

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, May 8, 1972

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, when we recessed for the dinner hour I was pointing out some of the figures advanced by the Federal Government as to the private and public investment in Canada outlook in 1972. And I was mentioning that some of the figures and comparisons for the four western provinces. I think this is where we should compare. I could compare them with other provinces but I think the prairie economies are more or less similar so that it is fairer to compare the ones with the other western provinces such as Saskatchewan, B. C. and Alberta. I mentioned the figures in construction as far as capital that will be invested, is anticipated to be invested in construction in 72. And I mentioned the figures for Manitoba as being 55.1 million; Saskatchewan, 71.6 million; Alberta, 455.6 million; and B. C. 353.9 million. So we have a great variation in that as I pointed out the Alberta figure is nine times that of Manitoba with only twice the population. So we should have a much greater capitalization going on in Manitoba both in the private and public sector, especially the private sector.

I could also give you the corresponding figures for the last two years but as far as Manitoba is concerned in 1970 this figure was 66 million; for the year 71, it was 51.7, and now we are going to spend 55.1, so there is a slight increase over last year but there is, as I pointed out, \$11 million reduction from the year 1970.

As far as the total capital and repair expenditures outlook and this applies equally as well, we find that for Manitoba for the coming year the total given is 199.9 million. The figure for Saskatchewan is 355.7 million which is very substantially much more, and we always talk about Saskatchewan as that poor province of western Canada and that we always feel that we are in a preferred position to Saskatchewan yet here we find that their capital expenditure will be almost twice that of Manitoba. The figure given for Alberta is 917 million which is four times that of Manitoba. Again they -- (Interjection) -- Well this is the amount of money that will be expended for capital and repair expenditures. This is the amount of capital that will be used and spent in that province and this will definitely add to the economy, to the prosperity of the economy. The figure given for B. C. is 703 million so that when we compare these figures and these are projections, these are not my projections, these are the projections of the Federal Government and they no doubt have figures to back up what they report, so that we more or less can rest assured that these are fair statistics that I'm quoting here.

And again if I take the last three years for that same expenditure for Manitoba in 1970 it was 198 million; in 71 it was down to 188.9 million, and now we are going to be back up to the same figure of 1970, 199.9 million. Mr. Speaker, these are just some figures to show just what is happening or what we can expect to happen here in Manitoba.

And then on top of that to impose a tax which will hurt, I think, the capital coming in, the capital being expended because sure enough when these figures were given the tax had not been imposed as yet and this could, may give some discouragement to some of the capital that would otherwise be coming in and would be spent here.

I would also like to briefly refer to the Canadian Tax Journal which the March-April issue, and which also given various comparisons as to the various provinces in respect of taxes, and I might add here that for Manitoba they list the new Successions Duties Act, Gift Tax Act, the Personal Income Tax Credit for sales tax is listed here, but then they also list real estate licence fees and it says, "A new schedule of fees applicable to real estate brokers and salesmen has been issued ranging from five to seventy-five dollars replacing an earlier fee schedule which ranged from five to twenty-five effective January 1st, 1972." Surely this is also an added tax that is being imposed on certain people in this province doing business in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I remember too well when the Revenue Tax which we are now amending was brought in in the six days, how strongly the members of the now government who sat on this side opposed the imposition of this tax. Oh my how unfair it was. -- (Interjection) -- Yes. It couldn't have been any worse from their expressions that they made at that time. And now we're not only going to impose additional tax, we're going to repeal some sections which gave relief to citizens of this province, and now we are going to repeal them. Surely enough if you thought it so improper to bring them in at that time, how can you change your mind so fast that you will now repeal the sections that gave relief to certain people.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

In fact I was rather interested -- the Member for St. Vital is not in his seat just now, but he was asking for suggestions from this side as to what taxes should be imposed. That's rather astounding but I think by the way we're going about taxing in this province that we'll soon have to be riding bicycles instead of driving cars and maybe the Member for St. Vital will have to get a bicycle instead of a car. Probably one of these new ones with the ten speeds on it and have a tax for each speed. Because -- (Interjection) -- or rent. They might even have a speedometer on it so that it would show the mileage and that you would have a mileage tax such as you are proposing on the airlines. So -- (Interjection) -- The Minister says that's why they're taking off the tax on shoe repairs so that they can ride bikes. I certainly took exceptions to some of the sections in the bill. I even proposed some amendments which some of them were ruled out of order because of interpretation of the rules that we no longer are able to make amendments to tax bills. I feel that the people of this province are not getting a good deal when bills of this nature are not sent to a committee so that we can hear outside representation. I'm sure a lot of facts would come to bear and would be brought out by people from outside of this House and probably much more emphatically than we in the Opposition even do it here today, or have done during the last couple of days.

I mentioned the matter of farm trucks that this should be -- they should be exempted from being commercial transactions. And I felt quite strongly on this, and I think the government should have come along a certain way and at least made that one amendment so that used trucks would not have to be taxed.

Then coming to the cigarette tax this is a 50 percent increase in tax and I'm just wondering, many poor people how they'll go about getting the necessary money to buy cigarettes, and you know that people who have that habit can't shake it. I still remember too well not so many years ago when I saw people going along the sidewalk and picking up butts, cigarette butts in order to get the necessary tobacco so that they could smoke. I'm just wondering what's going to happen now with increasing the tax, whether this will not happen again after this is imposed. Certainly this is -- I am not one who proposes or supports the habit of smoking, not at all. I don't smoke myself and as such I don't do that, but I think what's wrong here is that we are taxing the wrong people, many of them. You as a government have prided yourselves with the principle of ability-to-pay those are the ones that you are going to tax. What are you doing? Are you taxing those that have the ability to pay when you increase the tobacco tax? The same for the liquor tax that certainly not -- I am sure that there's many people who can ill afford, and cannot afford to pay that additional tax, yet you are going to levy it against them. -- (Interjection) -- I'm getting so much advice from this side that I hope they get up in turn and point out some of these facts to the government so that they needn't go unnoticed. We are giving out housing subsidies; we are providing day-care centres, and this is going to be financed by the cigarette tax, by the liquor tax, they are the ones that are going to finance these projects.

Well then the matter of Unicity came in this afternoon. There again farmers are going to pay a big portion of the cost of Unicity and here again I would like to hear the Member for Thompson later on speak on this particular issue.

But when we come to the real facts they say they have to impose this tax because they are going to make a transfer. kMr. Speaker, I don't accept that because when we take a look at the Estimates before us I feel that this tax is going towards a completely different purpose because as far as the transfer of tax a lot of this will only take effect next year and we are starting to tax them as of the first of this year in certain of the tax measures, and with other tax measures we're starting as of May 1st, and yet some of the relief that is going to come about won't come about until next year.

But what do we find in the Estimates? And, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out that we're going to pay out \$39 million in interest on our public debt. This is where the money is going. This is where the increased taxes are going and while it's 39 million now what will it be next year? We are going to borrow another 392 million so that we could probably say next year it'll be around 60 to 70 million and with the heavy rate of interest that we have to pay I am sure it's going to be much much more a year from now. So that when we talk of an imposition of tax for the purpose of transferring and giving, alleviating the real estate people, I don't accept it in its completeness. It can't be because of some of the benefits only coming into being next year and yet we are taxing this year.

Further what I have against this government and with their propositions is that until

(MR. FROES cont'd) . . . . we'll make some real changes we'll not have any change taking place. What I refer to is that we will have to decentralize and to again provide an incentive for people to economize and so that they will directly benefit because if we don't, if there is no incentive to economize whatever, costs will just keep on going up, up and up. And in this way if the people in Rhineland School Division saved a few thousand dollars here and there and then find out later on that they would just help to pay part of Winnipeg's mill rate, what purpose would they gain. And this is the very fact, this is the very reason why we see that costs are just going up and that people whenever grants are available they're used to the hilt. I am also trustee in a school district and we don't use up all our grants as far as textbooks is concerned. Then we get a report from the auditor and the auditor comments why don't you use up your total amount of grants that is available to you. Well, I don't believe in that principle. I believe in the principle where we can economize, we should economize, and that we should make savings. But this is not accepted generally. The rule is under the centralization program when grants are made available on that basis that everyone will use the maximum available and some more. And this is why we are running into the problem of increased costs year by year and there is no relief in sight. And therefore the system is largely and to a great deal to blame for what we are in at the present time. And as I may point out, that under our present financing system we never have enough money to pay our debts.

Members should know that our total money supply in Canada is only roughly 37-38 billion dollars, yet our total indebtedness is over \$100 billion. There is no way in which we ever can repay our debt in Canada under our present system. The system must be changed, by providing interest free and debt free money. There is no reason why we should by federal legislation give the power to a private group to create credit and then charge enormous rates of interest on that credit and then we have to go and borrow it from them, when we could do the very thing ourselves through the Bank of Canada and provide it for ourselves and save the large amounts of interest. We are talking of 38-39 billion here in Manitoba, but when we talk in terms of Federal Government, we are talking in terms of two billion. And for two billion dollars what can you do? You could build a City of Winnipeg, you could build 100,000 \$20,000 homes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I wonder if the honourable member would apply himself to Bill 21. I think he has wandered far afield. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE. I'm talking about the increased taxes and this bill is just part of it. We are just adding taxes to what we are already doing, and I just mentioned the Federal tax here, the \$2 billion of interest that we are paying on the Federal debt, and this would provide for 100,000 new homes at \$20,000 apiece. With five people to a family this would provide for 100,000 families. This would mean that a City of Winnipeg could have, all the people in Winnipeg could have a new home, a \$20,000 home, just for the amount of interest that we are paying on the Federal debt.

It's terrific when you talk and think of it. And this needn't be. We could change that system; and that's all that's needed, that we change the system. This is why I have been asking this government from time to time to make representation to the Federal authorities, be it at the inter-provincial conference, be it through resolution, but I think we have to do something about it because it just goes on worse and worse and there's no relief in sight; it will never get better. And the same thing holds true for the United States. There is no way out under our present system if we just go along the lines that we have been going. And therefore even this tax measure is just a stopgap measure and I feel that the very least, if we make a transfer what we should have done, we should have eliminated all the tax on farmland so that there would be a stoppage to taxing farmland, then the farmers would be on an equal basis with the city dweller and pay on his home only. I think this is what should be done; otherwise, if you are doing just on a halfway, they just add on the next year and within a few years you are at the same place that you were when you first started trying to give relief. I think this should be considered by this government and I would like to see some changes brought in in that respect.

I could have said much more because I feel that under our present system the Federal Parliament is not in control of monetary policy in Canada, it's the chartered banks that control it; they decide how much money will be made available and the Federal Government has to get on its knees and go to the banking concerns when they need credit. They are the ones

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . who tell us when we are going to have a tight money system or whether money will be made available at lower rates. Just in the six days the ceiling on interest rates was raised as far as the chartered banks were concerned and look what happened. Interest rates just went up and are sky high. This needn't have happened, we should go back and control the interest rates on banks.

Mr. Speaker, I might be veering off the topic of the tax bill before us, but I feel that the whole problem goes much deeper than just what we have in the bill before us and that just by passing this bill will do very little. Within a year or two this government will be back with other tax bills, or the future government, whatever we will have. If the system isn't changed another government will be back with other tax measures asking for more money, and this is all we can expect under the present system. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: I wonder if the member would mind answering a question? Is he suggesting that the Provincial Government should set up banks in competition with existing banks or is he recommending we nationalize banks in Manitoba to overcome the problem that he was raising? And would he support such a measure?

MR. FROESE: I am not in support of nationalizing banks. We have a Bank of Canada, all we should do is amend the Statute so that we can put it to use for the people of Canada, especially for projects such as schools, hospitals and what have you -- for institutions -- so that the money would be borrowed at cost and could, later on be forgiven for that matter and need not be repaid. These powers are there if the Federal Parliament would just exercise them, and it could all be done.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, I realize what the member is saying refers to the Federal Government, but what is his position provincially -- what this government can do? We can't tell Ottawa what to do. Does he have a suggestion how we should handle it provincially?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Banking comes under Federal jurisdiction and has been pointed out governments are not allowed to set up banks, they are forbidden to receive charters, but certainly if we had a provincial bank that would be more provincially oriented, I am certain it would work to the advantage of this province. Certainly that has been the case in British Columbia and as far as Quebec is concerned the Credit Union movement has two banks in Quebec which is certainly doing a job for that province and I understand other provinces are following suit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I spoke briefly I believe during the second reading of this bill. I just wanted to add one or two comments. I think taxes right at the present time are something that most of the people particularly within the Metropolitan area, the new City of Winnipeg area, are fed up right to the neck after reading the weekend papers. I think that there was some discussion on this afternoon by one or two of the members on this side but the Unicity taxes that are hitting the area now along with a further bill coming in that I am sure is going to go right straight to the consumer regardless of whether it's hitting the production level of production machinery and the free enterprisers as was mentioned today, or the businessmen, it still got to go back on the consumer. No businessmen can stay buoyant, stay in business, stay alive, can possibly pick up all the odds and ends that this government seems to want to put forward to them and still not pass it on to the consumer. Sooner or later these dollar bills have got to be picked up and brought back in through his cash register. So what was said this afternoon by the Member for Lakeside, for instance, I think he missed a good many of the points that we should have went to and mentioned in this bill and are certainly relevant to what's happening to the people particularly in the Unicity area.

I speak of Charleswood only, Sir. In Charlewood the area without improvements went from 43.9 mills to 72.9, and a raw increase of 29 mills. I say that that is a big enough tax increase for any person with a family, such as myself, that has to bring in the groceries, has to bring in the clothing, has to pay the rent - not the rent but the mortgage payments - and has all these things to do, to put that together without the further tax by way of our sales tax. I say that from the time that Bill 36 was introduced and I'm afraid . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think I've indicated a number of times today, we're not discussing Bill 36, we're discussing Bill 21. I wish the honourable members would

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . . . co-operate. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Thank you, Sir. Certainly I will co-operate. I only make reference to Bill 36 because I use it as a tax bill as comparison with Bill 21 which is also creating increased taxes, but the point I'm trying to put over to the members of the House is that our taxes are increasing day after day and this government doesn't seem to want to put a stop to it. Knowing what they did with Bill 36, they came back in with Bill 21 which is going to hit the consumer, the home owner, not only in Metro Winnipeg did Bill 36 affect it but right across the Province of Manitoba. So I have to make reference one against the other to let you know why I feel Bill 21 is not justified. In my home, as strapped as I am to the wall trying to feed my children and keep the holes out of the knees of their pants, Bill 36 hit me with \$240 per year and I say that my budget cannot afford that. I might be able to muster up a way between now and October of 1972 to pay those taxes after I get the bill in the mail; but certainly, Sir, if I'm hit with Bill 21 besides and the manufacturer passes on to the consumer and I'm hit with a further one or two percent on top of the five percent sales tax that I pay today, then I say I'm in trouble. So I use this as a comparison. I use Bill 36 as a comparison for that reason because it's furthering the problem of every homeowner in the Province of Manitoba and certainly I think it's a problem that should be brought in front of this Legislature.

The Unicity bill was brought in here in haste and this bill here, Bill 21, was brought in here in haste and they had no time, certainly had no time to look that bill over and bring it in here and let the bureaucrats of the City of Winnipeg check it out and see if that bill was the right bill. Let them see how to look at it and how to treat it, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does the City of Winnipeg, the council of the City of Winnipeg, the commissioners, do they know what it's going to cost to run the City of Winnipeg today? Do they know what my house is going to cost taxwise? Do they know what I can afford to pay? They put . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I appeal to the honourable member once more. We're on Bill 21, we're not dealing with the City of Winnipeg. I don't know how plain I have to make it but I do not wish to rise again on the same point. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Well, Sir, certainly it wouldn't be me that would want to get up and speak against what you wish me to speak on, but I think if you look back through the day, what the Member for St. Vital -- he said nothing while he was up there, I'll guarantee you that so I don't want to bring him in -- but if you tell me where he stayed on Bill 21, certainly I will not stray from the covers of that bill. I'm trying to use comparisons of what taxes are in the City of Winnipeg that I am a resident of and taxes are going to be, what the Provincial Government charges in several other areas, and I feel that I have to keep using one as the other. And, Sir, another thing as the House Leader speaks up tonight, I think that I should be able to walk through the zoo without having to argue with the apes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think the honourable member is getting impertinent, not only towards the Chair but also to the rest of the members of this Assembly in the language he is using. He has indicated that someone around here is an animal. I do think that that's not fair. I wish he would retract that. And again I appeal to him for the last time to stay on Bill 21. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I retract that insinuation that the House Leader, in regards to his being an ape, I withdraw that.

Sir, I want to speak on taxes, because Bill 21 is taxes and if you wish to rule me out of order at this present time I will sit down and take my place and I will not speak on this bill, because I want to speak taxes, because this bill is a tax bill across the board. -- (Interjection) -- Revenue tax is right and revenue taxes are what the City of Winnipeg are and they're ranged on that same level. -- (Interjection) -- All right. If that's your decision, Mr. Speaker, I will have to take my place and I won't be able to carry on with speaking on this. Well if that is your ruling, but Sir, I want to make comparisons against what it costs me to live in my home as real property taxes . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate for the last time to the honourable member, I have no desire to debate with him how he presents his discussion but I do insist that he stay to Bill 21. And if he has no desire to do that then I don't need to recognize him but I'll give him one more chance. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, your ruling is that I don't make any reference whatsoever to my taxes on my home. Is that what the situation is? Because the taxes on my home are so high at the present time that I don't feel I can have any additional burden, be it through the Revenue Tax Act on cigarettes, on cigars, on liquor, on clothing or anything, I can't afford

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . to take -- and if the manufacturers in this province pass me any more tax -- be it one percent on sales tax - I don't think I can shoulder the burden of that and I'm trying to put across to you that our city is hitting us as heavy as they can. I don't know how to say to you stay away from Bill 36, and I will not mention that bill number again but the taxes on my home are so heavy that I can't see that this government can justify bringing in Bill 21. And if the taxes that I'm paying on my home through real property are not accurate through the haste that they were brought about by, I am going to find myself being part of a deficit budget for 1972 for the City, which is going to create a problem when they pick up -- say they're five mills short and they pick that up at the end of the year and realize they deficit by five mills, plus what Bill 21 brings to me here in somewhat like a one percent on the sales tax in my over-all - what I have to buy in my home - then if there's an increase like there is every year and we find that the mill rate increases in the city for instance here from 72 mills, it increases five to 10 percent, and you add, say five mills, on to that just for an in-between figure - make it 77 - then they realize they are five mills short on their budgeting, they'll make it 82 . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member care to sit down? The floor is open for discussion on Bill 21. Is the House ready to proceed? The Honourable Member for Roblin. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Charleswood a point of order.

MR. MOUG: I rise, Sir, after watching today's proceedings of what went on in here and the latitude you let go, I challenge your ruling on you sitting me down.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to my honourable friend the member who was speaking, that we have rules in this House. That you, Sir, I think was most tolerant on at least half a dozen occasions, have suggested to the Honourable Member for Charleswood that he should deal with the matters under consideration in Bill 21 which bear no relationship at all with what the property taxes will be in the City of Winnipeg. Sir, in all due respect, you did ask the honourable member on these occasions to come within the confines of the motion that is under debate, namely third reading on Bill 21, which deals with such matters as liquor taxes, tobacco taxes, amusement taxes, aircraft taxes, and related taxes. And I think, Sir, that it was only proper for you that having asked and requested of the honourable member to confine himself to the debate to take what action you did, and suggest that the honourable member was not following through the request. Not the dictates but the request of the Chair and I say to all members of this House that we have a specific proposition before us in debate, and for goodness sake let's deal, Sir, with Bill 21. Unicity or the City of Winnipeg and property taxes there is no relevance properly within the concept of Bill 21.

I think, Sir, that you have acted with tolerance, with propriety and you have been very tolerant and I would suggest that we get on with the job of the consideration for third reading of Bill 21. I know my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek, Charleswood excuse me, from Charleswood has been involved in the field of politics for a number of years; he has had the opportunity of being the presiding officer in municipal affairs and I only suggest . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . that he and the rest of us adhere . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister of Labour for his contribution to the point of order which was raised. My ruling stands. The Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. On the same point of order.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we had the Member for St. Vital digress at great length on Medicare, Autopac, and then he related other tax . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. If the honourable member is not satisfied with my ruling he knows the procedure in this House. I have made a ruling and I am abiding by it. I think I have tried to deal as fairly with all -- will the honourable member sit down until I am finished. Would the honourable member sit down until I'm finished. I think I have tried to deal fairly with all honourable members this afternoon. I agree I allowed a lot of latitude and I requested if I recall at least a dozen times for all honourable members to participate in debate on Bill 21. But, the last half hour in respect to Bill 21 contributed at the present moment was just more than was necessary, and as I said we do have rules; they are your rules not mine; I just adjudicate on them. If you are not happy with my decision there is a procedure to follow. If not, we will get on with the business of the House.

(MR. SPEAKER Cont'd) . . . . The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I challenge your ruling with regret.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie on the point of order.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, maybe I may be allowed the courtesy to explain my point of order. I would expect the same latitude that the House Leader has had.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is, that other members in this House, in the debate on Bill 21, have been allowed a reasonable amount of latitude, and I quoted the fact that the member for St. Vital chose to, and was allowed to speak on a wide ranging field . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . matters of tax . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please. The Honourable Member is now reflecting on my earlier rulings and decisions. What the Honourable Minister of Labour spoke to was the particular point that was raised by the Honourable Member for Charleswood. That motion is before us. The honourable member has challenged the ruling of the Chair. Should the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

MR. ENNS: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, Walding.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Bilton, Blake, Craik, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, McGill, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Sherman, Spivak, Watt, Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 24; Nays 18.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Ayes have it. I declare the motion carried. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the First Minister. Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the appeal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, as likely being one of the final speakers in the third reading of this Bill I still would like to preface some remarks to the Minister of Finance and to the Government through you, Mr. Speaker, and there is still a lot of unanswered questions regarding this bill, regarding my constituency, with the Finance Minister just leaving so I guess he's not going to answer the questions which I have raised I think through two or three speeches in the debate. In the first one of course -- (Interjection) -- now the Minister of Public Works says pass, and that's how much he's concerned about my constituency. I regret that from this Government, they basically don't understand, Mr. Speaker, that there is a constituency out in Roblin, and maybe it is due to the name, or maybe the Minister of Public Works doesn't understand that there was a constituency out there before this Government existed, and before I get through with my remarks I'll try to prove to the Honourable Minister of Public Works that there is a dying decaying constituency out there, which was a viable fired up community with economic development and everything going on before this government took office.

But, Mr. Speaker, through this, and I hope the honourable member's office will give me time to preface my remarks and put it into the records.

I would first ask him, Mr. Speaker, through you, how come the Minister of Finance didn't include the words Production Machinery in the preface of this Bill? How come he didn't talk about the aircraft? He is going to tax airplanes now; they are going to fly across this province, and it don't matter if they don't even -- but it's not in the Bill on the preface. Mr. Speaker, this great ad that was shown in Saturday's ads of the Winnipeg newspaper. And fortunately that hasn't still gone out to my constituency in the little weekly newspapers. How come that ad wasn't in the weekly newspapers? So basically, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to get across to this Government and to the Minister of Finance, that this bill still isn't understood in my constituency and I am sure a lot of people in rural Manitoba still don't understand

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . the consequences of this bill. So through, Mr. Speaker, I appeal, again, to the Finance Minister in his summation of the debate and when he closes debate on this bill, to try to answer some of the questions.

And, Mr. Speaker, I went through a lot of the programs of this government. I got one here in front of me, "Action Programs for Southern Manitoba". Nothing about my constituency or west central Manitoba. For the north we hear, we hear speakers, Mr. Speaker, about all the taxation dollars that are being spent in northern Manitoba. We hear stories about all the taxes that are being spent in this great City of Winnipeg who are now this year, we are going to rural Manitoba we're going to have to kick in a million-five bucks for to pick up the tax bill because these city people can't afford it, so they are going to have to draw all this money out of rural Manitoba. Well, I hope that the Honourable Member for Thompson, Mr. Borowski, and his people will bring some of that great wealth and help us rural Manitobans to pick up some of this million-five that we have to do to the Unicity Bill. But that is only one or two or three. Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity to you, and I appeal to you again, Mr. Speaker, and I appeal to this Government, I had a phone call this afternoon from a little rural village . . .

A MEMBER: Which one?

MR. McKENZIE: Ethelbert.

A MEMBER: Oh Yea.

MR. McKENZIE: The Village of Ethelbert. The Church in the Village of Ethelbert today is up for tax sale.

A MEMBER: How do you like that?

MR. McKENZIE: The church is up for tax sale due to the taxation measures of this government. -- (Interjection) -- No. not until I'm finished. If the House Leader, Mr. Speaker, would take the time to go over and talk to his Minister of Municipal Affairs, he would understand what I am talking about in taxation.

I have a letter, Mr. Speaker, I have a letter in my hand here which indicates certain community clubs -- and I am not going to get involved in the debate of who they are or where they are -- but certain community clubs are closing their doors because -- (Interjection) -- well I that's -- certainly, and I'll move on to the church . . . because they can't pay these excessive taxes of this government, Mr. Speaker. And when we get to the Estimates of the Minister of Municipal Affairs Department I'll elaborate on this at great length and prove my point. The Honourable House Leader doesn't understand of course. He sits over there in his big fat cat chair and he drools there all day and he wonders what's going to happen. He stands up every once in a while. I doubt if this Honourable Minister has ever been in my constituency. I heard of . . . he passed through one night in the middle of the night but you know he doesn't call now when they are government. In the old days when he was working for votes he used to call around and look at the problems of the people of Roblin constituency. Now he is a fat cat Minister getting a big salary he doesn't call no more. He doesn't understand. Yea, the filthy rich. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about the village where I live. Inglis. Now I want to talk about the village where I live, I don't want to talk about Ethelbert.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to indicate to the honourable member we are on Bill 21, not on Ethelbert.

MR. McKENZIE: Well I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for directing me back to the attention of the Bill which basically is taxation. And I would just like to tell you of the Village of Inglis where I live, before this Government took over. We are a viable economic unit. Everything is working fine. Today we haven't got a restaurant in that village. They are all boarded up. We haven't got a machinery dealer in that village.

A MEMBER: We can't hear you over here.

MR. McKENZIE: Oh, oh then, and let's go on. We haven't got a bulk oil dealer. It's all closed up. I'm still there, one other merchant, a hardware man across the street. No, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, due to the taxation policies of this government that's a ghost town today and I dare say there's hundreds of villages in this town that are ghost towns today. We saw the debate of Sprague today. Again another example of the ruthless and selfish attitudes that this NDP Government, who do not understand that there are little people out in the country trying to make a buck and trying to make a living, but they bring in a bill, Mr. Speaker, like this. More taxation. They are now going to tax our production machinery; they are going to tax our aircraft, a new tobacco tax, amusement tax, ta da, ta da, and it goes on and on, Mr. Speaker. And then if I read the Orders of the Day correctly, succession



(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . duties, estate taxes -- where the devil, Mr. Speaker, is all this taxation of these great new philosophers of the new world going to end. When are you going to tell the people out in my constituency, look, we are cutting the taxes. Mr. Speaker, there is not one man or one member that bends over, that understands the word cut taxes. No. This great socialist philosophy and this great ideology. Take em over, tax until they are dead and then you take them over, like the land tax . . . . and keep pouring on the taxes, Mr. Speaker, pouring on the taxes, then we will take over the state, and then we will rule it all. And the Honourable House Leader sits over there in his great smile . . . . He doesn't think -- he's laughing. Isn't that interesting? Of all the years he sat here in opposition, Mr. Speaker, and all the great speeches he made sitting over there and appealing when I was sitting over in that bench about all the things . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of 9:00 o'clock having arrived, according to Rule 19 we go to Private Members' Hour. First order of business Private Members' Resolutions.

. . . . . continued on next page.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, No. 21.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside,

WHEREAS Manitoba based automobile insurance companies have been deprived of the opportunity of operating fully in Manitoba since the inception of Autopac; and

WHEREAS rates and service in the automobile insurance industry in Manitoba prior to the inception of Autopac were comparable to rates and services available elsewhere in Canada; and

WHEREAS rates and service under Autopac have not produced the improvements and savings promised and are unsatisfactory to many Manitobans;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of permitting the private sector of the Manitoba insurance industry to compete with Autopac so that the motorists of Manitoba will have freedom of choice in their purchase of automobile insurance.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I hoped the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs would have been here tonight to take part in this debate. He took part in it this afternoon and made a few statements on automobile insurance. But I want to in my few minutes here this evening try to relate to the government of the day the necessity of having the private insurance companies compete with Autopac so that the people of Manitoba would know once and for all which insurance is best and which might be the cheapest. That's all I'm asking the government of the day to do.

Mr. Speaker, as we relate back about three years many memories come back to the members of this Legislature on the way the government handled the problem of the day - appointing a certain committee to look into the automobile insurance industry. And who did they appoint, Mr. Speaker, who did they appoint? They went to B.C. to get a certain man, Mr. Randall, who had been an adjuter at one time - part of his life; they went to Ontario to get an ex-Saskatchewanite, Mr. Blackburn who had been involved in Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office and was working for the Crop Insurance Corporation in Ontario; and they got the Minister of Municipal Affairs and they made him chairman and lo and behold what kind of a report did they come up with? The very report we knew they'd come up with because they had the answer before they even started to even hold hearings. The hearings --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, they weren't even hearings, they weren't even hearings because I attended many of them. They weren't even hearings. They didn't want to listen to anybody because they had their minds made up. They weren't even hearings. They didn't want to listen to anybody because they had their minds made up.

A MEMBER: Kangaroo court.

MR. McKELLAR: Kangaroo court. That's right. The Honourable Member for Lakeside . . . Then we went on to relate to Bill 56 which we all remember, the debate that was carried on in this Legislature. The Honourable Member for St. Vital thinks that we were foolish to debate that, just as we were debating Bill 21 now, just as we debated Bill 36 in the last session of the House and I would like to assure the Honourable Member for St. Vital that the members on this side of the House have a duty and a function and that's not just to sit home on our fannies in our own constituencies for the whole 12 months. We are elected to come in here to assess the legislation the government might put before this House and to be a responsible opposition to the government of the day. Mr. Speaker, what did we find in that Bill 56? We found that one very important day in the month of May two years ago - over I don't know how many thousand people outside the door of this building, people who were concerned for a very good reason. People who were being affected by this legislation. People whose lives and livelihood were being affected to the point where many of them would have to leave the Province of Manitoba. And many of them have left the Province of Manitoba because of this Bill 56 and because of the government of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the honourable members of the day, because they're all over there yet, did you do the right thing for the people of Manitoba? Did you do the right thing

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . for the people of Wawanesa? I'm sure they'll say nothing to that because that's why I'm speaking tonight. Not only for the Village of Wawanesa, the Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company and another insurance company which I represent, Portage Mutual, both of those companies are mutual companies, are classed as co-operatives with the exception they don't pay taxes the same method the co-operative uses. They pay taxes the same as corporations. This is the difference between mutual companies and co-operatives. But what do they do to their famous Co-op Fire and Casualty, the company that all over the years that the government of the day when they were opposition always defended the Co-op Fire and Casualty. They always defended the co-op movement. What did they do? They chased them right out of the province completely because they're gone, gone completely. They didn't even love the co-op movement.

A MEMBER: Gone with the wind.

MR. McKELLAR: We could expect them to chase Wawanesa and Portage Mutual out because we knew they didn't love them, they didn't love them, but lo and behold when they chased the Co-op Fire and Casualty out that's a different ball game. That's a different ball game. The friends of the NDP Party.

Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of record that we experienced in the last three years. But lo and behold what has happened since then? What has happened since then? I can tell you what's happened. Chaos, confusion and more and more to come. Chaos, confusion and more to come. We have experienced it all.

Mr. Speaker, what did the honourable member say they are going to do? They are going to do it better, they are going to do it cheaper and they are going to prove to the people of Manitoba that they knew how to run the insurance company. Well I'd like to say to the honourable members in the front row, how little you know about insurance even to this day. And if you don't learn something about it you better give somebody else the job of running the industry. That's all I can say for the front bench of the government side here today. We all realize that none of them had any experience in industry but they surely would have taken a lesson rather than leave it up to the bureaucrats which they hired over to do the job.

Talk about confusion. I want to relate a little bit of the confusion that went on. How could a man become a lady or how could a lady become a man? Well I tell you the government of the day proved it, they proved, they proved it; they sent all these great fancy notices out telling the ladies that they were men, they classed them as male: they had all the rates wrong. That's the kind of confusion that exists. Not only did they send out one notice to the people in my area, they sent out as many as four notices, four notices. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, some of them never did get their notice not to this day, not to this day, they have never got their application for Autopac. Is that the kind of a government that you want running an industry, Mr. Speaker? I would say not, not under any consideration.

Mr. Speaker, they not only do that, they confuse the farmers, and I want to tell you when you confuse a farmer you make him mad. And what did the government of the day under their Autopac corporation do? They told these farmers last year in the House here, they told them out in the hustings, they told them with literature that they were going to get 30 percent in rural Manitoba discount. Not on their basic but on their basic and extension coverage. And what do they get, Mr. Speaker? I'll tell you what they got. I'll tell you what they got. They never even got it yet, lots of the farmers. They never got anything yet, never got their 30 percent discount yet. Mr. Speaker, is that the kind of service we want from the insurance company in the Province of Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, if that was a private insurance company they'd lose their license to operate in the Province of Manitoba under the old system. They'd lost their license. Mr. Speaker, it's a tragedy, a real tragedy. I only wish the Minister of Municipal Affairs was here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot about surcharge when we were dealing with this bill, and they haven't brought it in yet. And I'll tell you when they're going to bring it in. If they're re-elected after the next election - I know they won't be - that's the time they plan to bring in surcharge on . . . . But they brought something in its place, Mr. Speaker: the best money raising deal that you ever saw - demerit points. I don't know how many people in this Chamber here are paying on their demerit points, but I would safely say there's likely quite a few. In fact I found something in the March 13th Winnipeg Tribune where Mr. Pawley even said he's paying for a bad driving record and I couldn't believe that hardly because I thought he was up there with all the good record - but he said up in Saskatoon. Why, Mr. Speaker, that's a famous

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . place. I understand the Honourable Minister was invited up to Saskatoon to speak to the Saskatchewan Government insurance agents in the Province of Saskatchewan and even mentioned that the earth is round and he went on to refer to the flat-earth society. Mr. Speaker, he is not getting many invitations out to Wawanesa, I can assure him that. After the damage he did to that village and to the insurance company operating within the Province of Manitoba, an insurance company that operated for 76 years in the Province of Manitoba and found out three years ago that they weren't wanted any longer in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it just so happened I happened to get my application for insurance licence last weekend. I happen to be one of those who wasn't wanted in Autopac. I was told I wasn't wanted and the Honourable Member for Roblin was told he wasn't wanted. Not only were we told we weren't wanted but they told us about a month ago that we couldn't even collect on transitional grants. Not a cent for the Honourable Member for Roblin and myself. But that's not bad enough, Mr. Speaker, what they're doing to the agents of the Province of Manitoba. We paid \$15 a year in rural Manitoba for many years gone by and we paid that to write all lines of general insurance. Mr. Speaker, this year the rate is still \$15 and we're not allowed to write automobile. Is that the kind of justice, is that the kind of consideration you want conceded in the Province of Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, I would say not.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the members opposite just how many people have left the Province of Manitoba in the last six months. Up to March 16th. How many people have been done out of a job? How many insurance companies have left? Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the insurance companies which have closed down and the number of employees who were out of a job. Halifax Insurance Company - 20 employees; Canadian General Insurance Company - 50 employees; Home Insurance Company of New York - 5 employees; St. Paul Fire and Marine - 5 employees; Northwestern Mutual - 3 employees; Global General - 3 employees; London Midland - 3 employees; Guradian Royal Exchange Group - 52 employees; Safeco Insurance Company - 10 employees; State Farm Insurance Company - 4 employees. These are the companies that had offices in the Province of Manitoba and have closed down since the first of November. Total of 167 employees.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the other companies which have laid off people because of the government getting into the automobile insurance business. Norwich Union - 28 employees have been let out; General Accident - 21 employees; Co-op Fire and Casualty - 12 employees; Security Mutual - 3 employees; Continental - 50 employees; Canadian Indemnity - 8 employees; Great American - 3 employees; Sun Alliance Group - 13 employees; Dominion of Canada - 5 employees; Wawanesa Mutual - 40 employees; Zurich Insurance Company - 5 employees; total of 188; making a total of 355 people who have been replaced or displaced by the government of the day. Mr. Speaker, is that the kind of consideration we want to give our people who have spent many years working and trained in their particular field. I would say not.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to rating, there is one particular reference I'd like to make - injustice of the worst kind that was ever thought of by any government or any insurance company and I have to give the blame where the blame lies right on the Cabinet of the Province of Manitoba, of the NDP Government. Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard of an insurance company cutting the rate less than half because the Board of Directors of a particular company went into the office of that company. Have you ever heard of that? I don't suppose you have, and I haven't.

Mr. Speaker, on the 20th of March, the Cabinet passed an Order-in-Council, passed an Order-in-Council. And what was this Order-in-Council? It reduced the premium for Winnipeg Transit from 255,000 down to 120,000. Mr. Speaker, why was this done? Why was this done? It was done because the government of the day don't have enough of what it takes to stand up to the City of Winnipeg. And is that fair, Mr. Speaker, when the people of the rural parts of the province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member has five minutes. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. McKELLAR: . . . citizens of the Province of Manitoba are helping pay the subsidy, and I consider a subsidy over \$130,000; is that the kind of justice we want in the Automobile Insurance Corporation, the Province of Manitoba? I say this is wrong and it will be proven wrong if you're going to carry this type of policy out.

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

Why weren't the school divisions treated the same? Why wasn't the City of Brandon who operate a transit bus system treated the same? Why wasn't Flin Flon treated the same? These are the questions I'd like to ask at this time. Mr. Speaker, that's not the kind of justice we want in the Province of Manitoba. We want people in the government of the day who are going to treat everyone fairly, not get down on your hands and knees to a big corporation when they come before you.

Mr. Speaker, they can laugh all they want. I want to relate here because I only got less than five minutes. I want to say to the people here, to the members on the government side here, if they were a citizen of the town, the Village of Wawanesa, a town about 500 people, less than that now, what would they think if a big government come in and clobbered them over the head? What would you think? What would the Honourable Member for Thompson think if somebody went up there and closed down the nickel mine in Thompson. What would you think? You'd be screaming blue murder here. What would the Member for Flin Flon do if somebody went and closed down the mine in Flin Flon? I know what they would be doing, Mr. Speaker. They'd be in here screaming and crying and kicking and doing everything they could to make the government of the day understand.

Well I know what happened at the Village of Wawanesa. The government of the day realizing their error and omission promised they would do everything they could to help the Village of Wawanesa -- and I'm referring to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. That was two long years ago. But the people, the citizens of Wawanesa haven't seen that Minister since, and I don't expect they'll ever see him, and I don't expect we'll ever see the Minister of Municipal Affairs again either, because I've invited him out there and he will use every excuse in the book not to go there. And why won't he go to Wawanesa? Because, I don't suppose his conscience is bothering him, but he's afraid to meet the people head on in the Village of Wawanesa.

Mr. Speaker, there's been more injustices created by this government through Autopac, more clumsiness, more abuse on the average citizen in the Province of Manitoba as I related, more mix-ups, and so on down the line. I think it's about time that the government let the private insurers in the Province of Manitoba get in there and compete with them. Then we'll find out how efficient, how effective, Autopac is for the people of Manitoba. I would safely say, Mr. Speaker, if the private insurers such as Wawanesa Mutual, Portage Mutual, were to compete with the government of the day that they would prove to them in no uncertain terms, they could compete not only in rates, they could compete in service, they'd compete in adjustment claims, they could compete right down the line, and I think the people of Manitoba are ready right now to accept the private insurance companies back into the field because they've had enough of this kind of nonsense.

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

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a few remarks to the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. And he started his remarks with respect to the type of hearings that this government had in proposing automobile insurance to the Province of Manitoba. Well, first of all, the hearings that they had, the hearings were set out to do one thing. It was to bring in an automobile insurance plan as was set out in our literature, in our campaign in the last election. There was no fooling around. We knew what we were going to do. We had told the people prior to our 69 election what we were going to do and we were setting out to do it. It wasn't carried out like it was done in the many previous years of the boys on the other side where they held hearings year after year on automobile insurance and what was done? Nothing. Nothing. They held hearings year after year and I'll tell you why because I think there are people on the other side who are in the hip pockets of the insurance companies. I think the boys on the other side they must have put the squeeze on the Cabinet of the day, those fellows there who are tied into the insurance companies and they did that deliberately. --(Interjection)-- And that's a possibility. The member says they get their election funds from them. --(Interjection)-- What really happened . . .

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: . . . honourable gentleman to prove that I ever got a dollar from

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . insurance companies. That he can't prove, he can't prove . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please. Order, please. I would suggest to the Honourable Member for St. George that he is skirting on thin ice. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I didn't accuse any of the members . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: I ask the Honourable Member for St. George to step out in the hall and lay that charge tonight. Lay that charge tonight or else . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. That's not a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, if the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I indicated to the Honourable Member for St. George he was on thin ice. I ask him to reconsider what he's saying. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I didn't -- I wish to clear up what I didn't say. I didn't accuse any of the other members on the other side. --(Interjection)-- If the intention was there that I accused any of the members in particular, I did not. I'm referring to -- if the Conservative Party did not receive any funds from the insurance companies, I'd like them to say so, and that they didn't, and let the insurance companies stand up and say that they didn't donate funds to the Conservative Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . withdraw the charge he alleged to me that I took money from insurance companies.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think my remarks that I made shortly are quite clear that if I made any charges to the honourable members, I did not and I mentioned that. Mr. Speaker, during the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order. Would he state it?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, we're not prepared to argue with the Honourable Member for St. George, on the same basis that if he's prepared to accept the fact that his party received remuneration from . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order. Order. Would the honourable member please sit down, or shall I name him. I have a lot of tolerance but I will not have a point debated unless the point is stated. The Honourable Member for Lakeside did not state any point of order. All he did was debate with the Honourable Member for St. George. That will not occur. The honourable member can hold his seat until I'm done.

I'm going to indicate once more, I intend to run this House according to your rules and when I ask for order I expect honourable members to sit down and to hear what I have to say. If you do not wish me to Chair your Assembly, very well, but as long as I am Chairman I expect the respect that should be accorded to this Chair and I'm appealing to all members, once more, that that should be observed. I shouldn't have to tell any member that when the Speaker rises that is an indication for other members to sit down.

Now I'm going to say once more, as I did earlier, the matter of privilege that was raised by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, I asked the Honourable Member for St. George to reconsider and I think he explained. Now if there's any other further point of order, I'm willing to entertain it but I want the point of order expressed. I want no debate and no shouting match across this floor. All addresses will be to the Chair, or I shall leave the Chair and adjourn the House.

The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. George imputed motives to both members of this House and to corporations of this province and he has no grounds or justifications to make it unless he can back up his statement with fact. There is no onus, Mr. Speaker, in a democratic society for any individual or any corporation to prove that he did not do something and in the retraction that was made that was the condition that was put on it. Now I must say that, you know, we put up with a lot of abuse, Mr. Speaker, too, and I say this on a matter of order or matter of privilege, or whatever you like, but I don't enjoy watching the sneers on

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . the face of the Member for St. George or the Member for Thompson and I'll . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I do think - I do believe the point was explained . . . .

A MEMBER: It was not . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. If the honourable member wishes to debate with me, he can challenge me. That's his prerogative but I will not have a shouting match with any member on this floor. Now let's have that understood for the last time. I'm not entertaining anything for the moment. I do believe we can get along as gentlemen in this House. The Honourable Member for St. George has the floor.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What did the commissions in B.C. really say about the --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the members opposite perhaps did not hear the honourable member clearly and I know that it's impossible --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I am going to indicate once more that I do think honourable members should extend the courtesy to each member to have an opportunity to express himself. If a shouting match is going to occur, I'll call it 10:00 o'clock. I have no problem. My eyesight is short and it may be 10:00 o'clock right now. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture, on the point of order.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I know that it's difficult to recall all the words accurately and we can't really do that unless we have had the printing of Hansard but as I recall the point made by the Member for St. George, He merely quoted what another backbencher had said while he was speaking. He didn't impute that to any individual. He was simply repeating what had been suggested but not as an accusation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I think the evidence is there, Sir. Four or five members on this side of the House referred to the imputation made and I think the evidence is there. I, too, heard the honourable gentleman make that allegation; that is the cause of the problem at the moment and I believe the honourable gentleman would give those that have given him an opinion the benefit of the doubt in order that the business of the province might proceed. He realizes what the argument is and surely he may consider the fact that he has been misinterpreted and having been misinterpreted, if he will take that attitude, there's only one thing to do and that is to withdraw and no harm been done to anyone.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what a point of order is that may be considered at the present time. Unfortunately I was out of the House when a point apparently was raised but as I understood it, Mr. Speaker, on my return into the House you called upon the Honourable the Member for St. George to continue in the debate and having done so that to me is an indication that you were satisfied with the proceedings because if any challenging, Sir, of your ruling was to be made, it should have been made prior to that and when you called upon the Honourable Member for St. John's to continue . . . .

A. MEMBER: St. George.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . his participation in the debate, the time for challenging any ruling, Sir, of yours had passed. So I say in all due respect there was no challenge of your point of order. You called on the Honourable Member for St. George to continue and that having been done, there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I should like to indicate once more that I felt the Honourable Member for St. George had been skating on thin ice. It has been difficult to hear every word that has been going on here. If the honourable member inadvertently imputed motives, I'm sure he would be willing to take that back but he is entitled to an opinion and the explanation I received afterwards - I may not have caught the original words - indicated that he was not imputing to any member. But I'll allow the Honourable Member for St. George to explain once more and then he can continue. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: The honourable gentlemen want to hear me once more and I will tell them again for the second time that I didn't refer any of my remarks to any one of them. I was also, for their information, repeating remarks that I was quoting from another honourable

(MR. URUSKI cont'd) . . . . member like the Minister of Agriculture had stated. But I'll go back to my remarks and let them sit because I think there may be some thoughts running through their mind as to what the real facts are. --(Interjection)--

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

MR. CRAIK: . . . the imputation was very clear by the Member for St. George. It was from a carte blanche across the whole members opposite. It was very clear, and very clearly stated, and there is not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. --(Interjection)-- Order. I should like to indicate that we must accept the word of any honourable gentleman in this House. The Honourable Member for St. George has given an explanation; I have to abide by it. The Honourable Member for St. George. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I recognize, Sir, that with respect to the matter under discussion that you have, I believe, sincerely attempted to counsel the Honourable Member for St. George. I would suspect that in his continuations, his several continuations of his speech, he has rejected your counsel. He has not made any attempt to use the occasions or the opportunity that you gave him, Sir, to correct a situation that he caused and for the benefit of the Honourable House Leader who wasn't in the House for him now to come and lecture us, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, is that the Honourable Member for St. George did indicate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. The hour of adjournment has arrived. The House will be adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.