in the proper and full context.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, my question to the Minister was a very simple one: Was he or was he not accurately reported in today's press? All he had to do was to say yes or no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order. Will the Honourable Minister please continue his reply to the question.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I was about to outline the reason why the statement was made, and I want to say to my honourable friends opposite that a rating system with which I am familiar has a certain point system which after 14 points that are established, according to the questionnaire, after there are 14 points - or this is at that time -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that was one point. Yes, that was one point. For example, if one was single, one had so many points against them for being single - this is a rating system. If one had a certain mileage per year, there were so many points calculated against him for having travelled so many

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) miles per year. If one lived in what was referred to as a slum neighbourhood, there were so many points against a person for living in a deteriorating neighbourhood, or a slum neighbourhood - there is a difference between the two. If there was a person that was Negro, there were so many points charged. I believe it was 10, if I recollect. If a person was other than Negro but dark-skinned, there were 14 points -- yes, in the Province of Manitoba and indeed across Canada.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (River Heights): Name the company.

MR. USKIW: My honourable friends want me to name the company and I won't do that for this reason. I'll tell you why I won't do that. I'll tell you why I won't do that - because I don't know whether they are practising the same thing today or not. My honourable friend ought to listen to the context in which I was delivering my remarks in Pinawa, and that was that from time to time all companies . . .

SOME MEMBERS: Name the company.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): On a point of privilege, as a member of this Assembly I think that I have the right, without a flock of interjections from members who do not rise from their seats, to listen to another honourable member speaking in this House, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a legitimate point of privilege because there are privileges of the House and there are privileges of individual members, and I'm rising now as an individual member asking you, Sir, to request that the privileges of the members of this House be respected.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of privilege, I think it's reasonably well taken, and I would suggest that the order be enforced by the Speaker, whether the taunts and jeers from their places are being presented from this side of the House or from that side of the House, and my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, doesn't seem to recognize it when they are coming from the other side of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: I agree with my honourable friend that all members in the House should observe the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Minister please continue.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I think that what the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition said a moment ago comes very close to what you admonished the Minister of Transportation for saying earlier during the session.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Minister of Agriculture continue and conclude his remarks.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, again I want to point out that I was not accusing any company today of doing what I said was my experience during the time that I had been involved in the industry, but I illustrated how a sophisticated approach can be used to select clientele and that from time to time companies review . . .

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, are we still not on matters before the Orders of the Day? A question has been asked. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture would answer the question and I feel confident that what he is saying now he can do so when Bill 56 is before the House and not now.

MR. SPEAKER: I hope that the Honourable Minister is aware of the fact that this is not the opportunity for either lengthy questions or replies of unusual length.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think with an important question such as has been put by the Member for Morris, one ought to answer it most completely so that we are not confusing the people in this Legislature or the people in Manitoba, and that we must answer in the proper context, and to the extent that my full remarks were not reported, Mr. Speaker, is not my fault, and my honourable friend appreciates the fact that there is a great deal of editing done in newspaper reporting and the fact that certain words were used in the report which may be accurate but may be out of context, is of course no interest to my honourable friends opposite, but I think one ought to be responsible enough to make sure that the record is set straight, and my reference was to the system of rating that has been established from time to time with various insurance companies in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Was the name of the insurance company that the honourable member worked for the Cooperative Insurance Company?

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I declined to give the name of the company to the press.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): A supplementary. Did the Minister say that his allegation did not apply to a particular insurance company but therefore to all insurance companies?

MR. USKIW: No. I said, Mr. Speaker, that I was familiar with a rating system during the time that I was involved in the automobile insurance industry, and that was an example that I was illustrating.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume that we are going to be permitted the same latitude in asking questions as the Minister had in replying to a question, and I want to ask the Minister now if he will reply to the question that I asked him. Was he or was he not accurately reported in today's press?

MR. USKIW: I think, Mr. Speaker, I answered most fully.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I've had an opportunity to peruse a form, an application for a standard automobile insurance policy of the Royal Insurance group. I see no reference that the Minister mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a question.

MR. ENNS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member place his question if he has one?

MR. ENNS: My question is, simply, does the Minister's generalized condemnation of the insurance companies include the Royal Insurance Group?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Has the member filed the paper from which he was reading?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I had a request of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Would he care to file the paper from which he was reading?

MR. ENNS: Yes, I would be more than happy, Mr. Speaker, as I would be happy to file the application forms of all insurance companies.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member indicated . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member file the application forms of others?

MR. ENNS: I only have this one here but if you give me ten minutes I'll have the other ones. Here's a few more.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister will now be prepared to document the charge that he made last night.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I make an appeal -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll ignore that last remark. May I make an appeal that we try to avoid a continuation of the kind of impingement upon the decorum of this House as has taken place in the past 20 minutes or so. I'm not suggesting that the questions put by the Honourable Member for Morris are not valid but I am suggesting that he did get a reply and that there is no point in pursuing the question as to whether or not the Minister was accurately reported. I think the answer is clear. The Minister said he is not suggesting he was inaccurately reported but merely that he was incompletely reported, and I think my honourable friend the Member for Morris can accept that.

MR. JORGENSEN: Why didn't he say that, then?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder whether he can inform the House whether he is aware of any legislative committee, report or commission that has indicated that there is racial discrimination in the rate-setting by the insurance companies in Canada?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, if I may again, I didn't say that there was racial discrimination per se. I don't know. I have no idea. But I want to say this, that a point system in itself determines a great deal of discrimination on other -- on racial as well as other points.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and ask him, in reference to something that was said earlier, whether he regards the comments of the Minister of Agriculture as tending to build a community within a community?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to -- well, of course I can't answer the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, but would like to have answered the Honourable Member for River Heights on the question that he had asked the Minister of Agriculture but -- if they could give me by leave. I would ask that the honourable member, if I have leave, if the honourable member would read this issue of the Consumer Report. It indicates that there is, in fact, a situation existing in the United States where people in the Negro areas in the large cities are being charged exorbitant rates under the present insurance system.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Before the Pawley Commission, were there any representations made by anyone that racial discrimination was being practised by the insurance companies in their rate-making?

MR. PAWLEY: No, there wasn't any such representations to our committee. I was interested in this article that I just read this past week, though, and I would ask that the honourable member refer to it.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, as a supplementary question, up until this last week was the Minister of Municipal Affairs aware of any specific case in which racial discrimination had been practised by the insurance companies, auto insurance companies in Manitoba? Racial discrimination. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm asking -- on automobile insurance, the Minister of Municipal Affairs just made a comment for me to read something. I am asking, up until this week did he have any knowledge, has he had any representation or has he read anything . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member had placed his question. The House heard it.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, all that I can say in answer to the question is that no representations as such were made to me. I do know of the example that was referred to by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I am personally familiar with the form in question and I agree that it did indicate a form of racial discrimination in respect to the application of auto insurance.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister of Municipal Affairs would search out and table that form so that we would have it on the table of this House and we are in a position to make reference to it. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I've made a request to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He doesn't have to agree to this, but he has made a statement and so has the Minister of Agriculture, which they claim can be documented. I think we should have that document on the table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member making a speech?

MR. SPIVAK: I've made a request, Mr. Speaker. I have made a request. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has not answered it.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Were you an agent for the Co-op Fire and Casualty?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have to answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is he aware of any other company besides the one which he worked for, of carrying on what he has charged that particular company with?

MR. USKIW: I didn't state that the company I worked for was involved.

MR. CRAIK: To that extent, then, is the press report wrong?

MR. USKIW: I don't believe that the press report is wrong. I think it's not given in full context.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I address a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I would like to ask the Minister, while he is driving around the Province of Manitoba trying to destroy the insurance companies -- I beg your pardon, I think I'd be expressing an opinion and I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I want to ask the Minister if he is taking advantage at the same time to explain the part that he played in the infamous program called Operation LIFT?

MR. USKIW: My honourable friend obviously must have been back in the barnyard -- he's come back full of it.

STATEMENT

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

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, just to get things off into a little lighter vein here. To get off the subject of agriculture, maybe we should get back on the subject of sports, if I may. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure at this time to announce to the House that upon word received just a few moments ago, it appears that most of the arrangements have been completed in bringing in the Triple A baseball into the city of Winnipeg for this year.

I would like to, at this time, take the opportunity to thank all the various groups of people who worked so hard to make this a reality. There is also scheduled for approximately 5:00 o'clock this afternoon a press conference, which I hope to be able to attend, and as I said before and I repeat again, it looks very much like we are going to have our first game on the 19th of June.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, do I understand the Minister correctly? Is the Province of Manitoba sponsoring this ball team?

MR. BURTONIAK: The Province of Manitoba is not sponsoring this team but we are going to be making contributions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just say that our party certainly endorses the efforts that have been undertaken by the First Minister and the government, and the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, and the Centennial Corporation, and all concerned with the efforts to secure a Triple A franchise here, and I include the Winnipeg Enterprises in the group deserving of congratulations.

We feel that the securing of this franchise is a great step forward culturally and athletically, for our community and our province. The public relations value of a team in a Triple A category of sport cannot be over-emphasized. In terms of the value to the image of the city in North America, I think it's a red letter day for our community. I would hope that the team will join the roll call of famous Winnipeg and Manitoba sporting names such as the Blue Bombers, the Monarchs and the Falcons and the St. Boniface Seals and others that have brought glory to this province. So we align ourselves with the news, Mr. Speaker and congratulate all those who played an integral part in the success of this franchise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the others on behalf of our party to also extend my congratulations to the Minister for the part that he has played in getting the franchise to Winnipeg. I think it's a very happy occasion for all of us in Manitoba and Winnipeg to have the Triple A franchise established here in Winnipeg in this Centennial Year. I think there will be great benefits and economic factors as well in having the Triple A League established, or the team established in Winnipeg. As far as attracting tourists, as far as publicity, I certainly think it's a great occasion, and I would like to take this opportunity to hope that everyone will take advantage on June 19th, every member of this House, to come out and see the first game that's played in here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on the same subject, if I might, might I ask the Minister a question? Would he be able to outline for us the contribution the province is making? He indicated there was a contribution.

MR. BURTONIAK: I might say at this time, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member's question, that we have not made the contribution as of the moment but there will be a contribution going into this program as soon as this money is available, I should say.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, if I may, could I find out from the Minister what the commitment of the province is in relation to the project?

MR. BURTONIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's any secret. I could reveal that. I think I could mention this in the House today, since we made the announcement, that it'll be in the neighbourhood of \$25,000.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Honourable Minister, is the government going to have any equity or shares in this ball club?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the last question affords me an opportunity to elaborate somewhat for benefit of honourable members who all welcome the announcement and look

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) forward - most members having sporting instincts - look forward to the games that will be played here in the International League schedule this year.

In response to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the arrangement, tentative as it is, is to utilize some of the funds, and the Honourable Leader will understand the nature of the arrangement with Ottawa with respect to the World Hockey Tournament and the money that was supposed to be available or forthcoming for that. Inasmuch as the World Hockey did not materialize for reasons already known, moneys that are forthcoming from the Federal Government, would have been for World Hockey, are being utilized in part for this purpose, and there is in addition to that, of course, some financial contribution from the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. It is in a somewhat smaller amount. All in all, however, taking both levels of government, the financial contribution would be approximately about one-ninth of the total budgetary requirements being put up by other sources.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the honourable members of this House to withdraw from the Order Paper a bill. I'm referring to Bill No. 125, the Hearing Aid Bill.

MR. WEIR: Leave granted, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOUPIN: This bill, Mr. Speaker, was introduced for first reading and the reason why I would like this bill withdrawn from the Order Paper is that it could be referred between sessions to the Statutory Orders and Regulations Committee. One of the main reasons is because the industry has not been contacted to the extent that I would feel happy with, and I feel that the people involved equally have not been contacted by myself when I was transferred from Consumer and Corporate Affairs to the Ministry of Health and Social Development, and I am hoping that having this bill referred to Statutory Orders and Regulations, that this committee will be able to have a closer look at the bill and come back at the next session with a better prepared bill. Thank you.

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

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, having spoken rather quickly to grant leave for the withdrawal of the bill, maybe I would be permitted to make another comment or two, because, Mr. Speaker, with the bill being withdrawn I don't know the procedure that the Minister intends to take to have the bill presented to the Statutory Regulations and Orders Committee. He hasn't indicated whether he would be presenting a resolution which would have a draft copy of the bill attached, or what it would be, and I'm assuming in granting leave, and I still grant leave, that a recognized vehicle of the House will be used to provide a Draft bill to the committee so that the Draft bill, not necessarily a formal bill but a Draft bill, would be presented to the committee for study. On that understanding, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to grant leave.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, a draft bill will be ready.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the House Leader. Is it the intention of the government to withdraw Bill 56 as well?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that -- on reflection, I think that that question really doesn't bespeak an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: There was another question that intervened. It is the Chair's understanding that leave was granted the Honourable Minister to withdraw Bill 125. (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question will be directed to the Minister of Finance. Did the government and the Minister during the weekend agree to support the Prices and Incomes Commission's request to restrain unreasonable increases in costs and prices?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this government would always oppose unreasonable requests, but the honourable member surely must have read all the documentation that I distributed in the House and would have pretty full knowledge of what it was that we did discuss and say, and since he has already read it, I'm wondering that he's requesting information that must be contained in those documents.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the Minister then explain why a Manitoba Crown corporation, which is Manitoba Telephone System, which members opposite keep asserting has their approval, can the Minister justify 100 percent increase to the present charges that are being charged to the private radio stations for their transmission services?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this Minister is not aware of what the honourable member is saying and if he would give me precise information I'll be glad to look into it.

MR. MCKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister then explain the assertion of this government that public Crown corporations can do a better job than private corporations?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be improper for me to make the kind of a speech I would like to make on the occasion given to me by the honourable member. If members of this House are prepared to listen for an hour or two, I'll be glad to justify the statement but I will only restate my position, that the quotation just made is absolutely correct; I support it. Public Crown corporations, I believe, can do a better job and I expect that we will prove so over the next period of time with an additional Crown corporation entitled The Auto Insurance Corporation.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, with your permission I'll ask the page boy to deliver the letter to the Minister showing him that the rates were increased 100 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. I wonder whether he can indicate to the House whether, in the discussions with the Finance Minister of the Federal Government, there was any indication that the government would be altering or changing its position with respect to the White Paper on taxation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I gave a rather lengthy report to this House, including the filing of documents which the Honourable Member for Roblin may not have read and which the Honourable Member for River Heights may not have read. I invite him to read them.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, again - I've already asked one question in which the honourable member was in a position to indicate that there have been some -- well, I've already asked a question which the Honourable Minister has indicated there were discussions between himself and the Minister. This is in connection with the bank interest charges. Now I'm asking him again, was there any private discussion which would indicate that the government is possibly going to change its position with respect to the White Paper?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . 30 seconds ago.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sorry. Is what you said, Mr. Speaker, something to prevent my answering it? I didn't hear what you said.

MR. SPEAKER: I indicated to the honourable member that I'd heard a similar question put by him about 30 seconds ago to which the Honourable Minister had risen to reply.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh. Well may I, though, Mr. Speaker, say that it is not my intention to report on any private conversations that I have unless I volunteer to do so. Now, in specific, in relation to the Benson White Paper on Tax Reform I gave a lengthy report, and I would invite the Honourable Member for River Heights to read Hansard and the documents that I furnished him with.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Does the Department of Labour of the government make studied projections of manpower requirements by occupations in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. PAULLEY: Not precisely, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: Would the Minister agree or disagree that such studies would assist in developing plans for future investments in education and counselling and career training and so on?

MR. PAULLEY: The Department of Labour works in very close co-operation with other agencies such as Manpower, the Department of Education, for a continuing assessment of manpower requirements in the Province of Manitoba. It's a continuing process.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the reason I pose the question is because at a time when there is high unemployment there's still shortage of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a question?

MR. PATRICK: Well, I'm asking the Minister would he undertake, then, to perhaps

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) conduct such studies which I think would assist in developing the demand where there is at the present time.

MR. PAULLEY: If what my honourable friend is suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is as to whether or not the Department of Labour makes an assessment of trades' requirement in industry - and I think this is the point my honourable friend is making - my answer to him is yes, that we do continuously, or on a continuing basis - maybe that would be the better way of saying it, Mr. Speaker - make an assessment of job requirements in various categories of tradesmen and the likes of that, in order that through our apprentice training programs and Manpower training and retraining programs, we have available personnel required by industry with a certain amount of expertise.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would that be based on an annual basis or on a projection on a two or three year basis?

MR. PAULLEY: It's on a continuing basis, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, through the Department of Labour and its apprentice training division, I have requested -- and again, this is in co-operation, Mr. Speaker, with the Department of, well, even Agriculture to some degree, but Education insofar as our community colleges are concerned, and their training programs, to have a continuing assessment of trends in industry, changes in methodology in industry, so that provisions are continuing to be made for the purpose of supplying industry in Manitoba with qualified tradesmen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Honourable Member for Roblin has now sent me the copy of this letter from the Telephone System, I'm better able to deal with his question and I propose to point out that this letter indicates an increase in installation charges of one or two channels from \$15.00 to \$30.00, and a charge for a third channel from \$5.00 to \$10.00, and that all other rates and charges will remain the same. The first sentence of this letter reads: "Due to the rising costs associated with the provision of telephone services, we find it necessary at this time to increase the charges for provision of telephone channels used for or associated with program transmission." Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remind the honourable member that the criteria established by the Prices and Incomes Commission were that prices ought not to rise beyond increased costs and not to take into account any increased profits.

Well, firstly, there's an indication in this letter that the costs have risen and that's the reason for the increase. Secondly, I would indicate that the Telephone System does not operate at a profit. Thirdly, I would indicate that the Prices and Incomes Commission is set up to review matters such as this, and it would never, I am sure, make a blanket accusation such as the Honourable Member for Roblin did, without proper investigation, so I would only repeat that we would be opposed to unreasonable increases and suggest that there's absolutely nothing in this letter and nothing said by the Honourable Member for Roblin that would justify his extravagant statement. But if he feels that there is review required, then by all means I recommend that he communicate with the Prices and Incomes Commission and ask them for review.

May I also suggest that he has the right to consult with the Public Utilities Board about whether or not this is in accord with its requirements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation - I didn't happen to get in before - concerning Triple A baseball. I wonder, the fact that it is our Centennial year and the fact that there will be some money from the Manitoba taxpayers involved, I wonder if the Minister could use his good influence and try, to ask the organization to try and get the name "Manitoba" in rather than "Winnipeg" because we in the country are also very proud of Triple A baseball.

MR. BURTNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Honourable Member for La Verendrye for his suggestion. I do believe that there has been a list of names submitted and I believe that there was a suggestion already made that the team should be a Manitoba team rather than just a Winnipeg team. Now, we will have to try and use our influence, of course, but in the final analysis it will be up to the team themselves as to which name they want to take.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In the case of company towns where there are homes located, are the assessments made on the basis of each home or on the bulk property?

MR. PAWLEY: In respect of public housing?

MR. MOLGAT: No, in respect to individual homes in a company town.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Tourism. Is it his intention to suggest any changes in the liquor laws to accommodate the patrons watching these baseball games here this summer?

MR. BURTNIAK: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member should have a talk with the Honourable Attorney-General on that one.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

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

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, can we move to Bill No. 56?

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 56. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

Before the honourable member proceeds, a matter arose yesterday afternoon just prior to adjournment that I wish to deal with at this time.

On Wednesday, June 10, 1970 during debate on second reading of Bill 56, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell made the following statement: ". . . we come down to the final result that four people, three people and a secretary, have made a recommendation which they were instructed in the first place to bring in." The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs rose on a point of order and spoke as follows: "Mr. Speaker, I must, as a member of that committee, on a point of privilege reject any suggestion that the committee was working under any instruction as to the type of report it was to bring in, and the honourable member should therefore withdraw that remark."

Page 3 of the Report of the Manitoba Automobile Insurance Committee 1970, tabled in this House, indicates the terms of reference of the committee as follows:

1. To investigate the feasibility of instituting a program of public automobile insurance and to hear and consider representations respecting all aspects of automobile insurance.
2. To make recommendations deemed to be in the interest of the general public.
3. To submit draft legislation.

It is quite clear that the term of reference calling upon the committee to submit draft legislation is intended to be the conclusion to its assignment after having investigated the feasibility of instituting a public automobile insurance program, heard and considered representations respecting all aspects of automobile insurance, and made recommendations deemed to be in the interest of the general public, in that order. There's nothing contained therein to indicate that the committee was instructed by anyone as to the type of recommendations or legislation it ought to submit, nor is there anything contained in any way restricting, limiting or influencing the deliberations and actions of the committee with respect to automobile insurance. A committee was instructed to investigate, hear and consider representations, make recommendations and draft legislation. That was the extent of its instructions.

I turn again to the statement of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, and I quote: ". . . four people, three people and a secretary, have made a recommendation which they were instructed in the first place to bring in." The meaning is rather ambiguous. Does the honourable member intend to say that the committee was instructed to bring in a recommendation, or that the committee was instructed to bring in a particular type of recommendation? If the intent of the honourable member was the former, then I hope that he would take advantage of this opportunity to correct the statement in a manner that would remove any trace of ambiguity and at the same time bring it within the House rules. If the intent of the honourable member was the latter, then I regret to inform the honourable member that according to Beauchesne Fourth Edition, Citation 154(3), it is unparliamentary to misrepresent the language of another, and I would kindly ask the honourable member to retract his statement.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the intention of my statement was quite clear, that this committee had been instructed, I felt they had been instructed, it was my belief that this was the type of instructions that had been given to this committee, and using my interpretation of the right of free speech in this House, I felt that there

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) was nothing unparliamentary in anything I had said.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Chair had made its position quite clear. I've left one of two alternatives open to the honourable member, and I would hope that he would pursue one of the two courses which I have laid open to him.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I think my position is quite clear in this. I certainly believe that this committee had been instructed. This is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I believe I have . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the member again that if my appreciation of his comments is correct, I would therefore ask the honourable member to retract his statement because in that event I do consider it unparliamentary.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, if this offends the House then I will withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Speaker, continuing from where I left off, I would like to read a news clipping from today's edition of the paper, where the Honourable Minister of Agriculture stated in the speech last night in Pinawa, he admitted that the government Auto Insurance Committee was a biased committee since it was the declared purpose of the NDP government to implement a publicly-owned and operated automobile insurance scheme. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture stated, or admitted, that it was a committee that was biased in that direction. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources admits that as well.

MR. GREEN: I've said it all the time.

MR. GRAHAM: So that what we have is a committee that was not really concerned with presenting recommendations which were deemed to be in the interest of the public, but to bring in a government monopolistic automobile insurance plan. I think, Mr. Speaker, there were many things that they could have done under the existing insurance, which would benefit the public of the Province of Manitoba. There were many things that could be done which would improve the lot of the motorist and his passengers without the implementation of a government auto insurance scheme. Stricter enforcement of law, regulations governing the safety of automobile tires or the standard of automobile tires, would certainly lessen the possibility of auto insurance or accidents from blowouts, and there are many in a year according to insurance agents. There are many accidents caused by the blowout of automobile tires. Headlight standards is another thing in autos which do cause accidents, and possibly a change in laws regarding the headlights on automobiles might quite easily reduce the incidence of automobile accidents.

Another thing that might assist is an improvement in the standard of the automobile itself. If there was a certain standardization of the width of bumpers and the shapes of bumpers and the strength of automobile insurance bumpers, it would certainly eliminate the damage caused in bumper to bumper pile-ups at intersections. There are many things that could be done to reduce the cost of automobile insurance, but this committee didn't recommend any of those things. They have not made any recommendations to increase the safety standards that I can see in their report. The main purpose of their whole exercise was to institute a Crown Corporation and through the implementation of that Crown corporation they hope to, not take over, but eliminate some of the insurance business in the province.

In the field of expansion, economic expansion in this province, we find that many of the funds that are so necessary for expansion are used from the sources of the insurance people. Now maybe this is the intention of the province, to use their own Crown corporation to build up huge reserves to use for such purposes. They do state in here that the monies of the Crown corporation will be used for municipal purposes but there is no place in here where they state that the reserves should be limited, and if a Crown corporation is to be set up solely for the purpose of amassing large sums of money to be used for development purposes, then, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the original intent is of any benefit at all. I think they should expressly set up a corporation just for that rather than use subterfuge in obtaining money from the people of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the 15th of May, through the offices of the news service of the Manitoba Government, the Information Services Branch, we had a report in which the Minister of Municipal Affairs outlined the legislation that would provide a compulsory public auto insurance plan for Manitoba, and it's a summation of the statement in this House of the Minister, and it states that: "In a policy statement, on introducing the 29-page auto insurance bill, Mr. Pawley said it had two principal objectives: No. 1. To create a Crown corporation responsible

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) for the administration of the auto insurance plan. No. 2. To enable the Crown corporation, with approval of the Lieutenant-Governor, to establish specific terms, conditions and amounts of the plan to be adopted, the premium rate schedule, and the other administrative details of the program. All of this was to be done by the Crown corporation with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor. It was not the intention of the Minister to have this spelled out in the bill, but is to be left to the regulations that cover the bill."

This government has said that their insurance will be cheaper, and yet we have nothing to compare it with. All the bill does is enable them to set up a Crown corporation, and after that we will find out what the terms are going to be. This is a fairly large order for anyone to follow, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe the people of Manitoba are prepared to grant that amount of power to a Crown corporation, and I would like to see this government hold a referendum on the subject explaining to the people how much power they do want within the terms of the corporation rather than within the terms of the Act. If there are specifications spelled out in the bill, then members of the Legislature know specifically what they are talking about, and if in future years they see there is some particular portion of that Act that is not functioning properly, they have the right then to bring in legislation to change that particular portion of the Act. But, Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult for any member of the Legislature to bring in legislation to change regulations. This is usually the field of Cabinet, which is not a large body, and it places a lot of power in the hands of a very few individuals. Furthermore, those members are acting in a certain realm of secrecy, the results of which do not become evident sometimes for a considerable length of time. These things in some cases don't become evident to the public for matters as long as six months, three months, and once something is decided it is a little difficult to undo.

Mr. Speaker, in the report of the committee, I think there was a total of 37 recommendations that were made to that committee by various groups. There were some of those recommendations that were embodied in their plan but there were some that were not; and I would say this, that there were many other recommendations that this committee never even heard. They had the power to invite people to appear, and this was under the last term of reference, "The committee was authorized to examine, under oath or otherwise, any persons, groups or associations, whenever the committee considered such examinations were necessary." There had been a committee of this Legislature that had studied automobile insurance for quite some time. -- (Interjection) -- It was a committee of all members of the Legislature, not just members of one particular party. This was a committee embracing members of all political parties. To my knowledge that committee, or members of that committee, were not invited to appear before the . . .

MR. GREEN: Anybody could have appeared before the committee. They advertised.

MR. GRAHAM: They were not invited to up here.

MR. GREEN: Yes, they were -- they were.

MR. GRAHAM: That I know of.

MR. GREEN: The world was invited.

MR. GRAHAM: I think there was a wealth of knowledge there that this committee could have availed itself of, but it did not, and I wonder whether it is doing a service to this province by not doing it. In the past in this House whenever any major change in legislation is contemplated and committees are set up, it is usually a committee of the House, it is usually a committee of the House, and in this particular case. . .

MR. GREEN: Would my honourable friend permit a question? I believe that in the last three years of the Conservative administration there must have been presented I would say at least 150 bills. Can you tell me how many of them were considered by an all party committee before they came to the House?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, in the last three years I was only a member for a very short period, I can remember no committees being set up that were not committees with representatives from all parties.

MR. GREEN: I just want to repeat my question. My honourable friend said that when major legislation - there will be an all party committee considering the automobile insurance bill very soon - I ask my honourable friend, he said that all major legislation before it comes to the House is considered by an all party committee and I'm asking him, of the 150 bills that were being presented to the Legislature, how many of them were considered by committees

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) prior to coming to the House?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. WEIR: Is that a proper type question for interrupting a member in debate? -- (Interjection) -- Is it a proper kind of question?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on the question of automobile insurance and the establishment of a committee to investigate, did the public know that the instructions given on the 29th of October to that committee was to make reference to investigate the feasibility of instituting a public plan and to submit draft legislation.

MR. GREEN: It was in the newspaper. The notice was in the newspaper, containing exactly that.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It's not very long ago that this side was being chastized for speaking from their seats and the House Leader, the House Leader, the person who should be setting an example to this House is sitting here, Mr. Speaker, doing the same thing that this side was being condemned of by the First Minister not very many moments ago.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't be too much longer, Mr. Speaker, because I don't think that this committee did the job that it was set up to do. If they were interested in providing the best type of insurance for the most number of people in the province, I don't think that the legislation they have presented will do that. They have said that the plan will be 15 to 20 percent cheaper. At whose expense?

I understand that the rights of subrogation could mean that hospital costs, medical costs, workmen's compensation costs, could mean a 15 to 20 percent saving, in any type of plan. Now if this is the case then who is going to pay that extra 15 or 20 percent? If it's workmen's compensation then it's going to be the employer that subsidizes the auto insurance industry. If it's going to be hospital and medical, then it's going to be all the people of Manitoba, including those that do not drive automobiles, who will be assisting in the costs of automobile insurance. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that this is entirely in the interests of the people of Manitoba. I believe that the man that drives the car should be responsible for his actions and if it costs X number of dollars to cover the insurance on that operation then he should be the man that pays it. He shouldn't be asking the old age pensioner or someone else to assist in covering the cost of operation of his car.

I think that there was a field, the field of dialogue with existing insurance outfits that was not explored. I'm not trying to defend the present insurance people, no doubt there are many fields in that that could be improved; but did this government sit down and talk with them and explore the possibility of improvement? Mr. Speaker, I don't think the record shows that I think that this government said we don't want you, we don't want to talk to you. In fact we'll try and legislate you out of existence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before the honourable member proceeds may I introduce guests of ours in the gallery who have arrived in the last few minutes. Fifty Grade 5 students of Kind Edward School under the direction of Mr. Baker. This school is located in my constituency, the constituency of Burrows. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here this afternoon.

GOVERNMENT BILLS (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I don't know if I'll get the same applause when I sit down but in the meantime I think perhaps we must admit that a lot has been said on this controversial subject and I don't think that whatever I have to add or whatever little contribution I may make is going to change anyone's mind. I think that perhaps the whole issue of automobile insurance is in the hands of one man right now and that's not my aim to try and persuade him or anyone else, but I think certain things have to be said although I must admit I believe most of the things have been said.

I think one of the major statements that I have heard on automobile insurance was the statement made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition when he said he felt that it was like signing a blank cheque and that was practically it. I agree with him wholeheartedly, because

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) practically the first full two pages of Bill 56 goes something like this: "Benefit by regulation", "Coverage by regulation", "Insurance money to be defined by regulation", "Insured to be defined by regulation" and it goes on and on. Basically you could say that that's perhaps the principle of the bill while I think we all like to think different that it is not the principle, that a lot lays in the balance of what's going to happen with these regulations. In fact I think that the heart of the legislation definitely lies within the realm of those regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I think we would agree though that our main concern or main principle is not that only but the type of suggested bill in itself. I think that the principle involved stirs one to a position of mind that maybe some of the things that enter my mind are perhaps not things that are going to happen but they are scaring in certain fields, because I am not one of those that likes to think or does think that the sin lies in a corporation having the authority and having the opportunity of doing business of many natures for that kind and the question has been asked here, well what is wrong with Hydro or what is wrong with Telephones? Well absolutely nothing. I think that they were absolutely needed in their time, and still are. I don't think that many of us have to think back too far when we think of the situation of electricity especially in rural Manitoba. I think it was only the right thing to do for Manitoba to be induced to have a brighter and a better electrical future for all of Manitoba. I don't think that I have to go back and relate many of the stories as far as the Telephone System is concerned. I think there are enough members right in here that realize some of the problems that the telephone people were confronted with. I don't think that the pricing alone, the difference of rates across Manitoba leave alone the many broken down lines and communications, I don't think there is any argument there. I think we are all agreed that it was quite in order for these two, and many others; I wish not to refer only to the Telephone or to the Hydro. But to me, Mr. Speaker, we are entering into a field of business or into an industry that I think is absolutely unnecessary as has been stated very clearly by many members and I agree with them. If the insurance companies are not operating the way they ought to, then for goodness sake, let's do something about it. Let's change some of the legislation. I think it's in our power to do this. I want to be one of the last persons to say that there aren't certain things that ought to be changed. I am sure the insurance companies themselves - and I'm not here to protect them - but I'm here to say in fairness to them, I'm sure they would accept this type of legislation without any trouble at all.

Much has been said about Saskatchewan's insurance. Well conditions were absolutely different in 1946, I believe that was the year they started out, as has also been mentioned, when 12 percent of the population had insurance only at that time. Conditions are completely different today than they were in Saskatchewan and I for one don't even blame the CCF government at that time to make sure that something was done with the insurance situation of the day. But, Mr. Speaker, if this government is so concerned about doing things for the people of this province I think we should start thinking about a lot of other things, including such things as we have seen in the local dailies this afternoon, thinking about the price of drugs and of course many other things that should have a priority as far as I'm concerned, rather than being thinking along the line of automobile insurance.

I think in that respect the government could do more good than they are going to do with what they are trying to suggest now, and again I wish to repeat to me the sin doesn't lie in that a corporation be formed if that corporation is going to be an inducement to the things that are needed and also that it will be a corporation that will help the needs of the people of Manitoba. That in this case, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned is not the case here. I think that enough has been said on that subject possibly and it's a matter of opinion. I don't think I'm going to change anybody's opinion as I said before, but I think it's a fact that exists and other than changing some of the legislation, we have good insurance companies ready to serve the people of Manitoba and I do not want to take up the time of this Legislature to tell you of all the wonderful services that I have had personally and many others of you have had personally. I know that some of the members have mentioned, the Member for Roblin and some over here, have mentioned the fact that they - and they are correct as far as I am concerned, there is no question in that respect.

But to come back, Mr. Speaker, it is not so much the principle as far as taking over the country is concerned, or as far as completely nationalizing, at least I hope that's not the aim; as far as I'm concerned the main point that I wish to make at this time is that we should be thinking of priorities, and I'm sure that most of the members in this Legislature can think of

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) many things, think of education costs, think of -- I don't think I'll go into that subject, but there are so many priorities. As I just said a little while ago concerning our drug prices and the like and I think we should be more concerned. This government has pointed out several times that we are concerned about the Medicare premiums; they were concerned about the taxes paid by the aged. Well some of these priorities have not been kept but here is one that perhaps could have waited a little longer and maybe some of the other priorities should have been considered first.

I tried to indicate a little while ago that to me a Crown corporation in itself is certainly not the big sin, but I want to make my position abundantly clear that if the type of corporation as suggested in the insurance business is going to be formed, then there is a lot of food for thought as far as I'm concerned. I think all of us could become quite critical on a subject like that and I want to remind this government that the future, the future of a lot of people of Manitoba depends and is being threatened by this suggestion. Fortunately, we've heard this before, and I think I wish to remind members of this House, including the members opposite, I want to remind this government that Manitoba was built by free enterprise. I know this government knows the majority of our citizens are totally supported by free enterprise, and fortunately Manitobans have enjoyed a very high standard of living, and I also want to remind this government that to me one of the main reasons that we have enjoyed this high standard of living is because of the fact that we've had the opportunity of living with the free enterprising system.

I don't know - with all due respect to the Cabinet or to the front benchers - I was rather upset when the statement that has been made continuously, the fact that insurance will more than likely be 15 or 20 percent lower - of course I'm referring to the premiums - and the front bench has also suggested, or I maybe should point out at this time that when statements like that are made by the most important people of our province, people tend to believe exactly what statement is made. And maybe this is true; I'm certainly not here to suggest that it isn't. But if it is true, and if you know the cost, why can't we have the cost? And if you say, make a statement like that - I know that if I made a statement and said today that insurance is going to be 15 or 20 percent higher, well somebody would suggest that some backbencher said this, and the next thing they might say, Well, maybe it's true and maybe it isn't, but there's a lot of weight when people in the front benches make that kind of statement, a lot of weight is on it, and if you really know the cost then I wish you would reveal the figures to the members of this House. If you do know them and if they are correct, then I think you have a right to go ahead with a plan like this, but there's no indication other than what you know. You're not coming out or revealing, you go ahead at the start and say well this will be done by regulation, that will be done by regulations. This is fine. But in the meantime I think you should be willing to, if not document, to present the facts of cost to the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to bring forth a lot of figures or what have you, we've had quite a few, but I wish to add a few words and maybe not get completely away from this point. I know that a lot of people place so much weight on what a Cabinet says and I think it's worth repeating that when things are spelled out as they were and statements made that there should be a saving of 15 to 20 percent, I humbly suggest it ought to be spelled out, because I wonder if the other 12 disciples would have the same confidence if another government were sitting over there, whatever the name of the other government would be. I wonder if those 12 ministers would have the same confidence. I think this is serious, Mr. Speaker, because whatever's going to be put down in the statutes is of importance regardless who is going to sit there 10 years from now or 15 years from now. -- (Interjection) -- Well, that could be. Yes it did happen. Correct. But there's also certain statements at times that they say it could be marginal or what have you so we'll leave that.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know but is it not possible that this auto insurance will undoubtedly cost more after this plan is initiated than it did before? Is there not that possibility? And is there any way of proving how much more or how much less? I would like to suggest to this House when the Saskatchewan Government started looking into facts and started realizing that there were a lot more arbitrary costs than they had thought of and when this investigation was made I understand that they came up with a cost of 13-1/2 percent of arbitrary costs such as heat, light and many other things, and I wonder if there is not going to be less moneys made than perhaps the government is hoping at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get to another point, and to me this is also very serious as

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) hundreds of agents will be deprived of certain, and in some cases perhaps major portions of their livelihood, and I think it can be openly and freely said that some will even go bankrupt, and I wish at this time — I don't think too much of this has been discussed during the debate but I thought I'd like to bring it up, say a few words in connection with the many agents that are serving and have served, to my thinking, quite well. I do think and I do believe that Manitoba and many other provinces have been very blessed with particular participation of insurance agents as far as people forming a successful participation in community life. I would like to think of the many people, whether it be 1100 or 1200 or 1300 agents, so many of these agents are people that have been directly involved in community life, people that have helped uphold communities. I wonder if we can ever shape or record the record as far as what some of these agents have done towards community life. I wonder how much can a government-operated plan, whether there be regional people around or whether the head office may be in one spot, I don't think that while these people will perhaps be just as good people as those that are agents now, but I don't think the participation of community life will be quite the same. Many of us in this Legislature could go on relating the many things that have taken place in our own communities, many great things that some of these agents have done for communities.

I sometimes like to think of a small agent in my area, come around Hallowe'en time, the young folks especially very often don't know just what to do and this agent thought up the idea one Hallowe'en, he said "Well, we're going to serve them hot dogs; we're going to serve them pop and we're going to serve them coffee," and it's surprising, there was a lot less mischief done after the evening was over. I'm not referring to things like that, I'm referring not only I should say, I'm referring to some of the community life that agents have so well supplied. Also, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps, it would be in order to say that when we think of the Wawanesa Insurance Company, we think of the many things the people that are employed there — yes, somebody says it's only a village, does it really count, but it'll still throw at least perhaps 65, 75 citizens in that village out of work, and how the Minister of Industry and Commerce suggests, I don't think he belittles the fact but I'm sure, I don't know, because we know that this group started working perhaps 40 or over 40 years ago and I'm sure that there were many chances that they took during this time. Today it seems that they're being told, "We don't need free enterprise any more."

I'm sure that this government is not that naive to think or to realize that they would very much like to have even more power, they would like to perhaps nationalize this insurance if in any way possible. I'm very much afraid that when things like this are beginning to happen that — well, the thought was thrown out the other day that Saskatchewan was the battleground for Medicare; Manitoba is going to be the battleground for automobile insurance — and I'm very much afraid that the future of individuals is being challenged, not just through this automobile insurance bill but for the many things that I believe we are perhaps going to see happen in the future.

When I heard the other day of the young lady or the student complaining, or mentioning the fact that a teacher had been trying to pass out government information, perhaps favoritism, I don't know, I wasn't there, but to me this was a very sad day in my life. How damaging to a school system, how disgraceful to a democratic system, and most of all perhaps, how disturbing to a young mind whose father's livelihood depended on this industry.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, coming back to free enterprise, it was and still is a matter of toil, sweat, honour and of dignity to build up this free enterprise system and I wonder if this government across the aisle can really say yes we have taken all these points into consideration. Can you really or are you so lost in the fact that there are some evil free enterprisers and we're going to fix them regardless if it takes the rest of the population, the rest of the free thinking, the rest of the free minded people of Manitoba with them? If this has to be done because it's an election promise, I mentioned this before, that I think it should be a priority. I think there are other things more important right now than trying to ruin the insurance business.

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) Mr. Speaker, it just about has to be a matter of priorities, I mentioned drugs and I guess we could mention many other things. I see it as a sorry day for this government to sat that we're ready to close the books and the lives of so many individuals just for the sake of perhaps a political move. I do wish that things like education costs and other things would be considered first and then perhaps with a few changes in the insurance laws, I don't think they'd have any trouble persuading all of us that perhaps this is a matter that could be looked into.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that many facts and many figures have been laid before you and this Assembly over the past weeks. I for one have perhaps become a little bit mixed up at times notwithstanding that perhaps at certain times different sets of figures have been given for the same question and perhaps - well, I understand a few points perhaps should be brought out concerning some of the facts of our basic 54 insurance companies or sometimes referred to as the "54 groups," of the companies that are involved in Manitoba and this I understand covers pretty well 100 percent of the automobile insurance written in Manitoba.

I understand that of the 54 companies or groups of companies that are involved, and this excludes life insurance, that in 1969, 48 million, nearly \$49 million worth of premiums were written. That of course is all lines, and out of that amount a little over 29 million was automobile insurance. I understand, also, that the premium taxes paid on all the lines was nearly a million dollars and the automobile share was \$564,000.00. I understand that the provincial income tax paid on those premiums written was \$135,000, just a little over \$135,000. Now I can't understand, when the Honourable Minister of Finance keeps not saying, keeps intimating that they have not paid these amounts, and to top that off I think I should even go a little further and suggest that what about the provincial, municipal or the other taxes that have been paid out by these insurance companies? I do not think I have to reiterate the fact that -- and I think maybe it wouldn't hurt if I did, I think it is important -- the fact that many investments have been made provincially, and of course municipally, real estate - not real estate, pardon me - in school boards and of course in Manitoba corporations. I understand that a total amount of over \$45 million worth has been invested by these insurance companies. Perhaps I should -- (Interjection) -- In Manitoba, correct. Perhaps I should elaborate a little bit.

The provincial estimates I understand were \$41 million and the municipal were over \$4 million, the school board investments approximately a quarter of a million dollars and the total corporations over \$500,000, and investment in mortgages of over \$50 million. In other words, the total Manitoba investments ran over \$57 million. And another thing, the rentals paid on the premises used to operate these businesses came to over half a million dollars. The cost of supplies purchased in Manitoba ran to over \$2 million. That, of course, is excluding agents' commissions and adjusters' fees.

I have some more figures here that I thought were interesting. Some of these figures have been thrown around and I thought I wanted to get them as correct as possible, and again the full time figure for the number of employees in these 54 groups, that is in Manitoba, is 1,386, with them having 1,289 dependents and 81 employed part time. So in 1969 the total payroll was \$7,563,000.00 and the income tax these employees paid was \$1,138,000.00. The figures that I've just given you, these 54 groups represent 100 percent automobile writings and 97 percent of writings for all lines that come under the IBC's jurisdiction.

What the Honourable Minister of Finance means when he keeps on saying, "No, they are not paying income tax," I don't really know. If there is a secret beyond that, I think he wants to spell it out one of these days. I have the feeling I know what he has in mind, but this is not peanuts. This is big money and I think we shouldn't just go ahead and start throwing away something as valuable, leave alone the principle other than dollars and cents.

Now some time has been spent in suggesting that perhaps the length of time taken to settle claims could be improved on, and I wish to read or quote a few pages, and this is a report to the Wootton Report, or a brief presented to the All Canada Insurance Federation on August of 1966, and concerning the length of time taken to settle claims; and I shall read: "Not only were the overwhelming bulk of claims paid, but they were swiftly paid by the present system. The findings of the study with regard to the time taken to settle claims are demonstrated on a page next to this one, which shows that 72.8 percent of all the claims were settled within 60 days of the time when the insured first learned of the claim. A closer examination of that same table reveals that 25.9 percent of all the claims studied were settled within seven days, 10.6 percent between eight and fifteen days, 19.3 percent between 16 and 30 days, 17.0 percent between 31

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) and 60 days, 8.0 between 61 and 90 days, 8.6 percent between three and six months and 5.0 percent between six months and one year, 0.6 percent between one and two years, and 5.0 percent were unknown."

And it goes on to say, "A few claims were still pending and in several . . ." -- by the way, this was taken from an average of, I think, 2,000 claims. "A few claims were still pending and in several there was no information available, which is understandable. The time period was calculated from the date notice of the claim was received by the insured to the date when the expense was authorized or the settlement agreed to. Inordinate delay was virtually non-existent. Only 0.6 percent of the cases took longer than a year to settle. Only 5.6 percent took over six months to dispose of, and 14.2 percent took longer than three months."

So, Mr. Speaker -- I should perhaps read the next paragraph also. "Focusing on the different type of claims separately, one can discern that where bodily injury and fault come into play some additional time is required, and the claims by the insured himself were probably lost, 83.1 percent was settled within sixty days. In third party property damage claims, 66.4 percent were settled in this period; in the bodily injury claims 41.7 percent were thus disposed of, and in passenger hazard claims, it was 31.6; and in the medical payments claims, 41.8 percent were cleaned up in sixty days."

So Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned, these figures and facts certainly indicate that perhaps the fastest settlement of claims possible is made, and I can't see how any government, regardless how good a government it might be, could wish to bring back their claims faster than this, and I doubt if anybody wishes to or can, so I don't think that is one argument why we should go into a monopolized insurance business.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude in the same tone as my colleagues and many members on this side have done when they tried to present their contribution. We wish to again -- and I wish to stress this emphatically -- to plead with the government to reconsider their stand on a monopoly-run automobile insurance corporation. I want to particularly make this plea to the Minister of Municipal Affairs since he is piloting this bill. I think he's gone through quite a few experiences as far as the Selkirk Fish Plant is concerned, recently. I think he can feel what it feels like when certain things should perhaps have come that way but didn't, and I have the nerve to suggest to the Minister that I think he understands the kind of feeling that under consideration the word that need to be looked at again, and I think this is an opportunity that the Minister has to take a longer look, whether it be a six-months hoist or whatever it may be, I think at this point that there is still time to consider and to have that feeling.

Now I don't know if that fish plant is going to go to Selkirk or not. I guess at times it doesn't look like it will, but I don't know, and yes, we had the same case of an example, you might say; well, they were marching and they were asking and they were saying, "Let's protest; let's stop this if possible." The same thing happened in front of the Legislative Buildings. They were people that had their democratic rights. I have no doubt in my mind that many of those were insurance people. I have no doubt in my mind that many of those people that marched for the Selkirk cause that they were fishermen, and they both had that same democratic right to do just that, and I hope, I think that -- I must say, this government in power just now was good enough to grant the request for the South Indian Lake; is it then not fair to ask for the same consideration for the insurance industry? I think this present government would be rewarded by entertaining such a suggestion and not take the cold hard-core political attitude that seems to prevail in most of the contributions that I've heard coming during this automobile debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson. Do you want to ask a question?

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Yes. He wants to ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Would the member entertain a question?

MR. BARKMAN: Yes.

MR. BEARD: The member has been in the car industry. Would he, in his experience in respect to car depreciation, the operation, the gas and oil and repair, care to compare that cost toward the cost of insurance? Is the cost of insurance, added to those, very much of a percent?

MR. BARKMAN: Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that could be a two-edged question but I believe he's perhaps referring if the cost would be the same or not, I think in fairness I would have to say that the others would be higher. However, if he's asking the other question, that

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) are there going to more hidden costs, arbitrary costs than is on record or is shown, I'm very much afraid that there will be many more arbitrary costs than can be considered at this time.

MR. BEARD: A subsequent question. What would your costs of insurance be in your car costs of operation for a year? Would it be five or ten percent of your expense of operating a car?

MR. BARKMAN: I couldn't tell you the percentage, but I would have to admit that the other costs have gone up faster than these have.

MR. BEARD: One final question then. As an operator of a business, would you say that fifteen or twenty percent mark-up is a high mark-up in today's private industry? In conducting a private business today, do you think fifteen or twenty percent is too much of a profit to realize -- a gross profit?

MR. BARKMAN: No, I don't think so; in fact, I think all we're doing here is taking the 12 1/2 or 15 percent away from the agent that will be perhaps called profit as far as the government is concerned, but I don't think that 15 or 20 percent is too high. Unfortunately, many of us don't make it but I think it's a reasonable figure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: . . . a question? Would you consider -- you stated that there is no concern on the government's side. Would you consider \$104.00 reduction in Medicare is this type of lack of concern to the majority of people based on ability to pay?

MR. BARKMAN: I think the honourable member must be a good politician because I understand that a politician will never ask a question unless he knows the answer, but I don't know what policy he's referring to other than that particular one and perhaps the one that came up in the Liberal resolution some time ago. I believe he knows the answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: By way of information, Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the members that although we won't oppose this motion for adjournment, it is likely that we will oppose the next.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, did I understand the House Leader to say that he would by closure deny the right of a member to speak to this bill?

MR. GREEN: No, I didn't say that, Mr. Speaker. On the point of order, I indicated to honourable members that we would not oppose the motion to adjourn debate but we would likely oppose the next motion to adjourn debate, but we would not prevent anybody from speaking on it.

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

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member speaking on a motion to adjourn?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Well, I understand that if anybody wishes to

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize the honourable member wanted to speak. He was asking questions and didn't get up any further, so that's why I adjourned the debate.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I think that what has occurred is that the honourable member has adjourned debate and the Honourable Member from Radisson assumes that you have no objection to him speaking.

MR. EINARSON: No objection.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in the eleven months that the New Democratic Government has been in office, it has shown a high degree of consistency in its approach to good government. It has consistently followed a pattern of bringing about those changes that the people of Manitoba have asked to be made. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my honourable friends on the other side of the House of some of these changes. Firstly, there was a very significant reduction in the Medicare premium amounting to some 88 percent, of \$104.40 a year savings in health insurance premiums for the average Manitoban family of four. Secondly, the New Democratic Government has been consistent in its concern for the consumer by the new Consumer Protection Act which has been called one of the most progressive pieces of legislation in North America. Thirdly

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would be able to relate how this . . .

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I'm coming up to that point. I'm just coming to show the consistency and its concern for people.

MR. JORGENSON: Surely in this debate, Sir, we're discussing automobile insurance.

SOME MEMBERS: Order. Order.

MR. JORGENSON: I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the member will tell the House how he can relate the comments that he is making now to the bill before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member please state his point of order.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, I said, Sir, before I was so rudely interrupted on the other side, that my point of order is that the honourable member is not speaking about Bill 56, and it is my understanding that under the rules of this House a member must relate his comments to the bill before the House.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I am trying to relate it but apparently the Honourable Member for Morris does not like to hear consistency on this side of the government, the consistent concern for people. Certainly it has been consistent in its election pledge to create the office of Ombudsman. Manitobans now have an independent public protector who will investigate complaints against the government. Fourthly, the NDP Government has been consistent in its concern for the growth of our province by lowering the voting age to 18. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this government has taken the initiative in this area where previous governments have passed by on the other side. Well I can say that the Federal Government has recognized this and has followed suit. Fifthly, legislation was passed at the fall session allowing municipal governments to let old age pensioners travel for half fare on public transit vehicles. This is another example of consistent, forward-looking legislation that is designed to help all segments of society, of the Manitoba society, both young and old.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and list several other examples where the New Democratic Government has been consistent, straightforward, honest and progressive in its legislative program. Such matters as the setting up of the Northern Task Force, financial aid to farmers, aid to fishermen . . .

MR. BILTON: . . . order.

A MEMBER: There's no point in raising a point of order.

MR. BILTON: Are you going to allow this to continue or are we going to deal with Bill 56?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the point of order, I've heard numerous speeches from the other side talking about all of the priorities of government in relation to Bill 56, and I take it that what the honourable member is doing is merely demonstrating that the government has dealt with priorities and is now dealing with another one.

MR. BILTON: . . . a political speech we're listening to; we're not hearing anything about Bill 56 at all.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, every speech from this side is political.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: It is political and it is consistent with the facts.

MR. ENNS: Look Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I take no objections to the member's speech, but if he's making that speech he should make it accurately to the extent that in reference, in his specific reference to the bills that he talks about and takes so much credit, let the record be shown and --(Interjection) -- with respect to the lowering of the voting age to 18, this government or the past government consistently took the position of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. -- (Interjection) -- Order. Order, please.

MR. ENNS: . . . moving that when the Federal Government made the same move, so that by the same token with the Federal Government now changing their laws, we would have changed the laws . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Member for Lakeside . . .

MR. ENNS: . . . with respect to the Fishermen's bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down? The Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: . . . say something about auto insurance. Here again I must emphasize that one of the election platforms of the New Democratic Party in June of last year was auto insurance. Here we have shown a consistent pattern of fulfilling our pledges to the people of Manitoba. You all know the outcome of June 25th. We were elected; you were defeated. Mr. Speaker, the other week, a few weeks back the Member for Lakeside talked about the

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd.) difference between us and them. Well, Mr. Speaker, the difference between us and "them" is that where we are consistent in all our promises, "them" cannot understand what consistent means; "them" cannot understand that consistency means carrying out the election promises. They understand that election promises are only empty packages to be voiced at election time and then forgotten.

That is the practice of "them," and I do mean by the Official Opposition.

MR. GRAHAM: On a point of privilege. I would ask the member to withdraw that statement.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I didn't hear the point of privilege from the Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I distinctly heard the member making specific charges against this party which are incorrect and I would ask him to withdraw that statement.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the member state the charge otherwise there is no point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: On a point of order, Sir. I find that I must support the Member for Birtle-Russell, that the member made an inference that members of that party do not keep their word. That is not parliamentary and I certainly support him in the request for the withdrawal of that remark.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I stated that the practice of the opposition members during the election is to make promises which are not necessarily carried out once . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I demand I be heard on a point of privilege.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm asking you to make a ruling as to whether or not that remark is parliamentary and should be allowed to stand.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if a suggestion that political people have not kept their election promises was a point of privilege and unparliamentary I daresay that you'd have to take out half the pages of Hansard in Ottawa and half the pages of every Hansard in the Legislature, including half the pages of what you people have been saying in the last two months while we have been in this Legislature. That is not a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Everybody is available to see what either side has done. The Member for Radisson interprets what you people have done as not having kept your election promises, and, Mr. Speaker, the public decides whether they have or they haven't.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I've never been so shocked in my life as this past session to hear the charges and the words that fly day after day in this Chamber. A member can't be heard properly making a speech, where he's interrupted by insults and shouting and I think that the proceedings that have gone on in this Chamber in the last three or four weeks are a disgrace to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in all its history and . . . continues to be allowed well, I'm not going to sit in here and listen to them.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe this admonition has gone out to all sides; I would suggest that the members all adhere to the admonition that there be a lot less heckling if this is what you want. The House is in charge of the Members and they must maintain the decorum. The Speaker can only do it with their assistance. I do not really recognize that there was a point of privilege or a point of order in respect to the remarks of the Member for Radisson. He was suggesting that this was his opinion. He wasn't saying that it was so. The Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I regret, but on the same point of order . . .

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I believe the record will be shown in the Hansard tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, that if I've stated anything which . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member have a point of Order? -- for Lake side?

MR. ENNS: I believe Beauchesne, citation 145 would indicate that the imputation of motives is unparliamentary and certainly the remarks by the Honourable Member from Radisson indicated, imputed motives to our party as making certain promises that we had no intention of keeping. Now there is a difference between political parties making promises and not having the capacity, or not having the situation or the means to carry out promises, but if I recall, I had to withdraw remarks about accusing the opposite side of "wilful" deception. Now it was the word "wilful" that apparently made it unparliamentary and I'm suggesting that the

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) Honourable Member's remarks, which certainly carried the wilful intent in the remarks that he made about our party or group not, the difference between them and us, as us not wishing to carry out certain promises. To that extent it was wilful and to that extent, Sir, it was unparliamentary and I call for the retraction.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, one thing that is obviously causing difficulty to honourable members with respect to the alleged point of privilege before us, is a failure on their part to make a very important distinction as between references made to honourable members of the assembly in their individual capacities and references made to political party groups. While I have never held myself up to be an expert on the rules, I seem to recall very clearly a number of rulings over the years where it is clear that points of privilege with respect to unparliamentary expressions, with respect to the imputation of motives and the like, are points of privilege if they are referring to individual honourable members.

Now I think that the Honourable Member for Radisson was referring to a whole political party and as such does not constitute a point of parliamentary privilege. If he had singled out some individual member and had done so, made the same reference, or if he had imputed motives, then that would be a different story.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Radisson, proceed.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I believe my remarks at this point in time have indicated the consistency of this government. I think it is fair to say that June 25, 1969 marked a change in Manitoba, a change for the better. All members of this House are aware that change, be it social, technological, political or otherwise, is bound to affect someone in our society. Some will be affected by change more than others. During the past two decades there have been numerous changes that have affected people with respect to their jobs. For example, the introduction of the diesel locomotive in the transportation industry eliminated the need for coal, and this in turn eliminated jobs in the coal mining. Likewise, the old familiar coal-dog that once dotted the prairies, a familiar sight on the prairie scene and the water tanks has disappeared from the Canadian scene. People were dislocated by these changes but they did not come to the government and say that they must have compensation for loss of jobs. Many of these people accepted these changes, reorganized their lives and have no doubt contributed to the life of Canada in numerous other ways.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to other people who have been forced into new modes of living because of change. We know that some people who have earned university degrees are not working in the type of work for which they were trained because some jobs have petered out. If we are to be consistent we should pay compensation to these two categories of people that I have mentioned because their livelihood has been disrupted. Also what about the fact that the number of teachers who have been trained in the last year who cannot find jobs at the present time? Should these teachers have compensation? As one of their number I do not expect compensation. As a member of the New Democratic Government I must confess that I do have concern for people who are dislocated or have to suffer the distress of change. I want to make it clearly understood that we will do all we can to absorb anyone who is dislocated because of change into the types of work for which he is best suited. This brings me to another point that I want to make and it has to do with attitudes.

By this, and I think it was displayed very vividly earlier, by this I mean our attitude toward one another. I am concerned about some of the vicious attitudes that seem to be prevalent even today and in the past the former Member for Lakeside has displayed it on numerous occasions. It seems to me that we must always be positive in our approach to people. We must have a concern for all those who suffer from poverty, whether it be nutritional, economic, cultural or spiritual. If we are to make any impact upon these problems, our whole fabric of society must take a more brotherly, if I may use the term, stance, than it seems to be exhibiting at the present time. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the honourable gentleman would permit a question?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Yes.

MR. BILTON: Does the honourable gentleman believe in government monopoly?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I didn't get the import of that question.

MR. BILTON: Does the honourable gentleman believe in government monopoly?

MR. SHAFRANSKY: This is public business in the interests of all people of Manitoba. If it is a monopoly, which I guess it will be because it's going to be concerned with the basic,

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd.) but it is only going to be concerned with the basic coverage in the auto industry.

The auto industry wants to have this monopoly and I feel that people should have that responsibility.

MR. BILTON: Would the honourable gentleman answer my question - does he believe in government monopoly? Yes or no.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Where the public is concerned, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, with the member's permission I would speak on this bill.

MR. BILTON: In the absence of the honourable gentleman, we have no objection on this side, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: Mr. Speaker, I was going to title my speech on this bill "Freedom and Responsibility" because I felt that the economics of the case had been argued so well by my colleagues that it was not necessary for me to say anything about the economic merits of public automobile insurance, but I must confess that I was disturbed by the information brought to us by the Member for Ste. Rose when he said that the Wootton report which he described, and I think described correctly, as the most exhaustive, thorough and objective study ever made on automobile insurance had shown that there was no economic merit in a public automobile insurance plan of the kind that we advocate, and this disturbed me as an economist because I knew that what he said about this report insofar as its objectivity was correct. So I made a point of reading through the Wootton report at this stage, the whole two volumes of it, and I did find the statement that he referred to tucked away in the last few pages of Volume 2. But I also read the rest of the report, Mr. Speaker, and I found that, as I had suspected, with the exception of that one statement, the rest of the report verified the findings of the committee on automobile insurance and supports the principles of a public insurance plan.

Now perhaps the Member for Ste. Rose only read that one page or perhaps just that one paragraph which indicated some difficulty with the economics of public automobile insurance or perhaps he read the rest of the report as well and simply didn't advise the House of the obvious contradiction in the Wootton report. So I have decided not to dispense with my topic of "Freedom and Responsibility" but to spend some time with the members going through the evidence of the Wootton report - not my evidence, their evidence - which would support a public automobile insurance. I don't think the House has had the benefit of this and I think that the members would find it interesting.

So I will therefore review with the members of this House the basic findings of Wootton. The Wootton report says that in British Columbia, and this verifies some of the points that the member, Mr. Barkman, was making, the Member for La Verendrye, 54.1% of the claims take more than 15 days before settlement is reached, and 5%, only 5% of the claims take more than six months. But in over 10% of the cases it takes more than 15 days just to appoint an insurance adjuster, after the insurer has been notified of the claim. The Member for La Verendrye failed to notify us of that finding. In accidents involving bodily injury over one-fifth of the cases took six months to a year to settle and in cars involving litigation about half took one to two years to settle. In cars where compensation is over \$5,000 or over the average time of settlement was two years. The Commission calculated on a sample of 1,253 cases the actual economic loss involved. The economic loss included property damage, medical, hospital and other related expenses and income losses resulting from the accident, and the Commission says that the measurements were deliberately subjected to a downward bias, they were conservatively estimated, and on this basis they found that the actual economic loss in those sample cases was 2.7 million dollars, whereas the compensation actually paid out in these cases was \$900,000.00, that is one-third of the actual economic loss.

The Commission makes another observation on this, which I would quote, it says "that the bias is greatest where losses are more serious and the circumstances tragic. Thus the ratios of average compensation to average economic loss for minor injury is .85, for serious injury .44 and for fatality cases .20. The inference that the present compensation", the report

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) continues, "compensation system discriminates between automobile damage on the one hand and personal injuries resulting in income loss on the other seems obvious. The conclusion that this discrimination is undesirable hinges only on the belief that individuals deserve treatment at least the equal of that accorded bent fenders, a belief that few people care to quarrel with." That is on Page 112 of the Wootton report.

It then compares this system, the system that we now have, with the Saskatchewan system, and it quotes from a book written by two universally acknowledged authorities on automobile insurance, Keaton and O'Connell who wrote a book called "Protection for the Traffic Victim" and this is what that book, these authorities say about the Saskatchewan system. They say that red tape and delays are said to be practically non-existent, with death claims settled generally within six weeks to two months after claim, with minor injuries claims being settled in less than two weeks. As a result, lawyers have been employed by claimants in only a very small percentage of cases, except those involving death claim where bringing the claim has been considered a part of settling the defendant's estate. The Wootton report claims that its studies verify the findings of these two authors.

The Wootton report then quotes from a brief submitted to them by the Saskatchewan government insurance office, which I would also quote, and which the Wootton report as I'll indicate concurs with. The Saskatchewan brief is as follows: "A rather extensive claims organization has been developed with a view to furnishing to claimants under the Act prompt and efficient service. In the larger centres, Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and Prince Albert, drive-in claim service centres are established. A vehicle that has been involved in an accident anywhere in the surrounding district may be brought to a claim service centre to be examined by an estimator. The estimator is first and foremost a person who is experienced in the automotive repair business" and so on and so forth. The Wootton report concurs with this finding and it says, and I quote: "It appears that compensation in that province must be paid rapidly."

The Commission also condemns the high administrative costs of the present system. It says that "the ratio of administrative costs to premium benefits paid out, that is 37 percent to 63 percent" and this is a quote from Wootton: "Is far too high." It says that: "It would be desirable if a new approach to protection could be developed whereby a larger share of the premium dollar could be released for the payment of claims. The Commission notes the difference between the average processing cost per claim of Wawanesa, which is \$25.52, against the Saskatchewan figure of \$18.80."

Now the members opposite have been screaming for proof that a publicly run automobile plan will really reduce costs and here I would offer the proof that Wootton provides in its report. It says that "The Commission note with interest operations under the Saskatchewan Automobile Accident Insurance Act where expenses have absorbed less than 20 percent of the premium dollar for a number of years and less than 15 percent in license year 1966-67, leaving the balance available for the payment of claims. While the Saskatchewan scheme has frequently incurred deficits on annual operations as of many private companies, it has not done so over all nor in the past year." I hope the Member for Assiniboia has caught that.

"In this respect" the Wootton report says, "our findings concur with those of the State of California's '67 Saskatchewan jurisdiction report." I found perhaps most interesting of all, a footnote to this section, the evidence that Saskatchewan's accounting system was examined exhaustively by a panel of the insurance industry to see whether or not their accounting methods were satisfactory to their mind and in this footnote this is what it says: "The panel was subjected to extensive cross-examination" (the panel of the Saskatchewan insurance people) "was subjected to extensive cross-examination by various counsels to the insurance industry and by the Commission counsel on all facets of their presentation, including in particular accounts and accounting methods. The cross-examination took seven days. The Commissioners were fully satisfied as to the propriety of the accounting methods and the validity of the very full accounts presented to us."

Apparently the authors of the Wootton report were satisfied with the figures that the members opposite argue are somehow inflated or somehow incorrect. After seven full days of investigating the accounting methods they argue that they found they couldn't find anything wrong with them.

The Commission also had several chapters on the products, that is automobile insurance and the industry, and their discussion here is most interesting because they would argue contrary to the evidence referred from the other side, that there is very little that distinguishes the

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) product of one company from the product of another. It says that "the coverages are essentially standardized. The services may be slightly different from company to company but that this is of little significance to the average motorist."

What the Commission says about the industry is even more interesting. It says that "The industry is organized into a cartel of associations whose purpose is to fix prices and standardize coverages."

MR. ENNS: Would the member permit a question at this point? I'm wondering whether in his examination of the Wootton report did it also indicate at any point which companies do or in fact any practice racial discrimination with respect to the sales of their policies?

MR. GONICK: The Wootton report discusses various kinds of discrimination, price discrimination which the member can find in Volume One if he chooses to look. -- (Interjection) -- I'd like to finish my comments.

MR. ENNS: Fine. Well, he doesn't have to answer my question, he just has to indicate so.

MR. GONICK: The Wootton Commission describes the kind of cartel arrangements which exist in the industry. It says first "The Canadian Underwriters Association was organized in 1935 and in its letters patent it states very clearly what its aims are, that is to fix prices." The members can find that on Page 183. Its membership includes 47 groups comprising 106 companies. Then in 1964 another association was established to include many of the insurance companies that weren't part of the Canadian Underwriters Association. This was called the Independent Insurance Conference and its price fixing purposes are also specifically described in its constitution. This company has 13 groups and 32 separate companies. And about the same time a third body was set up called the Insurance Bureau of Canada and it includes virtually all the independent companies that were 'nt part of the other two, as well as the other two organizations as corporate members of the Insurance Bureau of Canada; so that altogether the IBC accounts for 70 percent of the automobile premiums. Now the Commission examined the impact of this organization and it says that it operates as the headquarters of a cartel-like operation. They quote from the IBC brief itself which it received, which admits that it was established to eliminate price competition that has emerged just prior to 1964.

So with all the talk of competition that we have heard in this debate of free choice private initiative and so forth, we find that in this industry like so many others that we know exist in this country, there is no effective competition, there is no freedom of choice. It's a private monopoly organized as a cartel with all of the abuses that we know exist in cases of monopoly.

The Commission also has some interesting things to say about profits in this industry. We know that, we heard from the industry and from the members on the other side, the difficult strait that this industry is in with regard to its profit intake and the Wootton report gives us an opportunity to tell whether or not the industry has been telling the truth. Well, it finds -- I should say first that the Wootton properly says that the profit statistic which is of most interest to and relevance to the owners of a business, is the profit on equity. So what it does, it takes the 2.5 profit margin that is earned by the industry and it says that on equity this comes to 10.2 to 11.2 percent. But this of course is not all the profits that are earned by this industry because the insurance companies invest their reserves in stocks and bonds and these stocks and bonds of course pay dividends. The profit earned therefore can be reinvested in more stocks and bonds or can be used to put up buildings which would then house these insurance companies or could be reated to others on which profit is made, and somehow these profits are never counted by the insurance companies and are never passed on to the insured in reduced claims or better service.

There are other ways in which the insurance companies can make profits, by cheating on taxes, I would say, and if the members like I can table -- I'd be quite willing to table an article that appeared in the Atlantic Magazine, September 1969 called "Why Automobile Insurance Rates Keep Going Up" which gives example after example of the way in which the automobile insurance companies in North America are able to avoid paying taxes through various techniques -- and of course that is not unique to this industry at all and I would not blame the companies for doing all that they do to earn as high profits as they can, that's why they're in business. In fact I must say that I would have to, if I wished to stay in this business or any business whose purpose it is to maximize profits, to minimize costs, would have to do everything that is possible to survive within the law, and that is what the insurance companies are doing and nobody can blame them. The difference between them and others perhaps is that they are powerful and

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) in the law of the jungle the powerful survive, whereas others perhaps don't make out as well.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I wonder if the member would permit a question?

MR. GONICK: I would like to finish in the time remaining. What are the total profits earned by the insurance industry, when you take into account the profit margins as well as the profits earned on investments, because that is the relevant statistic. Well, I think the members will be very surprised perhaps to learn that the annual profit on equity in this industry is 34 percent before taxes and 17 percent to 21 percent after taxes. No other industry investigated by the Wootton Commission earned such returns - and I can quote some of the returns which are indeed high but none of them rival this one. Meat packing - 13.3 percent return on equity. This is 1963 the year that the figures were available. Bakery products - 12 percent; breweries - 17.1 percent; iron and steel - 13.4 percent; food retail - 16.4 percent. Well none of these match. These are all before tax returns, and they're roughly one-half the taxes earned by the automobile insurance industry.

Well who would deny that these profits earned by this industry are exorbitant and totally without justification? Here is an industry that is providing an essential product, that is grossly inefficient, according to Wootton; is organized as a cartel that fixes prices, according to Wootton; an industry that's devoid of all real competition; an industry that earns exorbitant profits, according to Wootton; it violates every standard of good economic performance. Is there any question then that it should be taken into the public sector?

Would a government company in competition with a private company solve the problem? That is an alternative which many members have put forward. Well, how could it? The administrative efficiency comes by way of eliminating the agent's commissions, the advertising, the duplicated office space, the duplication in forms, the extra correspondence involved, the lawyers' fees and so forth. You would have none of these efficiencies, you would have none of these inefficiencies if the government were simply to go into competition with the private companies. The inefficiencies stem not from the isolated performance of each firm but from the inefficient industry structure and if all we did was to add one extra company on to an inefficient industry structure, nothing would happen, nothing beneficial to the public would happen. Furthermore, this solution would not cut down on the exorbitant profits, most of which are earned on investments of the reserves of companies. So that the alternatives recommended to this House by members of the Liberal Party in particular seem to be totally without purpose, would not do any of the things which all members agree is necessary for this industry.

Now it's true that Wootton did not recommend as a first step the establishment of a Crown corporation insurance office, but only because, in my view, it does not face up to the logical conclusion of its own analysis. It does list the conditions under which it would be appropriate for government to take an industry into public ownership, and this is a quote: "If conditions where competition is thwarted or monopoly inevitable and regulation is ineffective, the alternative of public enterprise should be considered as preferable."

Now that is not the recommendation of the committee of the New Democratic Party, it is the recommendation of Wootton which happens to coincide with the policies of this party and with the findings of the Committee's report. The Commission showed that virtually item for item these conditions prevail in the automobile insurance industry, that it did not seek to follow the logic of its own arguments simply, given the evidence that it itself finds, simply attests to a failure of nerve on the part of the Commission. On the other hand, the Commission did say that should an intermediate solution fail, then it would recommend the immediate establishment of a Crown monopoly; and in B.C. where an intermediate solution is being attempted, there is evidence that the B.C. government is being forced to reconsider that particular solution and set up a Crown corporation, a monopoly Crown Corporation.

Now that is as much as I wanted to say about the economics of this argument and I really had not intended to get into that because I thought our members has dealt with it very well, but I must say that I was disturbed by the point that the Member from Ste. Rose had made that the findings of Wootton were inimical to the findings of the Report, were contrary to the findings of the Report. Well, my studies of Wootton, the two volumes, show that on the contrary they support the findings of the report and support the creation of a Crown corporation.

I believe that most people who have taken part in this debate have reflected long and hard on the substance and intent of Bill 56. A Bill like this is one that does encourage members to expose their mental and spiritual state and I think that's what happened.

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) We heard from the Member for Wolseley who likens this battle to Dunkirk and Iwo Jima and he thinks that he's doing the same battle here that he did over there in World War II. In his mind this NDP government . . .

MR. BILTON: A point of order. In the absence of the Honourable Member for Wolseley, I don't remember him using the words "Dunkirk" in any part of his remarks.

MR. GONICK: Well, he didn't use the word Dunkirk but he did refer to World War II and his efforts there and why he was fighting there and he did liken the cause that he was fighting for there was the cause that he's fighting for here.

Perhaps in his mind the NDP is the same thing as the NPD in Germany; the same war, the same enemy, the same cause, only the battleground is different.

Then there is the Member for Fort Garry who hears the echoes of jackboots and probably he has visions of Buchenwald and Beausejour. Apparently he still fails to recognize that he saw Buchenwald in Vietnam when he visited there a few years ago. For him there's no people, there's no collectivity, there's no community interest, there's no communal freedom, there's no communal self-determination, there's no communal initiative, there's only "me, my interest, my initiative, my profit." It's right for individuals and privately owned enterprises to show initiative and to provide a service and make a profit; it's wrong for the community collectively to show initiative, to provide a service and make a profit. The one is free enterprise, the other is dictatorship, in his mind.

The Member for Fort Garry, the Member for Swan River, Sturgeon Creek and Roblin and Lakeside and Pembina and Emerson, there's something immoral about the people deciding through their votes to seek a collective solution to a problem that has vexed them for so many years. Somehow it's irresponsible for this party elected to bring into effect a public automobile insurance plan, to actually go ahead and do it. The matter needs more study somebody said. Talk it over with the industry another member advised. I don't know of any other subject that has been more studied than this one. A million and one half dollars in B.C., \$100,000 apparently here. I think we've had enough studies, we've had enough discussion; this party was elected to act and this is what it's doing in this particular issue. The members say that they are for compulsory insurance but they want freedom of choice. Freedom to them means the freedom to choose from among Colgate, Pepsodent, Crest and Macleans and the other 89 brands of different flavour toothpaste. They apparently are unable to make elementary distinction between choices that are phoney and choices that are real. Somehow it's not an exercise of freedom when the electorate decides to end an inefficient and exploited insurance system; rather, according to the Member for Fort Rouge, this is a manifestation of the tyranny of the majority.

Nobody in this House would deny the importance of individual freedom, but freedom cannot mean that the freedom of the few can count over the freedom of the many. In this debate perhaps no other word has been used more often than the word "freedom", but somehow the members opposite confuse the term freedom with the term free enterprise. They think the terms are synonymous. Well, I'm concerned with freedom as well, Mr. Speaker, and I think all members here are.

What bothers me is the implication on the part, the arguments of the members opposite that we are now free except for government intervention and government interference and if only government would get out of, not only the bedrooms of the nation, but also businesses and so forth, that we would be a free nation. The member says it would sure help. Well my problem is that I would agree that the question of freedom is of utmost importance to me, as members in my caucus know. There is no more important question. My concern is just how unfree our society is and what the sources of that unfreedom are. Let's take the case of the employer and the employee. The employer has bought the services of the worker and however humane his treatment may be, he still commands him. There is no personal freedom in this relationship. One commands, the other obeys.

MR. BILTON: You haven't employed, that's obvious.

MR. GONICK: The employees are free to leave and that is the extent of their freedom but only to hire themselves out to other employers who also command. To a degree the trade union movement has acted as a mediator but its powers are restricted because it cannot claim the rights that only the owners or manager has. Where is the freedom of this relationship, Mr. Speaker? Let's take man's relationship to the things he makes, the factories and houses he helps to build, the cars he produces, the clothes, the grains and the food that he grows; these are the products of his mind and his hands. If they become his master, he worships the product

(MR. GONICK cont'd) that he produces; they take on a life separate from himself. He bows down to them; the work of his own hands has become his God. He is a slave to the things of his own creation and the money that buys them. We are not . . .

MR. BILTON: This is Canada?

MR. BOROWSKI: On a point of order . . . the Leader of the Opposition . . . chastised this side for interrupting while one of his boys is speaking, may I ask him to admonish his members, especially the rooster from Swan River to keep quiet while this member speaks.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, that's no more a point of order than it is for me to get up on this floor. Sit down and be quiet.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Member for Crescentwood continue.

MR. GONICK: I think that there is a relationship which members opposite are unable to come to grips with. That is a relationship between men and the things that they produce. I think that man has become a slave to the things of his own creation and to the money that buys them. We call that freedom? Do you call that freedom? I don't think that we are happy being the slaves of our products. It's not in the nature of man. It's part of the social environment we find ourselves in; part of an economic system that we live in. Let's take the relationship between man and himself if you're interested in freedom. The most important relationship of all. We think of ourselves not as human beings but as commodities for sale. The blue collar worker sells his physical energy and his skills. The businessman, the salesman and the physician they sell their salesmanships, their personality. The value of a person is the value the market puts on him. If he has nothing marketable his market value is zero and he is useless and he feels useless. Do you call that freedom? The freedom of the individual to realize his own potential?

Let's look at the act of consumption. When we buy something it has nothing whatever to do with our effort or our intrinsic interest. All it requires is money. If I have the money, I can acquire an exquisite painting even though I have no appreciation or interest in art. I can buy a whole library even though I never intend to read a book. I can buy an education for no other reason than it adds to my social esteem; and if I want to I can destroy all these things.

As long as I have the money I can acquire and do anything I like with the things of my acquisition. There is no freedom to acquire without money. Is that the extent of freedom that the members opposite are concerned with? We are free to choose from among this product and that product, between this label and that label, but we are made into compulsive consumers. The more we consume the more we want to consume. Originally consumption of more and better things was somehow related to a man's happiness. Now it's become part, become an end to itself. We are not inherently gluttons, but we learn to crave every new gadget. We learn to become dissatisfied with what we have; we learn from advertising which conditions us from the moment that we can sit up and identify sounds and objects. Our children are trained to be dissatisfied and to want; they are programmed to be gluttons before they reach their teens. And we call that freedom?

So, Mr. Speaker, if it's freedom that the members want to talk about, let's talk about freedom. Not in the superficialities of the members opposite, not just on the surface; let's talk about the roots of freedom and individuality. We say, for example, that freedom means the right to express our thoughts. That means something only if we are able to have thoughts of our own and that is precisely what we deny to our children. Our schools must teach the word. Our children are taught right answers, and any time a teacher has the initiative to do something different, to say something different, to say controversial things, to assign controversial reading, chances are that he'll be badgered and attacked by the freedom loving members of this chamber, who insist that only businessmen must have the freedom of initiative. Teachers cannot because maybe they might use that freedom to say unpopular things. That's called indoctrination. Freedom is fine as long as it's safe, Mr. Speaker, as long as the right people use it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I haven't been able to say all that I wished to say about freedom and responsibility, but I want to say that the question of freedom is complicated. Freedom and free enterprise are not synonymous, or they are only synonymous for that handful of people who may be called truly free enterprisers. As people we have certain freedom, but freedom means more than the right to vote and the right to choose between buying a Ford or a Chevy. Altogether I would say that we are a very unfree society. That's because with the help of the media the pressures of conformity are so great; because the molding of public opinion is so centralized in the hands of a few; because the work pattern is authoritarian; because children are being suppressed and oppressed in our schools. We are unfree because men find themselves tossed

(MR. GONICK cont'd) about by market forces and laid off and shifted around, unable to plan for their future. We are unfree because we are drugged by the things of our own creation. We are unfree because a handful of men, those who control the major means of production, are able to threaten the livelihoods of thousands of men by introducing automation, by changing location. Our women are unfree because they are denied the right to control their own bodies, denied the right of abortion. They are unfree because tradition and prejudice restrict what they can do with their lives and the work that is available to them. So, Mr. Speaker, freedom is a subject which is not the monopoly of the members opposite.

I have just a few more . . .

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member wishes perhaps he could continue at 8 o'clock. It is 5:30. I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8 o'clock tonight.