

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 14, 1972

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The honourable member has ten minutes.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we were interrupted at 5:30, Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with some of the problems in agriculture today and some of the confusion that exists in the agricultural field and the uncertainty that exists in the minds of many of the farmers today. At the hearing that was held in the community in Rosburn by the Agricultural Committee, Mr. Speaker, a president of one of the locals of the Farmers Union supported by the views of an area director of the Farmers Union advocated that strikes should be abolished in labour disputes and compulsory arbitration implemented in its place.

Mr. Speaker, these were the views of some of the members, some of the farmers in this area. Now whether they represent the views of all farmers or not I don't know. These were views expressed by members of the Farmers Union and I sincerely hope that the Agricultural Committee will take into account all the briefs that were heard in all the sessions that were held. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that in the field of agriculture you will get many views heard from various sections of the country and they won't be unanimous nor will they be consistent in some cases because farming is a very complex matter, Sir, and the views of the poultry producer very well could be opposed by a hog producer, and those of a hog producer may not be similarly the same of those of a beef producer or a grain producer, and when you try and lump all these various specialties and the sale of these special commodities under one umbrella organization, Sir, I believe that the eventual outcome is a very watered down consensus of opinion that is certainly not unanimous by all concerned. I would say to you, Sir, that it is my opinion that the views of the various areas of farming can best be expressed by commodity groups, because when they express their view they are talking for that particular type of farmer and you will in all likelihood get a far clearer picture of the agricultural situation as it affects that particular group. It may not be the same view as that expressed by another commodity group, but at least you will have heard the views of the various commodity groups and the reasoning behind their thinking. When we talk about the problems of rural agriculture, Sir, one of the main questions comes again back into the field of transportation. This is the question of rail line abandonment and the erstwhile Minister of Rail line abandonment, the Honourable House Leader, Sir, I'm sure is acting constantly on behalf of the farmers of this province. I'm very sure that with his long line of experience in the railway industry that he is acting on behalf of the farmers and all of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time we are finding notices coming out to the various communities expressing policy decisions which affect these communities in a major way. First of all we had them last year by the Canadian Pacific Railway and now we are getting them from the Canadian National Railway. I find it rather amusing, Sir, to find that at the farm meeting that was held in Winnipeg here last week at which the Minister of Agriculture was present, that we find the Canadian National Railway pointing their finger at the railway companies and saying that it is because of the antiquated grain collection system that the rail problems that we see so evident today and the failure to move large quantities of grain on time to the seaport. But we also find that the grain companies are rather inconsistent in their respect, too, that they feel in some sense that rail abandonment is adding to their problems and I know of one particular grain organization that last year attempted to close and in fact did close quite a number of grain delivery points in this province and then within a year turn around and buy a far larger number of delivery points. To many of the farmers who are actual shareholders in this organization this causes some confusion because they're not too sure what the policy of the grain company is because at one time they are trying to close elevators and then they turn around and buy additional ones. So there is great confusion in agriculture today. This, Sir, is basically a result of economic conditions and after watching TV tonight, and the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I feel that perhaps he would be better serving his community if he went out into the country and conducted elementary courses in economics so that all the people in Manitoba could benefit from his experience and his wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the comments that I have to make at this time. I appreciate the indulgence of the members from the other side of the House and I hope that with their continued efforts that they will listen to some of the comments and the suggestions and the complaints that they hear from this side of the House and the result --(Interjection) -- well

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . . that is a prerogative of theirs -- but I hope that the general outcome of it will - before this session is over that we can eventually come up with programs which will assist all the people in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think I should commence my remarks by performing the usual type of role that has been performed by some of the members in the House and note the changes that have taken place since the last session of the Legislature and I look across the way and I now realize why the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell was moved from the back row to the second row. I would think that as a result of the demonstration that he has just performed that there is every reason to understand why he has been moved to the second row. I look across the way to see that the Honourable Member for Swan River has been moved to the front row of the opposition benches. I can only judge from this, Mr. Speaker, that it's a very clear and unquestionable intention on the part of his leader that the Member for Swan River should perform the role of being a member of the Shadow Cabinet. I think that's quite clear.

I note that the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, who I want to say has some good qualities about him only because he has considerable involvement and understanding with some of the good people that I represent due to a number of years of residency in my constituency that I think it's only fitting that I should welcome him to this House. I note that he sits close to the doors; I would judge from that it's only to the fact that he anticipates that there may be a movement either forward or backwards come the next election. The --(Interjection) -- I'm not taking any chances here. You know during the period of the Second World War there was a well-known political figure in Germany called Goebbels who used to utter the phrases that if you lied sufficiently there would always be some people that would believe you, and if you continued the lies repeatedly in a period of time the majority of people would in fact understand.

I am also told from some reading that I have done that in the 1880s there was --(Interjection) -- I hope that I'm not touching any nervous ends across the way. I am also told that during the 1880s there was a famous religious prophet in the New England States who prophesied that the end of the world was going to come about at a certain day, month and year. I am told that on that particular day, hundreds of people fled with him into a cave and waited for the end of the world to take place. Well that particular day the end of the world did not occur so he re-prophesied that the end of the world would take place one year later, that he had been mistaken in his interpretation of revelations. One year later he fled into the same cave with about half the number of people that he had taken with him the first time. Again the end of the world did not occur and again he had to reprophecy, reforecast, and on the third time only one person, he himself, was in the cave. Well this reminds me very much, Mr. Speaker, of what I would forecast for the Conservative Opposition in this Legislature. Due to the frequent statements which are untruthful, remiss representations, forecasts which prove wrong, it is only a matter of time until their numbers will dwindle down to, I suspect, one, if that, in the Legislature. I would suspect the Leader of the Opposition the Member for River Heights would be the last member to be in the House, unless the Member for Birtle-Russell should move from the second row down to the leader's seat because he has been making considerable progress between last session and this session. He might very well succeed.

Now I would like to deal with just a few areas because the Leader of the Opposition - and I want to go back to some of the earlier premises that I've made - have made a statement to the effect that motorists in the Province of Manitoba were paying more under Autopac than they were under private insurance. And this has been a statement that has been repeated over and over again. Now rather than deal in generalities on this question I wish to deal with specifics, because it's very easy to deal in generalities and then not be subject to any scrutiny as to whether or not the facts are correct.

During the process of releasing the automobile insurance rates, and during debate in regard to those rates last October, the members of the public who felt that their rates had in fact increased from what they had paid under private insurance were called upon to send their policies in for close scrutiny by the underwriting people -- and it need not have been the underwriting people for Autopac, it could be any underwriting people that could scrutinize those policies in order to ascertain whether or not the claims that were being made by certain people in the province who felt their rates were being increased were in fact true. There have been a number of policies sent in and I have a detailed analysis of 18 policies here that were received and were scrutinized from people who had claimed that their rates had been increased under

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . Autopac from what they had been before. These were the people who felt that they were part of that "preferred grouping" among Manitoba motorists that were paying higher rates. In those 85 policies, there were in fact only three people that were paying more than they had paid before under private insurance. Three of the eighteen. In fact, 72.2% of those that had sent policies in for analysis were saving from 10 to 45% with Autopac. I think this is very meaningful because these were people who suggested that they were paying more and in fact forwarded their policies in. I would like to suggest so that it's clear on the record for the Opposition, what were the reasons that so many people could be under a misconception in this respect, and there are five basic reasons. And of course there's been nothing but an attempt to confuse this particular issue in so far as the political opposition is concerned in this House. First, the coverage was entirely different in some of these cases. There was a comparison . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to ask all members to remember, I am tuned in to the sound system and the interjections as much as I would like to hear them, I can't from all sides, so therefore if they would refrain and wait until they are recognized, they could all be on tape and I could hear them too. I thank the honourable members. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: The first is, Mr. Speaker, that the coverage was different. Those, for instance, would find out upon scrutiny of the policy that in many cases when motorists felt they had a \$25.00 deductible that in fact they had only \$25.00 deductible fire and theft and no collision coverage. Some of these policies were in that instance. Others thought they had full third party liability coverage, when in fact they only had \$35,000 in Third Party Liability and were comparing it to \$50,000 Third Party Liability with Autopac. Others under private insurance had no accident benefit coverage whatsoever and yet felt that their coverage was equivalent compared with Autopac as to private insurance.

Other motorists were comparing uses, classifications which were not the same whatsoever. For example, some motorists were insured under private insurance, pleasure use only, not driving to and from work, and under Autopac they were driving their car to and from work and they'd only -- in one case here, the very first one, they had commenced to drive their automobile to and from work only a couple of months before the inception of Autopac so the entire rating classification changed, and of course the rate was different than it would be under private insurance.

The third is that you would have people that would move in from rural areas into city areas and, of course, would immediately recognize the increase in rates because of the change in territory.

Four, there would be changes in cars; the sale of one car, the purchase of another car and the moving up in the car grouping and there was of course the entire question of people comparing 1969 and 1970 rates with the Autopac 1972 rates. This was the most common error that took place, because certainly you cannot compare a billing of two years old with an up-to-date billing. No commercial transaction you can do that type of thing.

I would like to add to that, Mr. Speaker, that we should I think place on the record what we mean by increases over the past two years, 1971 and 1972, across Canada in Automobile Insurance, so that this fact should be kept into consideration when we discuss the rates under Autopac. In British Columbia there has been an increase in rates of 17% in two years. Prince Edward Island an increase of 15.4%. In Ontario an increase of 18% in two years. In fact it's interesting here that the increase in Ontario took place within two weeks of the Ontario election -- after it, not before. Alberta, an increase of 17% in two years. Newfoundland, an increase of 13% in two years. New Brunswick, an increase of 7% in two years. Quebec is the only province operating with private insurance this year where there has been a decrease in rates; a decrease this year in the province of Quebec, and the Member for Thompson says how come? He might well ask that. The fact is that the province of Quebec is this year studying the feasibility of a new automobile insurance system for the province of Quebec.

During the Ontario election campaign huge ads occurred in all Ontario newspapers. The ad read "What some Manitobans think about their brand of NDP government automobile insurance. Does it really cost less? We don't think so." The ad was sponsored by the Insurance Bureau of Canada, representing general insurance companies. The Insurance Bureau of Canada . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the honourable member would contain himself

(MR. SPEAKER (cont'd) . . . . . Order, please. I would ask the Honourable Member for Lakeside to contain himself, he has had his forty minutes. I don't wish to remind him again. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, six people were quoted in this ad. Six Manitobans were quoted as having paid more under present Autopac Insurance than they had paid under private insurance. Upon receiving that advertisement I took it upon myself to write to the people in question. One of the six I could not locate his address but I did write to five of the six and suggested to them that my concern about their suggestion that their rates were 15, 20, 25, 30 percent higher under Autopac than previously, that I was in fact concerned in order to ascertain whether or not this was true, and I requested that they should consider forwarding their policies to me in order that I could ascertain whether or not they were working under any misconception or whether in fact they did have a valid claim.

Only one answered my communications, a gentleman who is a well known insurance company lawyer in the City of Winnipeg. Well he answered, Mr. Chairman, we exchanged correspondence for a period of time, in which we continued to argue over his basic quote, but to this day, I have not received his insurance policy itself, for some reason or other in order to make an honest and proper comparison. -- (Interjection) -- Frankly I don't trust lawyers.

So, Mr. Speaker, the evidence continues to build up. Mr. Egon Frech who is a member of our own press gallery here wrote an article which appeared in the Toronto Globe and Mail -- it was not published in the Winnipeg Free Press. I don't know why really. My colleague says that shouldn't be surprising me at all -- back last October 30, 1971, in which he states that a year ago it was a popular game among insurance executives to predict dire things for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. One by one the predictions have been disproved as the government plan took place.

The Toronto Daily Star very recently published an article which referred to the attacks on Autopac, which I suggest is a very clear summary of the reasons and motivations behind those attacks. Toronto Star, January 28, 1972, "Insurance Central", this is an office located in the downtown Winnipeg area here "is a creature of the Insurance Bureau of Canada, an association of private insurance companies and the same body that placed those ads in the Ontario newspapers. The attack on Autopac then seems to be not so much the offspring of new consumer concern as a godchild of politics, with honourable mention to the Winnipeg Free Press".

Honourable members across the way made some reference, the Member for Lakeside earlier today, about delays, thousands waiting for settlement of claims. I would like to read for the purpose of the record the last paragraph of this article which states "Like much of the criticism of Autopac that is an unprovable statement. A Toronto Star survey in January 1971 showed that 31% of Canadians wait more than three months to collect insurance and 25% wait more than six months. Now is the time to bone up on that kind of statistic because sure as premiums, the Autopac battles next engagement will be in the province of Ontario.

What is the latest development? Well, Mr. Speaker, only last week it was brought to my attention that a very high priced firm based in Toronto, called, I believe the name is Contemporary Research Incorporated, has embarked upon an analysis, an interview of Manitobans insofar as Autopac is concerned. There is about 7 or 8 detailed questions, pages of detailed questions being posed now to Manitobans about Autopac. I know for sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Manitoba New Democratic Party is not financing this multi thousand dollar survey, nor is Autopac out of public monies, paying for this survey, Mr. Speaker, I think I should make that quite clear. I do suspect one - maybe it is one of those work projects - I think possibly it has the same sort of value as that grant that was made to a group that was studying the cult of Satan in Toronto, about the same type of value. The questionnaire, Mr. Speaker, ends up with the question: "How did you vote in the last provincial election - Progressive Conservative, New Democratic, Liberal and/or Social Credit". So I can only judge from that, one of two things: First, either it is a survey which is engineered and financed by the Insurance Industry in Canada, and it's an expensive survey because they are using interviewers around Winnipeg at the present time, with an intent -- that is people of Canada unknowingly -- with the intent that the insurance industry should become deeply involved in the political scene of this province within the next year or year and a half. I think it's pretty clear, pretty clear -- a questionnaire in detail about automobile insurance, with the questions somewhat weighted in favour of the response you want, with a final question dealing with your political affiliation. If it is not the insurance industry that is behind this multi thousand dollar survey then I would suggest it is the

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if my friends across the way say that it is not the Conservative Party that is behind this expensive multi thousand dollar survey, then I would certainly listen with interest to their denial of this, then I would definitely know that it was the insurance industry that was sponsoring this multi thousand dollar survey. My colleague here from Thompson reminds me, and I think it should be repeated again for the members opposite, that this is a survey that is not paid for by the insurance industry, not paid for by a political party in the final analysis, but in one way or another is paid for by the people unknowingly and unwillingly. They are assisting in the financing of this type of advertising poll taking survey making in the province of Manitoba at the present time and the people should know that that money is coming from their pockets. In the same way, in the same way that the honourable members opposite like to refer to government spending at any time, it is the consumer that pays in the final analysis, and I say that so that that is underlined and fully understood by the members opposite.

Another interesting thing happened to me, Mr. Speaker, during the -- I have a weakness from time to time of appearing on hot line programs as some of the members opposite do, I heard them the other morning -- and during the second week in January, dealing with automobile insurance, who should call in but the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Spivak, and we had a very interesting discussion about rates. It's all recorded. When we speak of political people speaking the truth, in the process of that interview I pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition that if Automobile Insurance in the province of Manitoba was to be returned to the old system that he was advocating, then 35% of the motorists in the province of Manitoba . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Well, on a point of order, point of privilege, I believe -- no I have some responsibility when speakers take it upon themselves to make suggestions or motivate reasons to the leader. At no time has the leader of the Official Opposition indicated that we return to the old system. He has indicated alternatives and he has indicated that he would take away the monopoly feature.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would like to suggest to the honourable gentleman that he should state his point of order and not make a debate or refute a point that was made in debate. There was no point of order that I recognize that the honourable gentleman was uttering. Now would he state his point of order, if he has one.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker on a point of personal privilege then . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, for clarification, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, this afternoon, Sir, the First Minister rose, the First Minister rose in his chair to ask your advice, Sir, as to just when a correction should take place.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ENNS: Well I am asking the Speaker now. If it is your ruling, Sir, that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I indicated that a point of order should be taken up as soon as feasible and as soon as possible. I do not wish to argue the point with the honourable member. I still say to him if he wishes to raise a point of order he should state the point of order he is making. I do not wish to hear an argument or a debate about the facts of the debate that was taking place. I wish to hear the point of order he is making. The Member for Lakeside,

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the point of order that I was making was the suggestion, the implication, the Honourable Minister responsible for Autopac's suggestion that the Leader of my party was advocating a return to the old system.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of order; that is a debatable argument. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: During the process of our little exchange on the program, the Leader of the Opposition did say that he supported a return to the competitive system -- if that is the words that the member would prefer. In hearing those remarks, I suggested to the member in question, the Leader of the Opposition, that a return to that system would mean that at least 35 percent of the motorists in the province of Manitoba would end up paying \$200 and more, up to 4, 5, 600 dollars as they had prior to Autopac and that he would in fact be elevating the rates for this group in that extent.

The Leader of the Opposition then travelled north the following day -- and I have a tape recording of this little interview -- travelled north to Dauphin and to Swan River. He spoke

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . at a constituency meeting in which I gather the member for Swan River attended, and the statement that he made at that meeting, Mr. Chairman - and again there is a tape recording of this - is to the fact that the Minister responsible for Autopac had stated, Mr. Speaker, that 35 percent of Manitobans would pay more under private insurance than under Autopac, would pay more, and therefore 65 percent would be paying less under Autopac than before. Those were his words, his statement, and I cannot say that the Leader of the Opposition misunderstood because he was involved in a direct conversation with me on that program -- the words are taped. And this is the type of misconception and untruth that has been touted about this province, Mr. Speaker, again and again by political and insurance industry representatives in order to confuse the total issue in this province on Autopac.

The member says, "Tell us about freedom of choice". Well you know if you listen, if you listened to the Member for Portage, if you listen to the members opposite you would assume that Autopac would indeed be in very bad shape insofar as the freedom of choice, so-called freedom of choice portion of an Autopac premium. You would assume that because nobody of course would be purchasing Autopac when they have the choice of Portage, Wawanesa, C.A.U. or any other group of companies in order to choose their insurance from. This would be the assumption that you would draw from those remarks. I would like to make two points, Mr. Speaker, in reply to that. Two points.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAWLEY: Two points, Mr. Speaker. Two points. And I would like the Member for Souris-Killarney to listen to these very carefully because I think they indicate something very precisely and definitely about the trend of the motoring public in this province insofar as their attitude to Autopac is concerned.

First, 75 percent of the motorists of this province in purchasing their additional coverage chose Autopac -- November the first. And I have every indication at this time that there has been the same repetition now as there was on November 1st, 75 percent.

Secondly, secondly the honourable members repeatedly make reference to the distaste, the distaste that government ownership, public ownership, Autopac must have for the commercial people of this province, for the business interests of this province. They have repeatedly suggested and stated that. So you would assume, Mr. Speaker, that Autopac's business relationship with truckers, with the large, national commercial groupings in the province would be very dismal indeed. That is not the fact. On November 1st, for the period November 1st to February 28th Autopac sold by way of commercial extension business, commercial extension -- this is the choice, the optional coverage for commercial not for the motoring public -- in competition with private companies three-quarter of a million dollars in business, three-quarter of a million dollars in business, representing 14,000 policies, 14,000 policies, and I'm prohibited from reading to you the large concerns and businesses in this province who chose Autopac in preference to private insurance under competitive systems. But if I did, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that it would be like a list of "Who's Who" in the Manitoba commercial world. And I might . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as a point of personal privilege as a member of this House, not necessarily as the House Leader, may I through you, Sir, appeal to all the members of the House to respect the decorum of this House. There is an honourable member of this House speaking and I think that it is historic in this Assembly that every member is given ample opportunity to express his views. If any member of the House wants to raise or to introduce a point of order or a point of privilege then according to the rules of the House he should rise in his seat, state his point, be recognized by you, Sir, and then express his opinion and the procedures of the House then carry on.

So as I say, Mr. Speaker, I'm only rising at this particular time as one of the members of the House and every member of this House has individual privileges as well as other privileges.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable House Leader. I would concur. I think I have been more than generous in the leniency I have shown in this Assembly. I do imagine that the real nub of the problem is self-discipline for all members. I think the fairness of the rules are evident. It's a matter of all of us adhering to our own rules. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this business in the commercial world, the commercial

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . extension business represents approximately two and a half million dollars and I would like to, so that it can be better understood, compare it with the business written in total of some other Manitoba-based automobile insurance companies in the year 1971. It was more than Co-op wrote. Co-op's total was 2.1. Portage: 1.6. Allstate: 1.2. Gore Mutual: 970,000. So I think that the significance of the total of insurance written in this one very narrow, small area indicates very clearly the success in which Autopac has been received by one particularly important segment of the Manitoba commercial world in competition with the private industry itself.

Another very interesting example of success by Autopac in contrast with that of the private insurance system was that in the months of July and August of 1971 it became increasingly clear that private insurance companies were not going to renew policies for risks they felt were not insurable, what they called poor risk younger drivers, accident-prone drivers. There would have been in the Province of Manitoba many thousands of motorists that would have been without insurance during that critical period of time if they had to depend upon the private insurance companies who had over and over indicated that their only concern was the motorist in the Province of Manitoba. There would have been thousands without coverage during those few months. Autopac developed an interim facility in order to handle those risks which the private insurance industry refused to handle.

Now you would think, Mr. Speaker, that Autopac would have in fact been severely hurt by having to pick up all those thousands of motorists in the Province of Manitoba that could not get their insurance elsewhere because they were considered too poor a risk. This would again be a logical assumption. In three and a half months Autopac wrote premiums worth \$290,000 and approximately 325 claims were processed, accident claims. I will be bringing into this House, Mr. Speaker, in the next few days a statement which will indicate that the interim facility was pretty well at a break-even point. So one can only wonder just why the private insurance industry, what they were ever thinking of when they refused to write this type of business during that critical period of time because Autopac did not lose large sums of money by taking all these risks that the private insurance industry turned their backs upon.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. PAWLEY: Now I would like to just make one further area of comment in respect to the statements made by the Member for Birtle-Russell and I want to leave some questions. The Member for Birtle-Russell suggested that public housing in his constituency was unpopular because of a situation which occurred in St. Lazare involving the bankruptcy of a building contractor who was in the process of building homes went broke, a private contractor, leaving apparently money owing in the area itself. This is the type of reasoning that unfortunately too often we hear from the other side. They use a particular incident in order to attempt to condemn an entire program. I think it's important that during this session, during this session we hear from the Member for Birtle-Russell and hopefully from the Leader of the Opposition whether or not the statement that the Member for Birtle-Russell uttered tonight represented the policy of the Conservative Party in the Province of Manitoba. Will they be prepared to rise in their seats and say clearly to the province as a whole, we are opposed to the construction of any more public housing units in rural Manitoba. Let them answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Probably an appropriate time to get a little northern flavour into this debate. Before we do though I'd like to pass along my congratulations to the mover and seconder. I think they proved that they are well indoctrinated with the philosophies of the New Democratic Party and I suppose we all now realize what their programs are since we've listened to the Throne Speech and the mover and the seconder. Some of the things we'll agree to and others, particularly on this side of the House, we'll have second thoughts on.

I also congratulate the new Member for Minnedosa, and I particularly say I congratulate him because far too often the party moves in and tries to take credit for a by-election saying that was a win for the party. And it isn't. Because after the parties have fought a by-election they usually muddy up the water so much that when it comes time for the electorate to get out and vote they have to look at the candidates and make their decision on the basis of which is the best candidate, and I presume this time they chose the Conservative member and that is why he is sitting here. And so again I congratulate him. Apparently he comes to us with many recommendations and we'll all be looking forward to hearing from him later on during the

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . . Throne Speech.

And we also would mention the Member for Wolseley, the little man that isn't here. I think that that is a problem that the government will have to look at very seriously and I think the people of Wolseley will be looking at it when the election is called and they will probably be saying, "Why were we not represented during the Session?" And possibly that is one of the regulations that should be looked into at an early date.

The new Ministers deserve congratulations and certainly those that have taken on new portfolios, new responsibilities; and particularly my friend the Minister for Cultural Affairs, Parks, Recreation. He's a veteran; he won his spurs from the opposition and while he was an all star on that side with pitching the spitballs we'll see just how good he is on the receiving side. I'm sure that he'll probably turn out to be a good fielder but we'll all be interested and I hope that the House Leader will make sure that his Estimates come up in time for us all to have our go at this new and interesting Minister.

Sometimes I have a hard time defending myself as an Independent and I would point out that as an Independent during the last election I was the only member that had a platform and campaigned in the constituency asking the people to in fact elect me to a seat in the Opposition, while all others in this Legislature were optimistic enough to promise their electors that they would be, if elected, sitting on the side of the government. So consequently we have probably 60 percent of the people that voted were actually misled because their members are sitting along with me on this side of the House.

And talking about my colleagues on this side of the House, the Liberals and the Conservatives, and their approach to the people as the alternative to government I wonder what my colleagues in opposition are really thinking because they're either busy consolidating or they're denying any intention of going to bed together and yet we find that they appear to be singing the same song to the electorate. Certainly they make no bones about saying that they, as each party, are the only respectable alternative to government. And yet, Mr. Speaker, neither the Liberals nor the Conservative Party have had the intestinal fortitude to present that platform that will win for them the confidence of the people next year. I therefore warn my colleagues that they are running short of time, if they are really serious about improving their respective percentages at the polling booth.

I further suggest that they not only must present a platform to catch the imagination of the people but they must stop preaching doom and gloom sermons on life in general and the business futures in particular in Manitoba. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I seriously consider the wisdom of a government being defeated if in the process the Opposition parties have destroyed the image and the good business relations of the province that they indeed wish to govern, because that is what seems to happen when Opposition get too ambitious about being critical rather than being constructive about the future of the province.

I'll leave my friends in Opposition at this time and turn to some of the programs that bother me, particularly one - or a group that we can all group together because we hear it on the street corners wherever we are: Welfare, the unemployment insurance program, manpower, trade training, have all turned into the most abused, misused and violated government services of all time; and both senior governments have to share the brunt of the anger of the taxpayers rather than assuring the proper adequate assistance to the needy and the elderly along with permanent jobs for the unemployed. They have systematically spread themselves out like an octopus. These programs are robbing the poor who need additional funds by encouraging people from all walks of life to beat the government. In fact these programs overshadow the best giveaways the TV stations have ever dared to sponsor. It would appear that the government is attempting to leave the impression that they have an access to a bottomless bag of money. Goodies for everyone as long as the taxpayer votes the right way. And while a great deal of this is Federal money, Federal programming, it is in concert with the provincial services, and I feel that the province must stand and be counted in respect to its participation in the waste and misuse of the tax dollars.

And then as we move north, we have to consider northern affairs in 1972. Perhaps the northern message in its simplest form should be talk and listen. It is time for the northern people to talk and for government to do the listening. Up until now, governments have not paid attention to what was said. They have proved this by sending back programs fresh out of the textbooks; government today leaves the impression that they're off and running with each department and director going in his own way. This Mr. Speaker, is not performance, it's



(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . . confusion that goes under the name of northern policies. We require a well established Department of Northern Affairs. It needs money and teeth to supply guidance and programming. Their head office and administration staff must be located in the North. Northern co-ordination is more important today than ever before in our history and it remains just as conspicuous by its absence. Today we find both senior governments working towards transferring the responsibilities of local Northern community affairs to elected chiefs or mayors and council. Local northern people are being introduced to the red tape of local government for the first time. They solve one mystery only to find that the policy is replaced by a new one. We admit that opening the new frontiers of Manitoba will cost money for new investments in government services. Everything possible must be done to cut costs by eliminating duplication, textbook experiments and decisions based on the judgments of people not located in Northern Manitoba. If you are going to diversify departments of government and build up the rural areas, I suggest that the frontier areas are a good spot to start. It is my hope that for a change government will look for reasons to do the job rather than excuses for not doing it and this is the problem that we have run into for many years. We have heard of the excuses for not doing it but never do we find compassion and reasons for doing it.

A good program of northern co-ordination could eliminate much of the confusion and encourage Ottawa to participate financially in sound make sense northern programming in our northern resource industries. Our metal resource industries are experiencing a period which in the case of nickel, the inventory reserves dictate a need to slow down production. This slowdown has caused quite a reaction at Thompson and I would hope that it will not affect the activity in other areas of the north. Our resources still represent billions of dollars of revenue that will help develop three quarters of our province. These resources are good for hundreds of years and if properly harvested we can pass along the prosperity to those that follow after us. I have no real quarrel with the mineral resource industry; they are as good as they have to be and they are as generous as they can afford to be. They play the game according to the rules of the marketplace and the legislation laid down by government. They invest huge amounts of money and are expected to return a profit, and their profit stops when the resource runs out, just as government tax returns stop.

I have never been in favour of government going into the mining business. It is expensive and it is a gamble and it is competitive. I believe government would be far better off attempting to attract or investing in secondary industry complimentary to our industrial townsites and using the refund resource materials that they are producing.

And moving on to our Northern labour pool. My one quarrel with northern industry is their reluctance to bend their hiring policy to accommodate northern residents. I believe our national trade unions must also share some of this criticism. The time has long past when industry and union should have sat down together and stopped pussing-footing around national policies and precedents. I believe they should approach hiring of northern Indian residents on the basis of what they can offer as work schedules and incentives. It should be accepted as a separate Indian and Metis regional negotiated hiring policy. Must of course, include representatives of the Indian and Metis people during the negotiation talks. And it has to be considered a shared northern responsibility of industry, of union and of the government.

Federal Department of State. It is rumoured that Ottawa will be eliminating the Department of Indian Affairs and grouping it with all other ethnic cultures under the Department of State. Surely our first Canadians deserve better recognition than being out of sight and out of mind. Indian Affairs and Northern Development offer them a much better hope of getting a piece of the action in the second one hundred years. It should be not necessary to point out again that the Indian people of Canada have unique problems. Some are inherited through their difference in culture and material values, but for the most part their problems have arisen out of the indifference of the rest of the Canadians, rather than the difference.

Going back to Confederation, we assured Europeans of the French origin that their language rights would be officially preserved. They were also assured representation in the Senate and the House of Commons and the English speaking Canadians from Europe were given the same assurance of language preservation and representation in government. The west coast was assured of transcontinental railways. There were many guarantees to assure Canada of a strong and lasting constitution. However, it really could not be called a respectable draft, Mr. Speaker, when we consider the callous attitude that was taken in respect to those who lost the war against the Europeans. Or did our forefathers come here as visitors, like

(MR. BEARD cont'd) . . . . what they saw and stay long enough to steal what the Indians had? My, Mr. Speaker, how the times have changed. Some years ago Germany and Japan invaded many parts of the world and caused an untold amount of death and destruction, and we conquered them also; the difference being rather than treating them as Indian savages, we helped them become the world economic and industrial leaders in our lifetime. My point is that what was considered right and legal by our forefathers is generally considered disgraceful and unfair today and we should try to make amends provincially.

Going back some years ago we opened seats in the Legislature for returning veterans. Why not recognize the Treaty Indian and Metis by setting aside two seats - one Treaty Indian to be elected by the registered Treaty Indians of Manitoba and one Metis to be elected by the registered Metis of Manitoba. There is no reason why we could not be leaders in this recognition of the people who were here first.

Local Northern Government would depend on leadership of the local chief and mayor and council for its measure of success. It stands to reason that just as in southern communities the program will depend upon strong, capable community leaders who have confidence in people. At present these leaders are not paid a salary, yet they are expected to replace the civil servants who were hired by government; these chiefs and councillors have to attend meetings every day, go to conferences, meet planes, listen to the other people's complaints and try and settle some Indian government differences. It has mushroomed into a full time job for each of them. They are responsible for paying out very large sums of money and keeping work projects on the move. With the cost of living and travel in the north at the highest level in Manitoba, I feel the chief or mayor should be paid \$600 a month and the councillors \$400. Certainly gas at \$1.40 per gallon would be an excellent example of costs, when I support salaries for local community officials. When I state those salaries I realize that the Federal Government have to be responsible for a great many of them.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to hold you up too much longer, but some of the other problems and injustices of Northern Manitoba which I would like to talk about later on in the session I have listed and rather than try and go over them all at this time and repeat myself later, I will just run over them quickly.

I believe that Churchill's overdue expansion program of its port facilities should be looked into. Also, the promise to consider co-insuring the ships and cargoes to extend the season; the long overdue promised northern air ambulance service; provisions to maintain the isolated airstrips on a year-round basis and the building of adequate shelters; contracting policies for the winter roads and the brush clearing; use of minimum security prisons in the north as legislation has been passed for, and the use of prisoners for full time pay work programs; prisoners transportation and accommodation when returned home after sentence is served in The Pas or areas further south. Review of our sports laws - particularly one which would outlaw trophy hunting and fish derby competition. Review the increasing use of isolated areas by sportsmen with the possibilities that a qualified guide be made mandatory. Review the necessity of having special laws and permits to cover sportsmen using their own plane or hiring planes to visit isolated areas. Consider the value of making it mandatory for American hunting parties to use registered guides. Review the terrifying practice of illegally running down game by airplane, snowmobile and power boats. Review the alternative school system legislation as and when it is presented for debate in this House. Consider pollution from water to land and to air, to the beverage containers, to the auto wrecking lots; the announced intention to flood South Indian and divert the Churchill water without the proper hearings. I would like to call for a breakdown of the \$60 million appropriated for the use in the north this year. Consider one long distance call charge for anywhere in Manitoba on a 24-hour day basis to equalize costs for rural and urban living.

Mr. Speaker, the north is bigger than forty minutes and it is very difficult to cover it in the forty minute debating period. Thank you for this particular part of the time anyway to cover some of the problems of Northern Manitoba and I would hope that as time passes we hear from others, I hope that others would show an interest in the north and give us the value of their interpretation of what should be done. Not necessarily are we always right but if we do have some debate on it at least we show people in the north that there is interest in what is going on in the frontier areas of this province. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer quickly to just a few comments to make to the Minister of Municipal Affairs before I get into my speech. Two comments really that I want to make after listening to the oration that he gave us here this evening in regards to Autopac. The one thing I want to say, Sir, is that the Minister can stand up in this House, he can rationalize his position all he likes about Autopac, he can explain in every way possible and apologize to the people or the members of this House, but I suggest to him that he go out to the country, to the cities in this province and see what they have to say because their interpretation is one thing and his is another.

Well, Mr. Speaker, from the witness in my position here this evening it is traditional that we acknowledge you, Sir, and say that this session is no different to those of the past. I for one want to say that I respect the position of the Speaker. I understand the difficulties that we may cause for you from time to time but assure you that I for one understand that and will give you my cooperation to the best of my ability.

I think also that it is customary to extend a word of congratulations to the mover and the seconder in reply to the Throne Speech. I should also like to make mention of my new colleague, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. I should just like to say because I've known him for quite a number of years. I was travelling in my car one Tuesday evening last fall when I had the radio on and I heard a news broadcast and it was stated on that news broadcast that a certain individual representing the Royal Bank in Minnedosa was considering throwing his hat in the ring for contesting the nomination of Conservative Party in Minnedosa at the time that the Premier should call the by-election. This hadn't been done at that time. And I thought to myself, knowing this honourable gentleman, how fortunate can we be to get this man to take the place of my worthy colleague, ex-colleague, Mr. Walter Weir. I want to welcome him to this Assembly and wish him well for the future.

I should like to make a few comments in regards to my constituency, Mr. Speaker. I listened to the orations from some of the Ministers across the way. They have indicated to us that we are being destructive critics, we are posing a very dark picture insofar as this government is concerned. I feel that this is our job as opposition members in any way we are able to present our position. I do want to say that I know in my constituency there have been delegations come before the different departments in this government in the past year either on an individual basis or groups of people and only a very very few have been fortunate in having any success in coming to achieve the goals that they'd hoped to when they arrived.

I want to make mention of one particular case where the Attorney-General this afternoon-- I'm sorry he's not here in his seat -- talked about all the legislation that this government has brought forth and I can think of one of them which is legal aid to those who can't afford it. And I happen to have a constituent who I thought was in this predicament, Mr. Speaker. He came into Winnipeg, he presented his story and the gentleman who took his case thought he had a very legitimate one but to the disappointment of my constituent a letter was sent back to him saying that we're sorry we cannot grant you any legal aid, which dealt with the problem of trying to secure wages from a past employer. I know this gentleman personally, Mr. Speaker, and the point I want to make here is that this government, while they give the impression that they are doing so much for the people of Manitoba, I have a classic example of where those in my constituency know better.

The Attorney-General also made mention of the number of boards and commissions that they had established and we were being critical of so many of them and we thought that they were unnecessary. I should like to make mention of one of them in particular to show that, you know, I like to be constructive in my criticism, and I can think of the Censor Board. This is one board that has had a good deal of publicity over the weeks and months as we are all aware. -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Public Works thought probably I had run to see "The Stewardesses" but I did see that show they called "Joe", merely for the purpose of being able to decide for myself what the people were saying and what the ex-Minister of Highways had to say over the by-lines and the byways about that particular movie. Mr. Speaker, my worthy colleague from Morris indicated very well I think, that's quite right possibly, I often wondered whether the Honourable Member for Thompson took great exception because it was just coincidental that particular individual who portrayed that character of Joe.

I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, when we were government, and I want to give a

(MR. EINARSON Cont'd). . comparison here, we had a censor board composed of three people. Today, Mr. Speaker, and I stand to be corrected if I'm wrong, but now they have nine and they say they haven't increased their civil service. When we were government we had three. The government today have nine. And I happened to watch a television program some months ago where two of those people -- where two of those people on that censor board were on television and if my memory serves me correctly they were in a very difficult and embarrassing position because they weren't exactly sure what their job was. They weren't receiving the proper direction from the Minister who was responsible for the Censor Board. Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba must be looking upon utter amazement whereby we have, is it two motion picture studios who have been before the courts because they have shown a film that the Censor Board permitted. You know my Leader said this government is collapsing. What do you call that if this is not collapsing? I just thought, Mr. Speaker, this is one example I want to use.

I should also like to now refer to the Throne Speech and I want to refer to one paragraph here which deals with the Department of Agriculture. Being a farmer myself and coming from an agricultural community I think that the comments we have to make in this regard are very important, and one thing I would like to say at this time, I am very pleased at the kind of interest that is being shown, not just in the rural communities, but in our City of Winnipeg say, which I heard through the by-lines under Peter Warren this morning where we had a gentleman from the Wheat Board, people were allowed to phone in and ask questions which I think was information that our city cousins were not aware of. I think this is a very good thing, Mr. Speaker, to create a better understanding between those of us who live in the country and those who are living in the city.

One thing I want to refer to in the Throne Speech, Sir, is -- and I quote here: "Members of the Assembly will have their attention drawn to the operations of the recently established Hog Marketing Board and we'll be interested to note that hog prices have shown marked improvement." Now I take from that, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture is taking complete responsibility and recognition for the increase in prices of hogs as of January 1 because of the newly appointed Hog Marketing Board.

I should like to quote from the Hog Commission's Report. There are three things here that I want to state for the record. The first one is -- "United States plants buy a large percentage of Manitoba sows and boars, also trial shipments of live hogs were well received. Commercial marketings in Manitoba forecast at 24,000 - 25,000 per week during the first half of 1972, which is a decrease from a year earlier. The market development and pork promotion projects expanded in 1971."

I want to state, Mr. Speaker, that the report that we received from the Commission indicates these three things which are attributable to the increase in prices of hogs in recent months, and I don't think that I should allow this to go unchallenged because this is the inference that the Minister is leaving with the farmers of this province, that it is a Board that he appointed, is as a result of our increased prices in hogs. I know that truckloads of hogs have gone from Brandon to Minneapolis and they have proven successful as this report states. The other thing is that in the past nine months we have found a market in the United States for sows and for heavy pigs, those kind of animals that have not seen fit to find their way to the market in Manitoba. This is as a result as to why our prices of hogs have gone up. Also the fact that we do not have the numbers of hogs in the province in the past eight months as we had the year previous. -- (Interjection) -- Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Honourable Member for Rock Lake if he is aware that of the three reasons which he gives for the increase, for the improvement in the price of hogs, would he not agree that at least one of the three reasons does trace back to the operation of the Hog Marketing Board, in that the Hog Marketing Board did help to find increased market for live weight sales of hogs in the Twin City market in Minnesota?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer to the First Minister this question, and I want to repeat the last comment I made from the report: "The market development and pork promotion projects expanded in 1971." This, Mr. Speaker, is the thing that I want to emphasize on, it is important, and I think will answer the First Minister. These things had already taken place before the appointed board by the Minister had come into effect. It has no

(MR. EINARSON (Cont'd) . . . . relationship whatsoever. There has been so much controversy over the board that the Minister has appointed.

I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, at this time that the Pork Producers Association held a meeting in Winnipeg on December 9th. Unfortunately I was unable to attend but my colleague from Lakeside, my colleague from Morris were there, and the indication, the direction that they gave to the Minister was before he appointed the board they wanted to have a referendum on that. But that was not granted. He did not abide by the wishes of the majority of those producers for that particular commodity.

Mr. Speaker, we had a committee that travelled throughout the province to deal with and listen to the farmers in regards to all the problems they had. I'm not going to deal to any extent on this particular report at the present time, we'll have an opportunity at a later date to do that. However, I do want to say that while many farmers presented briefs, they expressed their views, but the thing that concerned me was that the Minister himself, if what he heard from an individual farmer wasn't the kind of thing he wanted to hear he would try to portray or to convince the individual who had other views than what he thought was correct. And I do recall on one particular occasion where a farmer from, I believe it was at Dauphin, had presented his brief and he presented the kind of brief that the Minister was anything but pleased with, and he said, instead of asking him questions he indicated to this farmer that he was in dreamland and he said that his ideas would never work. This is the sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister is going to travel the country and listen to the views of the farmers I think one has to be prepared to examine all the different views before you come to a decision insofar as your policies are concerned.

I now want to deal briefly, Mr. Speaker, with the Minister of Industry and Commerce, his department. This is another area while it's Industry and Commerce it also has a bearing insofar as the farmers of this province are concerned. I have read in a number of papers where the McKenzie Seed Company of Brandon have been made mention of. I have read about the purchase transactions that have taken place through this particular seed company. I want to say here and now, Sir, that as I understand it McKenzie Seed was turned over many years ago by the late Mr. McKenzie to the government with the understanding that the net profits, if any, would be turned over to the Brandon University. I don't have any facts on this, Mr. Speaker, but it would be interesting to know how much money the University of Brandon has received from this company.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: If the honourable member would like to know I can advise him that for most of the years that McKenzie Seed was operated under the stewardship of the Conservative administration, it operated at a loss.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm extremely pleased to receive the answer from the First Minister. I'm extremely pleased, Sir. You know Mr. Speaker in the past year I am given to understand that McKenzie Seed Company made approximately \$150,000. I'm also given to understand, Sir, that this is something that the Minister of Industry and Commerce thought was a tremendous thing, that's his idea of economics. And on the basis of that small profit, he felt that here's an opportunity to get into the seed business. And so what do they do? They purchase Steele-Briggs which is a small package seed company. I think the Honourable Member for Portage stated, what was it? - \$2 million that they paid for that particular company. They also paid \$1,300,000 to Brett Young. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, if that figure is incorrect I'll stand to be corrected, but nevertheless the point I want to make, the point I want to make is, of those millions of dollars that the government saw fit to invest -- and who is the government? It is the people of Manitoba, it's the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba who invested in the seed business in this province. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the First Minister out throughout the country of Manitoba, go to those farmers who are operating seed plants and see what they have to say about this - about the government getting into the business of seed cleaning operations. You know the Minister of Agriculture has condoned Corporations for getting into the farming business. Do the farmers now realize Mr. Speaker, the farmers of Manitoba, that one of the biggest competitions they have got, the biggest corporation is now the Crown of the Province of Manitoba.

We have talked, you know, the farmers have had to compete with the treasury of the United States - this has been part of our competition and the First Minister and his colleagues have recognized that and they have gone along with that, and by these two things, condoning

(MR. EINARSON (Cont'd) . . . private corporations here they get themselves in that very same position. I wonder some day, Mr. Speaker, whether we won't have to call on a combines investigation of our Crown Corporations. That's why, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to get the answer from the Honourable First Minister as to the profit or otherwise that McKenzie Seed were making.

Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this the Minister of Industry and Commerce that we look upon as that economic expert who is getting into the business that has never made any money over the years? I am sure that the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba must be asking them some real serious questions: Where are we going, where are we going, Mr. Speaker? -- (Interjection) -- I don't know, Sir, whether the idea of finding our way down into a foreign country such as Mexico, I don't know whether they agree with their colleagues in the House of Commons, but the leader down there has been very critical of foreign investment in this country. Now I'm wondering whether the table has turned with our honourable gentlemen across the way. They have now found their way into Mexico and I don't know whether the Minister of Industry and Commerce has -- if he has found a market for the seeds and the product that we are producing in Manitoba, that's all well and good, but if he is going to use this as a yardstick by the fact that McKenzie Seed had made \$150,000 that this is the measure that should be used to invest these millions of dollars in an enterprise that has been in the red for so many years.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I want to say one or two things, to get back to my constituency. The Honourable Member for Churchill was talking a good deal about the Indian and the Metis folks. I want to say that I had the pleasure of being invited to the Swan Lake Indian Reservation back in February to attend the opening of a new administration building on that reservation, a reservation of approximately 465 Indian folks that I represent. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was very pleased with what I found there. I have visited the reservation on a number of occasions. The new building they have is a real tribute to those people on that reservation. I am also very pleased to report that I am given to understand that Indian Affairs have seen fit to allow the chief, Richard Cameron, his Band Council and the Administrator, Mr. Wilf Mousseau to take over the reservation on April 1. The folks on that reservation have established a cow calf operation of approximately 60 cows. I also understand that they are going into a hog enterprise and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that for any of those who do have problems, I am hoping that this will be a reservation that will set an example of what of what our Indian people can do for themselves. I am very pleased Mr. Speaker, Sir, to give this report to you.

Before I sit down, Sir, I think that the many problems that we are faced with, while our different philosophies don't always agree on either side of the house, I would hope that this coming year that the people I represent will have better response from the government than they have had in the past. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development that the House do now adjourn.

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