

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 25, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell) Before we proceed, I should like to draw the Honourable Members' attention to the gallery where we have 62 Students of Grade 4 Standing of the George Fitton School, under the direction of Mr. Thickens. This School is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

We have 19 students of Grade 6 standing from Lowe Farm Jr. High School, under the direction of Mr. Fehr. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Government House Leader.

We also have 40 students of Grade 9 standing from St. Johns High School, under the direction of Mr. Bohinsky. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

On behalf of the Honourable Members, we welcome you here today.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of Oo-Za-We-Kwun Centre Incorporated, praying for the passing of An Act to exempt the Oo-Za-We-Kwun Centre Incorporated from certain Provisions of The Liquor Control Act.

MR. SPEAKER Reading and Receiving Petitions.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the First Report of the Standing Committee of Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster) Have you put the question yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER No, I haven't.

MR. CLERK Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources met on Tuesday, May 23, 1978, and appointed Mr. Steen as Chairman. The Committee agreed that for all future meetings of the Committee the Quorum should consist of six (6) members. Your Committee met again on Thursday, May 25, 1978, and considered the Report of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member from the officers of the Corporation and the staff with respect to the Report.

By resolution of the Committee, the Annual Report of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation was adopted.

QUESTION put, MOTION declared carried.

MR. GREEN Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER Call in the members.

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

YEAS Messrs. Anderson, Banman, Blake, Brown, Cosens, Craik, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Galbraith, Gourlay, Hyde, Johnston, Jorgenson,

Thursday, May 25, 1978

McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Mercier, Orchard, Ransom, Sherman, Spivak, Steen.

NAYS Messrs. Adam, Axworthy, Bostrom, Boyce, Cowan, Evans, Fox, Green, McBryde, Miller, Parasiuk, Pawley, Schreyer, Uruski, Walding.

MR. CLERK Yeas 28, Nays 15.

MR. SPEAKER I declare the report received.
Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake) introduced Bill No. 37, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Wawanesa and District Memorial Hospital Association.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere) Well, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the First Minister, I'll direct my question to the Government House Leader and ask him if he will give this House some assurance that when a Standing Committee is convened and a Crown corporation is reporting that in the absence of the Chairman and General Manager of the said corporation that the committee will not presume to proceed and moreover proceed in a way that precludes any further opportunity of directing further questions and inquiries of the principal officer of that corporation.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris) Mr. Speaker, when a Committee of this House meets and pursuant to the rules that govern the conduct of the business of these committees, if there is a quorum, that committee will proceed to conduct business with or without the presence of the general manager or whatever officers are supposed to be there. It is up to them to be there on time and it is up to my honourable friends opposite to ensure that the quorums are met. If my honourable friends cannot provide even one single member to attend upon a committee when a committee is called, then I cannot be held responsible for that. If my honourable friends want the opportunity to examine whatever public corporation that's before the House, then it is incumbent upon them to be sure that their presence is here.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER Mr. Speaker, in asking the second question of the Government House Leader I would ask him if he is aware that our Party was represented at that meeting at 10:00 o'clock sharp — indeed, before some honourable gentlemen opposite appeared. But my real question is to ask the Honourable the Government House Leader that, in addition to the rules, is it not a fact that it is by definition impossible and pointless for the Committee to proceed when the principle officer of the corporation is not yet there. Upon checking I find that the Chairman and General Manager did not attend because of late notice until some several minutes after the Committee presumed to adjourn. So I ask the Honourable Government House Leader, would he indicate if the Chairman and General Manager was present in any case?

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN Mr. Speaker, I was not at the Committee so I cannot answer my honourable friend's question, but I do happen to know that the Minister responsible for reporting to the Committee and to this House for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation was present and was able to answer questions if there was even one single member of the opposition there to ask questions.

MR. SCHREYER Mr. Speaker, there is more to this than meets the eye. I would like to ask the Government House Leader if he is aware that in attending at the Committee at 10:00 o'clock that some few minutes later the Minister reporting arrived and was heard to inquire whether the General Manager and Chairman of the Corporation had been notified, and then someone was dispatched to ascertain whether he had been notified. Then upon leaving the Committee and returning five

later I found that the Committee had adjourned and the General Manager and Chairman of the Corporation had not yet arrived. So I'm asking the House Leader if he feels that that kind of practice is consistent with not only the rules but the rules and the practices of Parliament and the Legislature?

MR. JORGENSON There's one thing that I want to ensure, that the practices of the House and the Committees are followed, and as has happened in the past due notice had been given to honourable gentlemen opposite; due notice had been given to everybody who had the responsibility to attend. I cannot answer for those who do not respond to the notification of meetings. It's been a practice in the past all too often prevalent upon my honourable friends opposite that they delay in arriving at Committee meetings, thereby using up the time of departmental officials who are waiting to be questioned, the time of members of the House, the time of everybody concerned, and I would suggest to my honourable friends . . .

MR. SPEAKER Order. Order please. . May I suggest to the Honourable Government House Leader that he speak for himself rather than cast aspersions against other members of the Chamber.

MR. JORGENSON Mr. Speaker, if you've interpreted my remarks as casting aspersions on my honourable friends opposite I'm not doing that; I'm simply suggesting to them, Sir, that if they want the opportunity to examine, then my only advice to them is that they be there on time.

MR. SCHREYER May I ask the Honourable House Leader when he intimates or suggests that members on this side have delayed and kept the business of the Committee from proceeding, whether he had in mind for example last Thursday evening when the situation was just the opposite and honourable members from this side were kept waiting in the Committee over in Room 254. And secondly at 10:00 a.m. this morning, did the Honourable House Leader have that in mind, because at 10:00 a.m. this morning, Mr. Speaker, at 10:00 a.m. sharp, there were precisely two people in that room.

MR. JORGENSON Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that last Thursday night, if my honourable friends were able to muster ten instead of eight members, they would have made it exceedingly embarrassing for us.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN Mr. Speaker, further to the questions that have been raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to ask the Honourable House Leader whether it is the intention of the majority party in this House, if a quorum is not present at the time when a meeting is called, to then wait for other members to leave and start a meeting at a later time when the quorum does become present? And I specify, Mr. Speaker, a quorum was not present at 10:00 o'clock because of the absence of government members. Is it the honourable members interpretation of the rules, that if a quorum is not present at 10:00 o'clock and therefore a meeting cannot start, it can start at any time thereafter when a quorum of people come?

MR. JORGENSON No, Mr. Speaker. When a quorum is achieved in a Committee, that Committee then has the authority and the right to proceed to conduct business. My understanding was, that up until the point that the meeting started, there was not a quorum and if my honourable friends want to be participating in the conduct of business my only suggestion to them is that at least out of 23 meers opposite they should at least be able to find one member, just one, to attend upon those committees.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER Yes, Mr. Speaker. I now rise on a point of privilege, a personal privilege, because when the Honourable House Leader suggests that there wasn't one there, I have to say, Sir, that I attended at the Committee Room and sat at the table at 10:00 o'clock before some honourable members opposite were present, and I left for just a few minutes upon hearing my honourable friends opposite making inquiries as to whether the Chairman and General Manager of the Corporation had been notified, whereupon I left for a few minutes in order to ascertain whether or not other colleagues of mine would be present when the General Manager arrived. Upon returning to the Committee Room I found that the General Manager had not yet arrived but the Committee had proceeded to adjourn. So that's my point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK(Riel) Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege regarding the same matter, and I want to remind the Leader of the Opposition of the very short memory that seems to exist, back to the days when we attempted to have Public Utilities meeting called, period, and could not have it called and we've gone several years without ever formally receiving the reports to that Committee. And the same goes for the Public Accounts committee in years past. Mr. Speaker, that is a real. . .

MR. SPEAKER Order, order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Finance he did not have a point of privilege. The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER(Osborne) Mr. Speaker, on May 16th, the Meer for Selkirk asked me if the department had completed a. . .

MR. SPEAKER Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GEN Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was in the process of asking questions when I was interrupted on a point of privilege properly taken. I assumed that I would be permitted to continue the questions that I was asking and not be interrupted by another honourable member on another subject.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the House Leader is, if a quorum is not present at 10:00 o'clock, but some members of the Committee are present, is the honourable member saying that if the meeting convenes later and one of the members who was present at 10:00 o'clock is fifty feet, less than fifty feet from the Committee Room, that he will not be notified that the Committee is meeting? Is that the position that is taken by the free Manitoba party?

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON Mr. Speaker, everybody that is a member of that Committee is notified in advance of the meeting of that Committee. But my honourable friend is not a meer of the Committee. He was taken off the Committee and has not been replaced, and just as soon as my honourable friend is placed back on that Committee, then he will be counted as a member of the Committee; not before, and he should know that. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER Order please, order please. If we may continue with the business of the House — The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Morris distinguishes between a member of the Committee and a member of the Legislature, who is entitled to sit at every Committee meeting and to participate in the proceedings thereof. And I ask the Honourable Member for Morris, if such a member of the Legislature is there at 10:00 o'clock, the appointed time, and is waiting for the Committee to commence which can't commence because of the absence of government members, and is fifty feet from the meeting room when the meeting is convened, is it the position of the government party, that such meeting will convene without informing the honourable meers who are present at 10:00 o'clock?

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON Mr. Speaker, I repeat again, that my honourable friends will be given due notification of the convening of any Committee of this House. It is not my responsibility, but it is their responsibility to ensure that they are present. We will try, and I have given instructions to the Whip responsible on this side to ensure that meers on this side of the House are present at the convening of those committees. I suggest that my honourable friend does the same thing and we will have no trouble. There is no intention, and there was no desire, and I regret very much what happened this morning, but when the Committee has a quorum it is enabled to conduct business. If my honourable friends were not there I cannot speak for them.

MR. GREEN Mr. Speaker, will the honourable member agree that in the days of what his party calls the state control party, that I myself, as House Leader, went to both caucus rooms to get the honourable meers when a delay took place, and when the meeting did not start on time, that I myself went to both caucus rooms advising the members that the meeting was now going to commence? In the days of the not free Manitoba government.

MR. JORGENSON That, Mr. Speaker, may well be true, but that was because there wasn't a quorum

to start a meeting; not because there was a quorum and they could not conduct business. As my honourable friend knows, you cannot conduct business unless there is a quorum. There was a quorum there this morning.\$

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS Mr. Speaker, I find it's a bit ridiculous. I think there's such a thing as a bit of courtesy and rules are rules, but we are trying to deal with the affairs of Manitoba and my honourable friend, the House Leader, must have a memory — does my honourable friend remember just a couple of days ago when we had a quorum and the committee was called; we waited patiently, without criticism, we waited for the Minister of Health, who was occupied somewhere else — didn't we have a quorum? Did we start without the Minister? Were we courteous to the members? Did we try to work for the good of Manitoba or not?

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN Mr. Speaker, the committee had met; there was a quorum; my honourable friends were able to conduct business; as a matter of fact, I suggested to the Legislative Assistant to the Minister, who was unavoidably detained, to sit in the Minister's place in order to take questions that my honourable friends might have wanted to ask. There was no delay —(Interjection)— Well, if there was, it was at the instigation of my honourable friends, not because I suggested it.

MR. DESJARDINS This is untrue. It was the gentleman himself who said the Minister will be here

MR. SPEAKER Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that he identify a matter of privilege or a matter of correction, or if he's asking a question, please ask the question. The Honourable Government House Leader. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER Well, Mr. Speaker, a series of supplementaries; I confine it to this one question now, and that is to ask the Government House Leader whether it is the government's intention to proceed in committee to take up the annual report of a Crown corporation if the principal officer of that corporation is not present? Will that be future practice?

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to ensure that the principal officers of the Crown corporations who are going to be examined will be there on time, as I expect my honourable friends to be.

MR. SCHREYER Mr. Speaker, in light of that, may I ask the Honourable Government House Leader what he proposes to do by way of remedial action, given that this morning the principal officer of the Crown corporation, probably at no fault of his own, was not there and was not there even after the committee adjourned, for the reason that he had not been notified until this forenoon. Can the Government House Leader indicate if he will check to find out if there was adequate notice to the principal officer of the corporation and whether he did attend at this Legislature before the committee presumed to adjourn in his absence?

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside) Allow me to assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the General Manager and staff received the same notice of the meeting that all members received as a result of last Tuesday's sitting. Let me also draw to the House's attention that this is the first instance since the inception of Autopac and the Crown corporation that the chief executive officer has been made available to speak directly to members of the committee. It was never done, it was never possible under the seven years of that administration —(Interjection)— No, Mr. Speaker, he answered through the Chairman of Autopac in those days which were either one of the honourable members opposite — the Member for Selkirk, the Member for St. George or my immediate predecessor, the Member for Dauphin — but the chief executive officer did not present the report of his corporation and did not answer for the corporation as he did on Tuesday of last week. I think it's worth noting that into the record, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER Mr. Speaker, on May 16 the Member for Selkirk asked me if my department had

completed a review relating to the escape of one Appleyard from the steps of the Law Court Building. Mr. Speaker, at approximately 3:10 p.m. on May 12, Mr. Appleyard escaped from the custody of two sheriff's officers while leaving the Law Courts following a sentence of life imprisonment for murder. Mr. Appleyard was arrested on the Legislative Building grounds and taken into custody at 10:50 p.m. by the City of Winnipeg police that same night. Immediately after the escape, an investigation by officials of the department was begun to examine the circumstances surrounding the escape and to review the present security in escort procedures. A meeting of all provincial sheriffs including representatives from the RCMP was held to deal with prisoner escort, search and restraining devices, and to review the procedures and determine future procedures. As a result of these meetings, a directive from the Chief Sheriff's office has been issued requiring that all prisoners under escort be handcuffed in back, and further authorizing a sheriff's officer to handcuff a prisoner to his person as necessary. There has been no disciplinary action against the sheriff's officers involved since they had exercised the discretion to conduct the escort in a method that was approved under the guidelines then in force.

The investigation further disclosed that immediate action was taken by the sheriff's officers by pursuit, by notification to the police and by search action. The procedures which have been developed apply to the escort program throughout the province which involves the movement of persons in custody in excess of 9,000 persons per year.

Further, Mr. Speaker, on April 6, I was in a series of questions relating to proposed amendments to the Criminal Code by the Federal Government. I was asked by the Member for Wellington if I would provide information respecting the number of cases where services of interpreters have been used in the Manitoba courts, and whether the cost of translation have been borne by the department. I now have information for the last two fiscal years, 1976-77 and 1977-78. We have no way of knowing, Mr. Speaker, of instances where interpreters were used in court and the cost of interpretation was borne by private citizens, but during the fiscal year 1976-77 there were 22 occasions where an interpreter was provided in court, the fees paid by the department. The language used in those cases was broken down as follows: 3 Punjabi; 1 Filipino; 2 Spanish; 3 Portuguese; 2 French; 7 Native; 2 Polish; 1 Greek.

There were 27 occasions during 1977-78 where an interpreter was provided in court and these were broken down as follows: 1 Filipino; 3 Spanish; 2 Portuguese; 1 French; 12 Native (Saulteaux or Cree); 2 Polish; 3 Serbian; 2 Italian; 1 Sign Language and 1 Unknown.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't try and interpret those remarks of the Attorney-General. I'd like to ask the Minister of Highways, could he indicate to this House how the General Manager and Chairman of MPIC was notified of the meeting today, when he indicated that he was notified last week, when only committee members receive notification of the impending hearings and meetings?

MR. ENNS Mr. Speaker, it was indicated last Tuesday at the close of the meeting that we would be, in all likelihood, resuming the hearings on Thursday. But I'll take the question under notice and advise the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Order please. A supplementary question to the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the government now is not going to present chairmen and general managers of Crown corporations to the committees, is the Minister now in a position to go ahead and answer questions of a policy nature with respect to the corporation or will he always take them as notice and tell them that they will be dealt with at committee hearings?

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that I always will be and will continue to be in a position to answer for those matters that are under my jurisdiction and in this case MPIC is one of them.

MR. URUSKI Mr. Speaker, there were a number of questions then that the Minister indicated that

they were a matter of policy and could be discussed when the chairman of the corporation would appear before committee. Is the Minister now in a position to answer those questions that were posed to him by myself several weeks ago?

MR. ENNS Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that upon perusal of Hansard of that committee meeting, every effort will be made to answer all the members' questions.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm curious to know from the Attorney-General whether the translation of "Unknown" was supplied by the Minister without Portfolio as has been the practice but I would direct my question rather to the Minister of Public Works responsible for Autopac and ask him when he decided, or the department decided, Autopac, that they would make the license fees equal between male and female whether that included an equalization in all the benefits accruing to the Autopac system as well.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is anticipating a possible action that may be taken by the corporation. I would have to advise the honourable member that no decision has been made with respect to the recommendations made by the Human Rights Commission in this respect. They are under study at this particular time.

MR. AXWORTHY Well, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister then include as a part of that trial balloon that he is floating about the equalization of license fees an equalization of the insurance benefits where there is now disparity where males receive \$5,000 in death benefits and females only \$2,000.00? Would that be part of his re-examination?

MR. ENNS Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, that any restructuring of the premiums would call for a restructuring of the benefits and any action in this area totally will have to bear in mind, of course, the fact that the corporation, as such, cannot sustain any revenue losses as a result of that. But these are matters that are being taken under review at this time.

MR. AXWORTHY Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Minister of Public Works with respect to his announcement of the renovations to the Portage Home of \$750,000.00. Could he indicate to the House when he allocated that money whether he had not also indicated to representatives of the Canadian Association of the Mentally Retarded that he would have preferred to have seen that money allocated towards the development of community treatment facilities and does his decision now mean that he is rescinding that particular agreement or decision, that the money would be preferably allocated towards community treatment facilities as opposed to the extension of the Portage Home?

MR. ENNS Mr. Chairman, I have to beg the member's indulgence. I missed the first part of his question. Is he talking about the moneys that are allocated to the renovations at East Grove? Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question perhaps should be more appropriately answered by the Minister of Health with respect to overall policy. I think the Minister of Health and I share jointly with those people most directly concerned that the solution or the end or the goal or direction would be to depopulate that centre but we are faced with the immediate problem of providing care and service for a large number of patients at that facility. We anticipate some difficulty in being able to house them as other major renovations are taking place with respect to the Fire Commissioner's codes and those alterations that are being carried on at East Grove, even though they are being questioned by the Mental Health Associations because they are deemed to be not in pursuit of the overall policy of depopulating and getting into community residence type centres which we have no quarrel with — but in the meantime, we have the problem of housing the people that are at the facility and of having the capability of maintaining reasonably adequate housing while further renovations take place.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have leave to make a non-controversial statement. (Agreed)

I would like to commend the former Deputy Minister of Labour for being named to the Labour Attache post in the Canadian Embassy in Washington. This is one of the most prestigious posts in the diplomatic field and he will be reporting directly to the External Affairs Minister, Don Jamieson, and Labour Minister John Munro under the supervision of Canadian Ambassador, J. H. Warren,

and I congratulate him.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for Autopac. In the light of his statement that he's in a position now to answer all questions that he previously deferred to the chairman, can he tell the members of the House now why Autopac gave a security contract to Metropolitan Securities without going through the tender process?

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS Yes, Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

MR. PARASIUK A supplementary. I'm not sure whether the Minister has any difficulty with his hearing. I asked why did Autopac give it and he is now saying yes. Well, I'm asking him specifically and clearly why did Autopac give the security contract to Metropolitan Securities without going through the tendering process?

MR. ENNS I have no difficulty with my hearing. The Member for Transcona asked me whether I could answer a particular question and the answer is yes and I have no intention of answering that question.

MR. PARASIUK Does that mean that the Minister then is trying to cover up the awarding of a security contract to Metropolitan Securities without a contract when in fact he had asked me to raise it with the general manager. Now that we cannot ask those questions of the general manager, he is refusing to answer the question of why the security contract was given to Metropolitan Securities without going through the tendering process.

MR. SPEAKER Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member who is asking questions that he has a perfect right to ask questions but Ministers also have a perfect right to refuse to answer if they so desire. I suggest also that in the interests of expediting the affairs of this Question Period, that we only have another seven minutes left and that we use it as wisely as possible.

The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK Mr. Speaker, when I raised this question a few months ago in the Legislature, I was instructed or asked by the Minister to raise these questions of the general manager. My colleague just asked the Minister if he would answer questions that the general manager could have answered in the committee and he said yes, he would. In that light and given the fact that he answered the question in such a manner, I then asked a very straightforward question as to why the corporation awarded a contract to Metropolitan Securities without a contract which is in line with the questions I had been previously asking the Minister.

MR. ENNS Mr. Speaker, I can well recall the Member for Transcona asking that initial question some months ago, or a month ago, in this House. I wonder perhaps why he did not avail himself and be present at the time the examination was taking place of the Corporation's affairs, and the Corporation Chairman was there on Tuesday. I might also wonder why he chose not to be there, whether he is a member of the Committee or not, as another non-member of the Committee was there for a brief period of time to press these questions to the Committee this morning when they sat. The simple fact of the matter is that when the Committee was called to order there was no opposition member present, there was no questions being put to either the Minister or anybody else.

Now Mr. Speaker, if you are going to hold this House Leader or this side responsible for the wanderings to Scotland or to the bathroom on the part of any members opposite then we serve notice that we don't intend to conduct the affairs of the business of the Province of Manitoba in that way.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER I'd like to ask the Government House Leader in the usual way if he can indicate when it is intended to call the same Committee with respect to Hydro, to have the Chairman of Hydro present, and also whether the Committee will be convened again at a time when the Chairman

of MPIC can be present as well as was not the case this morning.

MR. JORGENSEN Mr. Speaker, it is the intention to have the Committee on Public Utilities meet again next Tuesday at 10:00 o'clock and the Manitoba Telephone System will be in attendance to answer questions from my honourable friends opposite, and when the consideration of the report of the Manitoba Telephone System is completed then in all probability we'll proceed with the examination of Manitoba Hydro.

MR. SCHREYER Mr. Speaker, that's fair enough. After the Telephone System Chairman has been questioned and the report dealt with I understand from the Minister's answer that Hydro will be called.

In light of that may I ask the Government House Leader if it is the intention to convene the same Committee at a time subsequent to that when the Chairman of MPIC can be present?

MR. JORGENSEN Mr. Speaker, as far as the government is concerned the examination of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation was completed this morning in the absence of my honourable friends.

MR. SCHREYER Are we to take it, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, are we to take it then that the matter was dealt with in exactly four minutes and in the absence of the Chairman and General Manager?

MR. SPEAKER Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN Mr. Speaker, I think I should correct an impression that was left by the Leader of the Opposition. The Chairman of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation was in attendance at the earlier Committee meeting at which my honourable friend was not even in Canada, let alone in Committee, and there was an examination conducted at that time and it was agreed at the conclusion of that meeting that there would be a further meeting this morning —(Interjection)— Well, I cannot speak for the Chairman of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. The Minister who speaks for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation was there. I have no way of knowing why the Chairman was not present at that meeting. I think you'll have to ask the Chairman of the Public Insurance Corporation that himself.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources. Can the Honourable Minister confirm that two push-pull Cessna Skymasters that were based in northern Manitoba and were used for air-fire detection patrols have been put up for tender by the government and are no longer based in the north of the province?

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson) Could you specifically name the type of aircraft you're talking about? There's a possibility, Mr. Speaker, I can check and see if that's two of the particular planes that the Manitoba Government is ridding themselves of, but the last suggestion leaves the impression with this House that they're not being replaced with something in relationship. I'm sure he's talking about forests and their protections and I'd like to assure him and the House that there's no room for him to fear in that particular manner. .

MR. COWAN Perhaps the Minister then can confirm that an Aztec aircraft that was formerly based in The Pas area and was also used for air-fire detection patrols has been turned back in to the leasing company and consequently there is no government air Aztec using The Pas area currently as a permanent home base?

MR. MacMASTER Mr. Speaker, I'm not one bit concerned about the number of government airplanes that are on duty in fire detection in the Province of Manitoba. What I've said here, and the statement stands, that the appropriate, proper protection is in place as per previous years. There is really no difference whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Churchill. A final supplementary.

MR. COWAN Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned. Can the Minister confirm that air- fire detection patrols out of The Pas area are currently being made by a Cessna 180, a

single-engine plane with a substantially slower air speed, and consequently lesser range than either of the earlier mentioned twin-engined airplanes that have been used in the previous years?

MR. MacMASTER I've been assured, Mr. Speaker, that similar protection is in place this year as any other year.

MR. SPEAKER Order please. The time for questioning having lapsed I now call Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Highways, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Selkirk.\$

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed this afternoon on a matter of grievance. Mr. Speaker, I want to mention to you that this is the first occasion in the past nine years that I have seen fit to rise on a point of grievance in the House, and the grievance relates, Mr. Speaker, to the circumstances of this morning. Mr. Speaker, there has already been a number of questions, some feeble attempts at answering, as to what took place this morning in connection with the Committee meeting of Public Utilities. What we do know, however, is that at 10:00 o'clock this morning there was not a quorum. We do know that at 10:00 o'clock this morning when members were to have assembled for the meeting of the Public Utilities Committee that the Leader of our Party was present at that meeting, and we also know, Mr. Speaker, that due to some discussion which had taken place involving government members, in which there was some question raised as to whether or not notice had been given to the General Chairman and Manager of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, in which our leader fairly assumed from that discussion that some effort was going to be made to attempt to contact the general manager and chairman in order to ascertain whether he would be present for questions and exchange of information; that our leader did in fact leave Room 254 for the space of three or four minutes. During that brief interlude, we know, Mr. Speaker, that rather than government members waiting for the appearance of the general manager, chairman, and without, Mr. Speaker, having the decent courtesy — without courtesy, I'm not talking about strict legalisms — but without having the courtesy to check to see if the opposition leader, who had been in attendance only two or three minutes earlier, would like to return in order to participate in the page by page discussion, government members rushed, rushed as though they were in some sort of panic through the Annual Report of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I say panic because they would have otherwise sought out, it would only have taken them a bare few seconds, to have reached the leader of the opposition to ascertain whether he was interested in participating in the committee meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I own up to it, that I arrived in the meeting this morning about 10 minutes late, and I will not try to seek any excuses for being 10 minutes late, but I do know that as I arrived in the committee room, members had not quite risen from their chairs. If I recall correctly, the vote was just being taken — had just been called by the Chairman, and the Chairman, I do believe, could not have helped but have seen myself enter Room 254 just as the vote was being taken, and within 10 seconds to 15 seconds after my arrival, the leader of the opposition returned to the committee meeting. And within two or three minutes the Member for St. George, who could have offered a great deal of important and useful information to that committee, a former Minister responsible for Autopac, arrived, having driven some 90 miles from Arborg this morning, so that he could participate in the deliberations of the committee. And of course members opposite don't feel that's really very important . . . very important. This group opposite, who were elected on the basis of Free Manitoba, Free Manitoba, to replace a government which they emphasized over and over again was a government that was Controlled Manitoba — to replace Controlled Manitoba by Free Manitoba, a government that would attempt to encourage the freest and fullest exchange of

information, so that Manitobans could all benefit. That's what Manitobans were led to believe last October. This morning we see the very opposite. —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, often it is years and years before arrogance rots into government. Mr. Speaker, it's been barely six months, and this government is already beginning to rot with its own internal weaknesses and arrogance and lack of courtesy — and what is their answer, "Oh, we were working within the legal confines of the rules; we were working according to the legalities of the rules."

Mr. Speaker, I know not of another instance — maybe members can provide me with an instance — of where the New Democratic Government acted in a similar fashion during its entire eight years of being in government. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster mentioned only a few moments ago how he walked into the opposition's party caucus room in order to give them the courtesy of rounding up members to be present at a committee meeting.

Mr. Speaker, another occasion within the past week comes to mind. An occasion on which meers assembled in Room 254 in order to deal with the Estimates of the Minister without Portfolio. Mr. Speaker, we sat in that room awaiting the arrival of the Minister some eight — possibly ten, it was very very close to quorum if it was not a quorum of opposition members — and at approximately 8:15, the Minister of Finance walked into the room and moved that the committee rise. We did not proceed that night, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware, and the Minister of Finance can correct me, whether or not there had been an agreement arrived with our House Leader, I believe there had not been any agreement that committee would rise. I believe that there had been no discussion with the committee, because I was part of that committee, in which we were advised as to the reasons before the placing of the motion. Mr. Speaker, they pushed through the motion — the committee rose — they went back to a meeting of Cabinet; that is their right, and, Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of the legality of that move, it is a question of human concern that there be the fullest exchange and that Parliament work in the interest of all Manitobans — not just for those that are Tory Party members in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, only the other night at 10 minutes after 12:00, again while members were discussing at length with the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Task Force his report, and we were doing our best in order to obtain information which would be of benefit, I do believe, for all Manitobans; at some 10 minutes after 12:00, when the Member for St. Johns indicated to the committee members that he was not only physically but mentally exhausted because the committee had been sitting from 8:00 o'clock that very evening, and wanted some indication from government members as to when the committee would rise — and keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that only the Thursday night before the government had seen fit to ram through the rising of that committee at 8:15 — wanted to receive some indication whether it was the intention of the government to force the continued sitting of that committee to 12:30, 1:00, 3:00 a.m., 6:00 a.m. — there was no courtesy. And they are perfectly legal; they are perfectly within the rules, because rules are so important to them, but there was no attempt to provide courtesy to opposition members, and to say, "We would like to continue to sit, at least to 1:00 o'clock, or at least to 2:00 o'clock."

The Member for St. Johns was not given the courtesy, was not treated with the respect he deserves, was not given the common decency that decent men would offer and provided with an answer. No, government members continued to sit because they were already, Mr. Speaker, diseased with that rot that I spoke of earlier which usually takes years to seep in, insofar as a government was concerned, that was already quite obvious.

Mr. Speaker, there were so many questions that I wanted to deal with quite frankly this morning in the co Committee of Public Utilities, and I only wish I had been there at 2 minutes after 10:00 rather than a few minutes later, and I hold myself responsible for that. So I was legally wrong, I was a few minutes late, but Mr. Speaker, I had hoped, I had hoped in my own little way that I could provide some information with the Chairman and Manager of Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation — as mentioned, he wasn't even there at 10 minutes after 10, so that I could not have, even upon my arrival, had that exchange of information that I had desired to have with the Chairman and Manager of the Public Insurance Corporation.

But I had hoped that there could be some contribution towards the committee meeting this morning by members because the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation is an important institution in the fabric of the Province of Manitoba. We know that members opposite wish that it would go away; we know, Mr. Speaker, that the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, Autopac, is an embarrassment to the members opposite because in 1971, Mr. Speaker, members opposite said that public automobile insurance in Manitoba would be a failure, that it would not work, that Manitobans would revolt against the implementation of a plan which they said would reduce freedom

of choice in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we know that their representations in 1971 have been demonstrated to be figments of the imagination. Autopac is now an embarrassment, a deep embarrassment to members opposite, and Mr. Speaker, therefore this morning at 8 minutes or 9 minutes or 10 minutes after 10, when the government members rammed through the vote that they did, we know that either they acted (a) stupidly; (b) they acted with arrogance; or thirdly, Mr. Speaker, there was trickery involved.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the government of today does not want to deal with the issue of why they transferred 2 cents of gas tax from the revenues of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation to the Consolidated Revenues of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we know that members opposite do not want to be embarrassed by questions that would demonstrate that automobile insurance premiums will increase next year, mainly as a result of that deliberate policy move on the part of the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. Mr. Speaker, we know that the former Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation had indicated there would be an increase in accident benefits for Manitobans within the purview of the Manitoba Insurance Corporation program. And we know, Mr. Speaker, that without explanation, this government has seen fit not to proceed with that progressive move on the part of the former Minister responsible for the Public Insurance Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, we know that this government does not want to explain to Manitobans why they have seen fit to permit a non-improvement in the insurance system in Manitoba so that accident benefits would be improved, and that which is spent —(Interjection)— on lawyers, yes; on adjusters, and other unnecessary expenses pertaining to the tort, general tort area of Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, is not minimized, which would be the net result as a result of a proportionate increase in the no-fault accident benefits under the Public Insurance Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many other areas, many other areas, that certainly the opposition party would like to have discussed this morning with the Chairman and General Manager of the Public Insurance Corporation. Mr. Speaker, it is not adequate to say, "Well, the Minister is present." Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Minister of Highways, I would sooner any minute, any day, discuss Public Insurance Corporation with the General Manager and Chairman of MPIC and to have his presence. And Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting to find and to discover just exactly when the General Manager of the Public Insurance Corporation was informed of the meeting this morning, because I know from my previous experience with the General Manager and Chairman of the Public Insurance Corporation that if he had received the same notice as members of this House then he would not have arrived at this building at 20 minutes after 10 this morning. I know the General Manager and Chairman of the Public Insurance well enough to know that that would not have happened. So it will be interesting to receive advice from the Minister responsible for MPIC as to when he provided to the Manager and Chairman of the Public Insurance Corporation, notice of this meeting this morning. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that notice was not received by the General Manager until this very morning, and that's the reason that the General Manager was not present in order to deal with questions at 10 o'clock or 10 minutes after 10 this morning.

And certainly that was very convenient, very convenient for government members, because they don't want to discuss the gas tax; they don't want to discuss the fact that they have not improved the Public Insurance Corporation program; they do not want to discuss the fact that they have no accident benefit program, which was to be increased from \$75 per month to \$112.50 per month has not been improved; they do not want to discuss why death benefits under the no-fault area of the Public Insurance Corporation program have not been improved.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening is that they hope to starve the Public Insurance Corporation in this province by ensuring the increase in its rates, by taking away its revenue and by diminishing its program so that they can welcome back into the Province of Manitoba, hoping to muster public support, their friends in the private insurance industry. That is the basis, that is the thrust of their actions, and Mr. Speaker, that is why they had no stomach to have a thorough discussion with opposition members this morning about public insurance in the Province of Manitoba. That is why they did not welcome a discussion with members of the opposition this morning, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, that rather than welcome an opportunity for the Manager and the Chairman to be present this morning in order to discuss these questions, they preferred to say, "Well, the Minister was present. He would have dealt with the problems, he is responsible for making the report." Mr. Speaker, that is what is happening in the Province of Manitoba, regrettably, at the present time.

I want to just say, by way of closing, that I do believe that there is need for government, the government across the way, to recognize some fairness, to recognize some decency, to recognize

some courtesy and to realize that not everything in society in the world operates on the basis of the rule book, because, Mr. Speaker, the opposition can proceed on the basis of only the rule book just as much as the government. There is a place for fairness and decency in the affairs of man. And in the space of six months, Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by saying it appears that that decency, that fairness, that desire to have the fullest exchange of information, is departing the ranks of the government, and an arrogance is beginning to rot away at the very nature, the very fabric of this government.

Mr. Speaker, from a purely partisan view — from a purely partisan view, Mr. Speaker, I should welcome it. But it is not to the benefit of Manitobans and I would urge government members to change their ways because their approach, their attitude, their limiting the exchange of information through lack of courtesy and through stunts, Mr. Speaker, harms in the ultimate only Manitobans in general. It will harm them but it harms basically and overall Manitobans, and it is for Manitobans that we were elected to serve, and to serve in this House to the best of our abilities and to be given that opportunity not only as government members but as opposition members. Government members it appears need to be reminded of that fact. I had not thought that after six months it would be necessary to offer some little reminder to government members in this respect. Usually it takes years.

So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I again say that I regret that we have not had the opportunity to exchange this information. I regret that the Minister of Highways has already indicated to my colleague, the Member for Transcona that he isn't even going to bother to try to answer a question which the Member for Transcona raised with him a month ago when the Minister responsible for MPIC said, "Go and ask the General Manager and Chairman of MPIC, go and ask him." He makes no effort, Mr. Speaker, to say: "I will do my best to provide the Member for Transcona with an answer." No, all that he is interested in is being as smart as he can working within the strictness of the rules without, Mr. Speaker, trying to provide the Member for Transcona with some fairness and some responsibility to answer.\$

Mr. Speaker, we shall watch with interest the continued operations of this government to see whether or not this government will revise its ways and attempt to operate in a democratic, in a fair fashion, in the interests of all Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK Mr. Speaker, unlike the Member for Selkirk, I have risen in this House before on a matter of grievance, and when I was a member of the opposition for a period of eight years, I tried to take advantage of the opportunity once during each year of those eight years, to avail myself of that opportunity that is available to every member of this House, when we're dealing with the Supply motion. And of course I expect, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Selkirk will likely use his opportunity for a grievance next year, because it is a vehicle that is very handy and very useful for a member of the opposition to use. So that in itself, the fact that it's the first grievance in eight years, I would think is quite understandable. It would be a little bit surprising if he rose on a grievance when he was a Cabinet Minister on this side of the House, and I think he was during that entire period. But of course —(Interjection)— Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said it would be somewhat unusual and it is somewhat unusual to rise on a grievance. I can recall grievances, Mr. Speaker, where members —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the conditions under which a member of the Treasury Bench rises on a grievance is one that is caused by usually a grievance from the opposition, and that's why I rise at this time, to comment on the fuss and bluster that's going on with regard to the events of this morning.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Winnipeg Centre says democracy is unimportant. All of a sudden he's conscious of democracy. I want to relate two or three things historically, going back. I want to relate one late night in this Chamber, back several years ago, where a vote 4 was called and the yeas and nays were called and the bells were rung, and the members of the opposition — and I was a member of the opposition at that time — we went to our Caucus Room to discuss the issue and we got into a very long discussion on the issue. It tried the patience of the government. The Government House Leader got up, ordered the bell stopped, the doors closed. That happened, Mr. Speaker, in this House. Mr. Speaker, that happened in this House.

MR. SPEAKER Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a matter of privilege.

MR. GREEN Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege, a matter of privilege of the Speaker

of the House, Mr. Speaker, because the Speaker gave notice to the opposition that they had a reasonable time in which to answer the bells, that they had not answered the bell, and that he could not give them more than a reasonable time. And after that reasonable time expired I did ask the Speaker if there was no inclination on the part of the opposition to return and this was after over three-quarters of an hour, that there should be a vote. Mr. Speaker, it was the Speaker who said to the members of the opposition that they would have a reasonable time to vote. On that occurrence, as a matter of privilege, the opposition hoped to forestall democracy in this province by refusing to vote. That's right.

MR. SPEAKER Order please, order please. Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Inkster that when he started out I thought he did have a point of privilege; I thought he had a very legitimate point of privilege. But a point of privilege consists of only an explanation of what happens, and I'm sorry that the final remarks that he made destroyed his point of privilege.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK Mr. Speaker, we'll talk further about democratic rights in this House. Let me refer, Mr. Speaker, to the days that happened — on many occasions, where the opposition rose after there had been some consideration of the Manitoba Hydro Report and asked for the next sitting of the Hydro Committee and said: soon, due course, when it will be announced. Well, Mr. Speaker, what had happened year after year, is that rather than face the Committee, the government simply froze out the Committee. The report was never formally adopted and the most important issue, the most important financial issue, that will have affected the purse of the Province of Manitoba and the taxpayer of Manitoba, was squeezed out, frozen out, by the refusal, by the back door method of not calling the Committee. Now we're being accused because we called the Committee and called it —(Interjection)— he calls "trickery" for goodness sakes. The Committee was called duly, properly, and was held. The Committee had a quorum; there was no need to go to the Caucus Rooms to try and raise members to have a quorum. The Committee report was gone through page by page; the Committee Report was received.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at another one. The Public Accounts of this province were not adopted year after year because of the former government's refusal to call the Public Accounts Committee once they got off the Auditor's Report. That was it! They never called it. And they call "trickery" for goodness sakes; they talk about democracy.

Let me tell you one other that really sticks out in my mind, Mr. Speaker, which was a debate that I wanted to hold, you know, as a member of the opposition, on the question of the CFI issue at the time it was being held. Mr. Speaker, out of courtesy it was understood — and I meant to rise on it a number of times and it was finally decided that the proper place to speak on it was on Second Reading of the Capital Supply Bill because that was the one that contained the amount of money that was going to go into CFI and there would be a wide ranging debate. I was ruled out of order. We challenged the Speaker's ruling and the government supported the Speaker's ruling; the issue never even got debated in the whole session, even though we'd attempted, Mr. Speaker, to have it focussed to that point where there would be a free rein debate on that issue. And then it was ruled out. And that's democracy. And these people, who slept in, and did not have one member, Mr. Speaker, this morning — who slept in — and I was at the Committee meeting and I deliberately went over because the Member for Elmwood was at the Tuesday meeting, the Member for Burrows was at the Tuesday meeting, and there was a third member of the government that was on the Committee, and I checked and one of the members who had been there was exchanged for the Member for Selkirk, who was the new third member of that Committee on the part of the government who was not there. None of the members who were there on Tuesday, were there.

MR. GREEN The cowards are at it again.

MR. CRAIK The cowards are at it again. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster is very handy at using all sorts of derogatory words and that's certainly not derogatory in comparison to some of them that he is capable of using. Every time he gets cornered, he starts it; he pounds his desk, he thrashes, he pulls his ear and he uses all the dirty words he can finally dig up. I don't call that dirty; in fact that's complimentary compared to many of them that he has used. So, Mr. Speaker, let's just get first things first. If there are questions that the opposition wants to direct in regards to insurance, there are two things that can be done at this point in time. We have absolutely no qualms if they want to approach the Insurance Corporation directly, if they want to talk to Mr. Dutton, if they want to direct questions to him directly. He is now the Chairman, Mr. Speaker, he wasn't before — there was a Cabinet Minister who was Chairman — he has been now made Chairman;

it's been done in an attempt to treat all the Crown corporations basically the same, to make it an arm's length operation as far as possible. It's the same setup now as Hydro and the Telephones and the MPIC. It has a representative from the caucus benches of the government on each of those boards as it had in the past; there is no change in that respect.

But I repeat, if there are further questions they want to direct so be it. Mr. Speaker, if they seriously think though, that there is a problem with the way that that Committee is operating, I suggest that they go back to the Rules Committee and try and rectify it. But as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, at 10:15 today, when that Committee wound up, that Committee had done everything it was charged with doing. It had a hearing, and most of the hearings traditionally on MPIC in recent years have run approximately one day, one meeting. There was some indication from the Member for Elmwood, whether it's on the record or not I don't know — towards the end of the meeting on Tuesday he felt that it wouldn't wind up, there was probably another 15 minutes or so — and we're expected to know that there's others coming in. We're unfair because suddenly they want to make the case that we pulled the guillotine on them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the indication was on the Tuesday meeting, that probably the opposition was nearing the point where they were finishing their examination of Autopac. And because they slept in, they expect us to be mind readers; we're a new government trying to do our job, we're trying to do it expeditiously, we're not complaining about the time we spend in the House, but the members opposite realize there is another aspect of government and that is what the people elect governments to do and that's to run their business. We expect to run it expeditiously. I fully expect to, and we do do that. I expect to and we do operate with despatch, if they're going to shout arrogance. I mean that's the kind of people they are; they know all about arrogance, they learned a lot about it over eight years. So, Mr. Speaker, they can shout arrogance all they like, but I am going to suggest to you that particularly in the early days of a government, you could expect that government to act expeditiously, get the job done that they are elected to do and, Mr. Speaker, it won't be because of arrogance, it's just because there is a lot to do. And if they want to sleep in in the morning, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, there are others who cannot afford to sleep in, in the morning, and not be at 10:00 o'clock meetings.

Mr. Speaker, that's the way the land lies. There was a quorum there, Mr. Speaker, the quorum in that Committee was six members out of the eleven members; there was a quorum there, the quorum was all government members; there was no member of the committee in sight who

MR. GREEN Our member was here at 10 o'clock.

MR. CRAIK . . . there was no member of the committee in sight that was a member of the committee, Mr. Speaker. There was plenty of opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to look at the issues regarding Autopac. There are still plenty of opportunities for that to occur. I repeat, we have never put any barriers in the way of members opposite even going directly to the chairman of Autopac — so be it — go to the chairman of Hydro, go to the chairman of Telephones, go to the chairman of Autopac, ask your questions. It's a free and open society as far as we're concerned; we haven't tried to put any wraps on him, Mr. Speaker. I know the Member for St. Boniface doesn't like what I'm saying. —(Interjection)—

MR. CRAIK Well, Mr. Speaker, how do you like that for a threat? How do you like that for a threat? Mr. Speaker, the size of the capacity of the members opposite to deal in innuendo staggers. It staggers because they know very well that it's not that long since they were in the position of making the decisions of government.

MR. SPEAKER Order please. May I suggest if honourable members want to talk to one another that they do it when someone else is not speaking in this Chamber.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK Mr. Speaker, if this Chamber wants to look at stretching democratic rights and using autocratic powers, you'll look and find a much better example than you did this morning, and you will not have to look very far. I'm going to repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that this new government intends to move along as expeditiously as possible. If the members opposite want to stall things, they're going to have to find better grounds than they can put forward for their non-appearance and non-participation and non-protection of the rest of their committee members, Mr. Speaker, than they did this morning. They're going to have to find a better example than that to prove that in

fact there has been any abrogation of any democratic rights, Mr. Speaker, under this government.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI Mr. Speaker, we've just been given a lesson by the Minister of Finance on democracy. We're going to move along as expeditiously as possible and the fuss and bluster of the opposition, devil take care, democracy is not important; we're going to do our business come hell or high water in this House. That's the message that the Minister of Finance said, "If you fellows want to sleep in." Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Finance will have to go a long way to keep up with any one of the members on this side. m, I can tell hi if he talks about sleeping in, I think he should keep the hours that any members on this side keep and have kept. I can tell him that I was late, that I was 10 minutes late; in fact, I bumped into the Chairman of the Committee as he just came out of the Chamber when I was walking down the hall, and I said, "Aren't you in Committee?" and he mentioned to me, "Don't you know the Committee is over?" I thought he was joking, I said, "Well, you know, it's just after 10." —(Interjection)— What time was that? That was about a quarter after 10.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Housing asked me why I wasn't in Committee. I was notified late last night; I'm not a member of the Committee but I wanted to participate in that Committee. I can recall for the Minister of Housing many times when we waited for their critic, the Member for Minnedosa, until he showed up. I remember waiting 15 and 20 minutes for members of the opposition even though there may have been a quorum or there may not, I will not quibble that point, but I do know that to make a committee effective, it is the day members of the opposite side ask the questions of the Chairman or the General Manager, whoever comes to answer before the Committee. I recall many times waiting for that member. But you know, we've had today displayed in this House, the House Leader not knowing all the facts, because they certainly weren't given to him by the Minister of Highways or the Minister of Finance, indicating that, "Well, look, we're going to call a committee whether there is a quorum or not. We're going to whether there are any opposition members or not, we're going to call a committee and let it go through." This morning was a perfect example.

They now say that they have appointed the Chairman of the Public Insurance Corporation and made him Chairman and General Manager both, so that they would be treated the same way as all other Crown corporations. Well, Mr. Speaker, today the Minister of Highways gets up in this House and says that I am now prepared to answer questions about the corporation, because when questions were put to him previously he would not answer them; he deferred them to the Chairman and General Manager. And today the Chairman and General Manager is not even in the building when Committee is over with — and they say that they have received the report of the Committee? I defy any member on the government side to tell me that the Chairman and General Manager was in the building when that Committee had ended. I grant you that he was not. Why was he not notified? The only one that can have the responsibility is the Minister of Highways. He says he was notified; how was he notified? No member, no non-member of Public Utilities Committee receives a notice unless the Minister responsible for that Crown corporation notifies him. I venture to say, who fell asleep was the Minister of Highways. He didn't notify the Chairman and General Manager of the Crown corporation to be there. That's who fell asleep at the switch, not the Chairman or General Manager who was notified probably at 10 o'clock when he was supposed to be here, he was called, "Look, you better get down here because Committee is meeting." Who fell asleep? The Minister of Highways is the one that fell asleep.

The one that fell asleep is the Minister of Highways and members of the government side. They didn't have the common courtesy and decency to at least have the Chairman and General Manager there. Had the Minister remained as Chairman of that Crown corporation he could have gotten up in this House and said, "Look, there was nobody to question me; that report was passed and it was dealt with," but he didn't. He wanted to, as he indicated, to treat this Crown corporation like all others, at so-called arm's length and that's the way he wanted to deal with this Crown corporation.

Well, we have the parliamentary democracy, Mr. Speaker, that is approximately — how old? 700 years old? Somewhere in that range, where in ancient history the lords came to petition the monarchy and over the years it has grown into the present government opposition system, it's this two-way street of having the government and the opposition certainly has been done away with by the present Conservative government. They are now taking the legislative process in this province back 700 years. They want to have a one man, one party system. The Member for Pembina, he just loves — and he is so gleeful at what has happened this morning, that this report, this committee,

should be rammed through regardless of what happens, that this report should be adopted — he agrees, he agrees as a new member that we should go back to the old feudal system where the governing party is the only party, to hell with the opposition and the other spokesmen of the people of the province. To hell with the people, we will do what we damn well please in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance talked about committees, or lack of committees being called, the gall of that Minister to say that committees weren't being called. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Public Utilities Committee previously. I can recall his leader, his leader spent one whole day, one whole committee meeting himself, questioning the Chairman of Hydro on his own, when no one else asking one question, not one question. And the Minister of Finance gets up in this House and has the gall to get up and say that there were no committee meetings called, and they weren't called for any purpose. Public Accounts Committee — I was a member of that committee as well; that committee was called every session. Every committee was called, Mr. Speaker, every committee. Now, if there were no questions, like the Minister of Finance says, "Well, we normally passed Public Insurance in one day." I don't give a damn if they passed it in five minutes, but if I have questions and if I have the opportunity to attend that committee, I want to ask those questions.

Mr. Speaker, I was there; I was 10 minutes late; I'm telling you I was 10 minutes late. The fact of the matter is, the Leader of the Opposition was there at 10 o'clock, before some of your members were there. —(Interjection)— Before some of your members were there. He came to our caucus room to see if other members were there; the Member for Selkirk was there, they walked back into Committee; by that time everything was over with. That's what happened. That's democracy, Mr. Speaker. That's democracy? What a free Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, that's dictatorship. You know, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose talked about this government being a dictatorship; they certainly have proved it this morning, Mr. Speaker, they have proved it this morning.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is allowing all the members of the opposition to go to all the chairmen of any Crown corporation they wish. He says, "Go to the chairman of the Public Insurance Corporation; go to the chairman of Hydro; see if we care; go to them." But do you know what they did to the Deputy Minister of Labour? They fired him when he spoke to the former Minister of Labour. When the former Minister of Labour came into this House and had lunch with the Deputy Minister of Labour, who fired him? The Minister of Labour fired him. —(Interjection)— Nuts? Isn't that what she said in the press? That's what the Minister of Housing says, "Nuts." You ask the Minister of Labour. —(Interjection)— And now, you can't remember; he's lost his memory. Mr. Speaker, he was fired shortly after the election, and one of the reasons was that the Minister of Labour, I believe, in her remarks to the press, indicated that he was passing on information to the former Minister of Labour; that's what the Minister of Labour indicated. And they talk about talking to the chairmen of the Crown corporations.

What has the government got to hide, Mr. Speaker? What has the government got to hide by doing what they have done today? This is what we call open government. Mr. Speaker, this is what they call open government; free Manitoba. We've got a real free Manitoba. Are they ashamed of the way that they are increasing taxes and on one hand lowering premiums for a few months, automobile insurance for a few months, where on the other hand they will have to impose higher premiums so that people will say, "Well, look, they have to raise premiums, that Autopac can't be any damn good." We're going to raise premiums and at the same time still collect the same amount of money from motorists that we did in the past, so we may as well bring in competition. They're just inefficient.

Mr. Speaker, they are hiding the fact that even though they are transferring 2 cents of gasoline premiums away from the corporation; that they could have raised the benefits in the automobile insurance fund, the no-fault benefits, they could have increased these benefits and kept the funds as they were and still came out at the end of the year with a profit. They could have increased the benefits so they would be the highest anywhere in Canada and still have the lowest premiums in the country and not raise any premiums this year. That's what they could have done.

They are deploring that; they don't want to talk about any increase in benefits. The Minister of Highways says if there is going to be a matter of policy he will announce it. He has every right to announce it but he has been deferring questions of this kind to the Chairman and General Manager, he says that's where it should be. You know, what should those benefits have been today? They should have been increased substantially, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I want for the edification of the backbenchers to tell their constituents that the no-fault benefits on their Autopac should have been increased substantially; that the total disability should have been increased at least from \$75 to \$112 a week; that the partial disability should have been increased from \$25 to \$35 a week, at least; that the death payments — the previous limits which

were scheduled between \$500 and \$10,000 depending on the age and marital status of the deceased, now the new limits should be between \$1,000 and no limit. There should be no limit on the death benefits for the survivors of the spouse on the death of the victim of the accident. Medical expenses — they are presently at \$2,000; the new limit was to be \$15,000.00. The total impairments — present limit is \$6,000; the new limit would have been \$12,000.00. Partial impairment — there was a previous limit of a specified percentage of \$6,000; that should have been doubled to a percentage of \$12,000.00. A doubling of the funeral expenses to \$1,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, all these benefits could have been accomplished without an increase in premiums this year, but what do we have now? We have a siphoning off of \$7 million from the corporation because the motorists will still be paying that tax. You know, it really boils down, Mr. Speaker, to half-a-million motorists in Manitoba paving the way and paying the way for who? 150 people. 150 people whom that government has forgiven the succession duties and estate tax. What we have, Mr. Speaker, is socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor, where we have half-a-million motorists paying for the succession duties of the 150 people who paid duties previously; that's what it is, and no increase in benefits whatsoever. That could have been accomplished. And now the Minister of Highways, he hasn't got even the decency to sit in this House and listen to the members speak about his portfolio today. He ran out of the House when the Member for Selkirk began to speak and he hasn't been in the House since. Mr. Speaker, I phoned him this morning with

MR. SPEAKER Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that it's very unparliamentary to cast aspersions against another member in the Chamber, especially when that member is not in the House. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI Mr. Speaker, I hope that the members on the opposite side will bring in the Minister of Highways, the Minister responsible for this corporation, whom I telephoned this morning after the meeting was on, and I phoned him personally to find out whether the committee was going to be called. I telephoned the Minister of Highways, and I asked him, "Look, are you going to be calling that committee?" He said, "No, we have just had the committee." I said, "How could you have had the committee when the Chairman and General Manager wasn't there?" "Well," he said, "we've passed that report and there will be no committee." I said, "Okay, that's it," then I hung up. I frankly thought it was a joke, and I thought the members on the government side —(Interjection)— they are a joke, Mr. Speaker. The poor House Leader today has been embarrassed to no end; he has to get up in this House and defend the undefendable. He believes in democracy; he believes in free speech and he believes in the process, but he has been led down the garden path by his colleagues, to defend something that they cannot defend. He cannot defend the discourteous attitude and discourteous manners and the way the committee talked about today and it was handled today. He cannot defend that.\$

Mr. Speaker, what do we have today? We have all that has transpired today, all this debate and this manner in which the government has handled this committee, all in the name of freedom of choice. Freedom of choice in this Province of Manitoba, freedom of choice to do what? To pay higher premiums like they are paying in Ontario, in Alberta, all over the place. You know, I was in Alberta just prior to the last election and I spoke to a civil servant who had moved from Manitoba to Alberta to advance his career in personnel affairs and he spoke to me. He said, "You know, there's no sales tax in Manitoba. (sic) I bought a new car," he said, "but boy, you know, they sure made it up on insurance. I don't even drive the car that I brought back from Manitoba which is five years older because the premium on the old car is just phenomenal, it's almost worth more than the car is worth." He doesn't even drive the old car. So that's the kind of freedom that they are talking about.

We can only assume that the actions of the government is really to proceed to dismantle Autopac. They have made a commitment to the private insurance industry, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— all you have to do is read the press statements of the meetings going on and the supposed meetings going on between the president of the Insurance Bureau of Canada and Ministers of this government. —(Interjection)— If the Minister without Portfolio wishes to speak, he's perfectly . . . I couldn't hear him, I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Elmwood have a point of order or want to ask a question?

MR. DOERN Mr. Speaker, I have a matter of personal privilege that I would like to raise at this

time. . .

MR. SPEAKER Order please.

MR. DOERN . . . in regard to comments made by the Minister of Finance. I'll either speak now or I'll wait until my colleague is finished but . . .

MR. SPEAKER I would suggest to the honourable member that he give the courtesy to his colleague to complete his remarks.

MR. URUSKI Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was indicating, we can only assume by the actions of the government today in this committee is that they are proceeding with their policy of dismantling Autopac. You know, the morale in the corporation is low; the members of staff just don't know what is going on, is happening. It was a deliberate move by the government to put the general manager and chairman as both, as one operation, thereby the Minister responsible can now, through Cabinet, make whatever decisions, policy decisions, they want without facing the board of directors and the members of the executive staff when those decisions are made. That was a very deliberate move on their part to do that. He can make all the cuts he wishes without having to face the general manager and the staff of the corporation about the dismantling or doing whatever administrative changes they're . . . Why do you not have the guts to get up and tell the corporation what your intentions are? Do you not have at least the decency to get up and say, "We do not believe in public insurance, that within six months time you will be phased out." Or are you going to tinker them to death by allowing competition and allow Autopac to take the bad risks and let the private companies cream the new risks? Do you not have the fortitude to at least announce those policy decisions and speak up and do as you're told? Because if you do, Mr. Speaker, if this is the way they're intending to move, is to slowly nickel and dime it to death by allowing the private companies to come in and compete and take the good risks while the public corporation take the bad risks, then they may as well do away with Autopac right now. I will tell them they may as well close its doors immediately if that's the course of action they're intending to take.

It is no sense having a public corporation on the market when there is 100 insurance companies already in the field to have a public corporation being 101. It just doesn't make sense because the basic saving is in the administrative costs. The businessmen that the Minister without Portfolio was associated with will tell him that, that the savings in the insurance field are in the administrative costs, that no private company in terms of the payment back of benefits can compete with the system now in effect in Manitoba, that no way can a private company provide 85 percent or better in benefits to the motoring public as compared to the 60 percent to 65 percent by private companies. They just cannot compete and there is no way of getting around it.

But the government, Mr. Speaker, has a dilemma; they have a dilemma because they have a cash flow of approximately \$100 million. They have \$100 million of revenue that is being invested and used by the Department of Finance to invest in hydro, in telephone, in municipal debentures, in hospitals and schools, both in long and short term funds. That means that if they have to go on the world market and borrow those funds, with the decline of the Canadian dollar they would have to be paying a premium today. They have a dilemma because they would have a cash flow. They have now \$100 million that they can use at their desires for the projects that are necessary within this province.

What is happening today, Mr. Speaker, by the actions, by the dictatorial actions of the members on that committee and the Minister of Highways whom I only fault — not the House Leader. He has been getting up and defending the indefensible. The Minister of Highways got up in committee — I wasn't there but I can only assume because he is reporting for it — (Interjection) — I will speculate, yes, I will speculate about what he did. I will tell you; I'm allowed to speculate on what the Minister of Highways did. He got up and said, "Look, there are no members of the opposition. I don't want to be embarrassed that we are going to take over the two cents in gasoline premiums away to general revenues. The motorists will still have to keep paying that two cents. We can't increase the benefits because if we had the two cents in revenue and increased the benefits, we'd still come out with a profit, so we've taken away the two cents, no benefits, and we're going to have to raise premiums this fall, all in one." Isn't that an embarrassment? The Member for Emerson smiles. He knows that it is an embarrassment to him and the members on the government side. The Minister of Highways who was here at the beginning of debate moved out of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina talks about wild-eyed speculation. Well, Mr. Speaker, there

is no wild-eyed speculation. I defy him to call my figures wrong when I say that the benefits that were announced during the last election campaign could have been accomplished with no increase in premiums this fall, none whatsoever. Now we will have a diversion of \$7 million into general revenues by the two cents tax, no increase in benefits and an increase in automobile insurance. The motorist will be hit twice. On one hand they will have a reduction in premiums for a few short months; on the other hand they will have an increase in premiums when the renewal period comes in. That's what will happen and that's the type of system that the government is embarking upon. Half a million motorists, as I've indicated, half a million motorists, Mr. Speaker, are going to be paying for the benefits to 150 people, the benefits that the succession duty elimination has given to approximately 150 people, half a million motorists will pay for that. It is as I've indicated before, socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. Today's actions in stalling the discussions in the committee and legitimate questions of members on this side by a very very poor move on behalf of the government, a real discourteous, inconsiderate move by members on the government's side of at least giving the common decency of notifying the Leader of the Opposition who was there at 10 o'clock that the committee is going to continue on and that there were members here that wanted to speak on that committee. I did. I'm not a member of that committee. I was not notified of the Tuesday meeting; I was out of town all last week. That is true. I was away last week, I wasn't here at the Tuesday meeting. I was called last night and I was told that there was a meeting here this morning and although I'm not a member of that committee, I made every effort to be here although I was . . . Look, I drove a hundred miles; it does take two hours to drive in, I did leave home at eight. —(Interjection)— I'm a sleepyhead — I left home at 8 o'clock. I got up at seven, I got up at seven, so I was late. But the fact of the matter is, I bumped into the chairman of that committee who had just left the room and said that the committee was over. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER Order please. The hour being 4:30, we're moving into Private Members' Hour but before we do, I would like to introduce a school of 42 pupils from Waskada, Grades 4 to 6, under the direction of their teacher, Betty Downey. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood on a point of privilege.

MR. DOERN Mr. Speaker, there is a statement made by the Minister of Finance that I believe is a matter of privilege and I would draw it to your attention as follows. He indicated that a member of the opposition had indicated Tuesday morning that there was only a few minutes more required in the debate. Someone between myself, the Member for Burrows and the Member for Inkster had made that comment. The comment that was made was as follows: "It would be my hope that there would still be an opportunity of approving MPIC's report in the remaining ten minutes." The speaker was the Minister of Public Works, a member of the government. No member of the opposition made that statement but a member of the government who indicated that he thought or he hoped that it could be wrapped up in ten minutes. It certainly was not any member on this side.

MR. SPEAKER I want to thank the Honourable Member for Elmwood for bringing that to our attention.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

PUBLIC BILLS — SECOND READING

BILL NO. 5 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

MR. SPEAKER The first order of business, adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson, Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess this is one of those perennial issues, it seems to have been a perennial issue at least, that has arisen in this House and it has been debated, I guess, by our society in Manitoba and indeed in other provinces and that is, whether persons 18 years of age should be permitted to consume liquor or alcoholic beverages, beer and whatnot, in public places.

I, as one member, do regret that the Member for Emerson has to come in here with a negative

motion. I think this is a negative approach on the part of the Member for Emerson and I think it's generally a negative frame of mind that people have who get up in this Legislature and support this particular measure to take an element of freedom away from the young people of Manitoba because that's what it's all about. It's a very negative measure and it reduces freedom. If that's supposed to be an uppermost issue in the minds of the honourable members of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, with this measure they're doing very well in taking away freedom from people.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are the basic arguments that I would like to review. Perhaps they've been mentioned before but nevertheless they bear some consideration. There's no question that this motion, this move, to take away freedoms of the people who are 18 years of age in this province from going to a public place and consuming alcoholic beverages, there is no doubt that it is inconsistent with The Age of Majority Act that was passed by this Legislature a few years ago. People of Manitoba who reach the age of 18 are considered to be adults. They can do all the things that an adult of other ages — 21, 24, 36, 52, 99 — at the age of 18 in this province, Mr. Speaker, you can do all the things that an adult is entitled to do, whether it be inherit property, sign certain documents, get married on your own, raise a family. In spite of all that, nevertheless, we're going to take this freedom away from those people who for every other reason are treated as adults according to The Age of Majority Act but they are not going to be permitted, if this measure passes, they're not going to be permitted to go into beverage rooms and other public places to consume such beverages.

The other area of inconsistency, of course, is with regard to the actions and attitudes of our courts. In the legal system that we have if you are 18 years of age you're treated as an adult. Up until that age you're treated as a juvenile. So here again is an inconsistency. While the courts will treat you as an adult, nevertheless for this particular purpose, the consuming of alcoholic beverages in public places, you're not an adult.

Not long ago the Minister of Health advised the House — made a statement to the media that a particular offender at the Youth Centre had become of age, had become 18, and under our laws he was therefore sentenced to jail for having caused some damage in the Manitoba Youth Centre. He was 18. He had arrived at 18. Because he'd arrived at the age of 18 he was therefore subject to adult laws and was to be treated as such and he did receive — I believe, if I'm correct in my information — a sentence of nine months in jail.

Well, the fact is, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that if capital punishment existed which it doesn't, but if it existed an 18 year old would be put to death in Canada and in Manitoba if he was found guilty of committing murder — first degree murder. He would be put to death. He would receive capital punishment at the age of 18 if capital punishment existed in this country of ours and therefore be treated as an adult in this fashion, but nevertheless he's not considered to be mature enough to have the right to go into a public place to consume alcoholic beverages.

And of course the third area of inconsistency relates to military service and I think it's been said before in this House but I'll say it again because it's worth repeating, 18 year olds are old enough to go to war if Canada should be at war; they're old enough to defend us, to die for us, and that's happened — in the First World War and the Second World War, through conscription — you're old enough to die defending your country in many wars that this country has been involved with, but particularly in time of conscription, and yet we are ready so easily to take the right of this particular age group away — to deny them this freedom. And again I say, therefore, it's inconsistent with the attitude prevailing with regard to military organization, with regard to defence of Canada.

I don't know what is going to be achieved by this measure. I really don't know what the honourable member really expects to achieve. He is somehow thinking, I believe, that there is going to be less drinking among younger people, among those who are below 18 because there's some sort of concern that those who are below the age of 18 are somehow or other getting admittance to public places to consume such beverages and somehow or other the administration is at fault. Well, I really wonder how widespread, or how serious this is, and really whether because of a removal of this freedom, because of a further restriction that's going to be placed by this particular measure if it passes, whether there will be any less consumption. Will there be any lowering of the amount of consumption of alcoholic beverages in the province? And will the young people in question in particular cease to consume less alcoholic beverages?

I recall as a young man I had the privilege of playing in an orchestra around this province — played at many social functions, weddings and so on, and I can tell you from many years back

that young people in this province consumed alcoholic beverages in public places even when the drinking age wasn't allowed until 21 — even with the 21 year old restriction. This is some years back. So I really don't think that there'll be any reduction in consumption of alcoholic beverages by this particular move.

Really what you're doing you're putting another restriction. You're bringing about further restriction in the movement of people in this particular age group. And surely we're all agreed on moderation. Everybody's agreed on sobriety. Everybody agrees that alcoholism is a disease and should be treated. Everybody agrees that alcohol should not be consumed in excess, and there's no disagreement on that, but surely there's a better way to achieve the ideals of rational consumption of alcoholic beverages. Surely there's a better way to achieve moderation. Surely there is a better way to ensure that liquor is consumed reasonably and moderately in public places. The way that has been suggested by the Member for Emerson is the worst way, in my opinion, the very worst way. He wants to take freedom away from young people. He wants to limit them. He wants to restrict their movements because I would point out to the honourable member that many people who are of adult age, including 18 year olds, go into a pub and do not consume alcoholic beverages. They may go with a friend, and they may sit there and drink cokes or soft drinks of various kinds, or orange juice or tomato juice — there's no law which says if you go into a pub you have to drink alcohol. In fact, the law does say, the regulations do say that owners of pubs are required to make available to customers non-alcoholic beverages. So I daresay, in fact I know of some young people who do go to pubs with friends and so on and who do not drink, but they enjoy going there for the music and for the companionship and so on.

So I don't really think it's going to achieve anything except to restrict freedom. That's what it will do. It will restrict the freedom of movement of people, and for those members of this House who find freedom such an emotional word and a word to be treasured and an object to be pursued and achieved I say you are not demonstrating your love of freedom by showing support for this particular measure.

There is a better way to achieve moderation and rational consumption of liquor and alcoholic beverages. I suggest education, Mr. Speaker, as one of the better ways — education in the schools, education through different organizations, certainly training at home is important, and that is a better way. But I submit I suppose in the last analysis it depends on the moral standards of society because the moral standards of society ultimately will dictate the behaviour of people in this particular area — the behaviour of people in the consumption of alcoholic beverages. It'll be the moral standards of the peer group of those young people; it'll be the moral standards of the community, the moral standards of society in general.

I think that if one looks at various other times in history that hundreds of years back I think it was very customary for people of all groups, age groups, to consume beer and wine in particular. I'm thinking especially of Europe where there was no particular age restriction. It was a commonly accepted social behaviour. It was not frowned upon. It was not treated as an illegal act for a young person to consume some beer or wine in a public place. That was not considered to be illegal. In fact it wasn't considered to be immoral. It was accepted as a moral standard.

As a matter of fact Europe, before the expansion of Europe to the new world, the typical European consumed mainly beer and wine. He did not consume coffee. He did not consume cocoa. He did not consume tea because those things were unheard of. Coffee, cocoa and tea came from the new world — from South America, and it also came — tea, etc. came from Asia. So this was unheard of in Europe in the middle ages, so people did consume a lot of beer and a lot of wine. So I say that we do have our standards, our standards do change. There's no magic in any particular age group. Age limits do change through periods of time, and I don't think there's anything magical about 18 years of age, or 17 or 19 years of age. It seems to be accepted though that at 18 you're treated as an adult. You're treated as an adult for military service. You're treated as an adult for the criminal court for criminal laws. You're treated as an adult with everything that is under the purview of the Age of Majority Act, and I say it's simply inconsistent and unreasonable to take this one group in our society and say, "You're treated as an adult in all these other ways but not with regard to consuming beverages, alcoholic beverages in a public place." I do regret, Mr. Speaker, that many of the Conservatives in this Legislature are moving to take away freedom of our young people and I do regret that they are moving in a way to penalize the youth of this province. I think that - we have some very, very fine young people in the Province of Manitoba. I have confidence in the youth of this province. As a matter of fact I think that they are as a group, the teen-agers in particular — I'm thinking of teen-agers, people who are about to become adults or young adults — I think they're perhaps one of the finest segments of our society and I give them full credit for being responsible people. I think that they are very generous people, the young people. By and

large a young person tends to be a very generous person and by and large a young person tends to be very concerned about his fellow man, his fellow woman.

I can't help but think of the typical case of a person having car trouble on the road. If you have car trouble on the road, Mr. Speaker, where for one reason or other you find that your car will not move and you're out in the country some place between towns, between cities, and you cannot move and so you have to try to flag down some passing car, nine times out of ten — well, I can't give you the ratio — I shouldn't say nine times out of ten, but I think there's a very good chance of young people stopping to help you. It's the young people who will go out of their way to help others in trouble. I found this through talking to other people and from personal experience. It's the young people who will stop. It's the young people who are prepared to be concerned about their fellow man, I think more so than older people in our society. I think it's tragic but too many older people tend to be indifferent to the needs of others and I really think that this is a sad commentary on some of us but at the same time I do look with favour on the way our young people have conducted themselves in this province.\$

So given the fact that people, the youth of this province are very responsible, are people who are concerned about other people, I think that this is an insult to them. I think the Member for Emerson is insulting that particular age group in our society, to those people and to young people generally, not only the 18 year olds but their friends — the teen-agers in general. I think it shows that he has, and many of his colleagues who are going to support this measure, have no confidence in them, that they do not trust them, so they're going to take away some of their freedom. The end of the world will not come about through the movement of this measure. In fact, very little is going to happen except I think the main effect of this measure will be to restrict people. That is the main measure. That is the main impact. It will have no impact on the amount of alcoholic beverages consumed in this province. It will have no impact on the way people carry on and treat one another. It will have no impact on the degree of sobriety, and I think that it's regrettable that this government is cutting funds to the Alcoholic Foundation of Manitoba, cutting back programs to educate people into wise drinking habits, at the same time as many opposite are prepared to pass this particular measure.

That is the way to go, through education, and through training in the home, and through general moral standards of moderation. That is the way to go, not to pass a law to restrict people. So I say, let us have confidence in our young people. Let us trust them. I trust them. Many members of this House, I would hope will share my views of trusting of those young people and not pass this particular measure. Let's put a vote of confidence in the youth of this province. Let's give them a vote of confidence and defeat this particular negative anti-freedom measure of the Member for Emerson. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I don't intend to make a long speech and normally I doubt if I would have chosen to speak on this debate, as I probably will find myself opposing some of the members from my side and certainly after the words of my colleague and friend, some of the statements that he made. I think that I should nevertheless take part in the debate at this time because I do not consider this as a lack of confidence I certainly don't consider it as a lack of confidence in the youth of this country at all. I have no ideology hang-up one way or the other about this.

When this was brought in last year I made the statement that if I was sure that something would be done, there would be some amendment somewhere to make sure that the present law was enforced, then I would vote against such a bill, and this wasn't done at all. Now, you know, we could make a long speech about all the ills of alcohol, because I don't think there's anything worse in society today, I think you can find it at the root of all evil, that doesn't mean that alcohol — mind you, I'm talking about excessive alcohol now, I'm not talking about . . . I think there's a lot of good points in alcohol, also. But I've seen it, and I've seen it fairly close to me, and maybe I'm a little more concerned than I should be, or that other people might be, but I feel, as I said, there's no ideology hang-up, but I feel there's a problem because of these schools, and I choose to be practical. It's no use standing on all kinds of principle and ideology and talk about the freedom of the individual.

You know, I think if we help them, I would hope that if this is going to help — if it's going to help only a few — I think it's well worth it, and until we bring in the proper legislation or proper amendment to make the people of Manitoba obey the laws, and this is not being done, I think that

it is worth the chance to change this, and if we're wrong, I don't think that too much damage will be done. You know, it was said that they fought a war, well maybe we should think a little more of our people; maybe at times maybe we should protect them. I know that this is going to sound very bad to some of the members especially on this side, but I don't care how it sounds if it does the job. I'm not too sure that it's going to do the job, but we've tried everything else, and I'm ready to take a chance. We've talked about fighting a war, in Vietnam there are kids of 12 years old that are running around with a rifle, we don't say, "Here, have a slug, because you're fighting a war." I don't say that this is necessarily that you can compare.

So I intend to vote for this resolution or this bill — I don't apologize for it at all — I don't say that I'm over anxious, as I say, I wish there was another way. I subscribe, in general, to the freedom and the respect of the young people, and so on, as much as my honourable friend that just spoke, the Member for Brandon, but I guess it's because I respect that generation so much who I think will be the leaders tomorrow, that maybe we should be a little more careful but not make it a little more difficult to have the law obeyed because of the situation that you have people in certain schools now that are drinking.

So I say, I believe in as much freedom as possible, but I don't believe that we should challenge the people unnecessarily to put temptation in their way, and therefore as I say, I doubt if there will be too many from this side but I certainly intend to favour the resolution, and I don't apologize for it at all.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Minister responsible for Housing.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I intend to be nearly as brief as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and I'm supporting the bill for probably very close to the same reasons he is. I supported it last year when the resolution was brought in; I supported an amendment back when the age of majority was changed in this province to make the drinking age 19. At that time we lost the amendment and we now have the 18-year-old age of majority in drinking age, and the Meer for Brandon East is full of so much falderal that he doesn't know what he's talking about.

Quite frankly, if he wants to carry on about people fighting and the age of majority, you know, and the person can carry a gun . . . you know, when you were 21 back in the First World War, still the drinking age was 18 — pardon me, you could join when you were 18, but you couldn't drink until you were 21 and he talks about young people. I'll tell you this, when the drinking age was 21 I did take a drink at 18, and that's what's happening now. It's 18, and then they're taking it at 15. —(Interjection)— The Member for Elmwood — it always did— he doesn't know. I will tell you this that I have teenagers as many of you and you may have some that do it, but when it was 21, even at 18 they knew they were doing wrong.

But, that's not the main thing again. What's happening today? Really, what's happening today? Where are most of the car accidents — 18 and drinking; where are most of the fights — the things that are going on that 18 year olds shouldn't be involved in, and wouldn't be if they didn't have liquor? Why, because of liquor, that's the same thing. Mr. Speaker, let's not really go all the way around the mulberry bush on this, what we really did — it was a mistake to make it 18, it was a mistake to go from 21 to 18. Let's not talk about armies, it was a mistake, and that's the way you'll explain it to the young people of today; you won't talk about freedoms and all that nonsense, you will say to them, "Look, look," —(Interjections)— I mean the nonsense that the Honourable Member for Brandon East starts to talk. You won't talk about taking things away from them, we'll say to them, "Look, look, it was a mistake giving you the drinking age at 18 because you can't handle it at 18." And they can't, and anybody that doesn't have the guts to stand up and tell them that, that they're not capable of handling liquor at 18 anymore than I was or you were, you're wrong, because I will tell you that.

And then the other situation that I heard yesterday — the Member for Inkster just confuses me when he says things like, "You know, when we see people older doing things. Don't do as I do, do as I say." Since when were children or young people allowed to do all of the things older people could do? Since when didn't we make regulations to protect them? And that's what we're doing, we're basically saying, "You should not have liquor at 18." It was wrong, I'm saying, to put it at 18, it should have been 19. Because you take it out of the schools, you make that year a little bit more, and we should stand up and we should make that change, and don't beat around the bush about all the talk — you made a mistake or we made a mistake in this Legislature— it should be raised for the benefit of saving some. Ask your policemen? Ask the people who are involved with the teenagers, ask them, ask them and you will find out, you'll find out that liquor

hasn't helped them one bit, and we should have the fortitude in this Legislature to say that it hasn't helped them, let's raise it.

Let's do what some of the other provinces have done, because they found out it was wrong. Let's do what some of the other states have done because they found out it was wrong. You know, the honourable members on the other side, it's votes with them — the 18 year olds. Votes, you're afraid to get up and talk to them and tell them. You don't beat around the bush with young people, you be straightforward with them..

And I tell you, the Member for Brandon East, when he talks about the teaching — and we will teach them, we will educate them. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that I've seen more school teachers going on in school classes about liquor, etc., and they listen to the school teacher about as much as they listen to their arithmetic if they are not interested, and that's about it. The only way that you'll have success in schools, is to have volunteer people going there who have had experience with liquor talking to those young people — that's the way you'll have the experience. The Alcoholic Foundation goes around spending their money training teachers in the schools to teach the kids and the kids don't listen to the teachers on that subject, and you better learn it right now. So then you want another great big bureaucracy made out of the thing. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, let's not beat around the bush about it, it should not have been brought down from 21 to 18, it was too large a drop at once. We thought we would be able to overcome it, handle it in a couple of years or five years. We haven't handled it in nine years, we've only deteriorated the situation with young people and liquor, so let's change it.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Inkster with a question.

MR. GREEN Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the honourable member would submit to a question. Well, the honourable member, during his remarks said, "You fellows on the other side, who are voting for this, are seeking votes." Would the honourable member agree, first of all, that probably on a popular referendum, which I don't consider a means of dealing with this question, that his position would prevail, and secondly, when he refers to honourable meers on the opposite side seeking votes by voting in this way, does he make that same application to those members on his side, who may vote the same way?

MR. JOHNSTON It's a fair question. I made the statement, Mr. Speaker. If I would suggest that if it was the age of majority as being 18, it was lowered . . . it was lowered, brought in by the government, by the 18 year olds, it's votes — that's the reason why they don't want to change it.

Mr. Speaker, and I also answer the other part of the question. I also answer the other part of the question that there is no doubt, that if a poll were taken today, my position would be the most popular, my position would be the most popular.

MR. GREEN I want to pursue the question, because perhaps the honourable member didn't understand it. When he was talking about voting for this bill, he said, "He said members on the other side," which I took to mean that all of the members on that side are now committed, or whether this is now a government vote, if not — which I still presume to be the case, and it is a fact which I believe to be the case — that members on that side will vote against the bill, is he saying that those members on that side, who vote against the bill, are doing it for the purpose merely of getting votes and not because they think that the bill is wrong?

MR. JOHNSTON Mr. Speaker, again I say that it's a fair question, as he explained it. I would only say that if a member votes for this bill, he could have that fear, no matter what party he's a member of.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a question?

MR. EVANS Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would entertain a question. We talked about consistency, at least I talked about consistency, and the Honourable Minister referred to it in his remarks.

One major area, of course, is the right to vote, to elect people to Parliament or the Legislature or indeed to sit in the Legislature. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER Order please, order please. May I suggest to the honourable meer, that any question he asks is for clarification only of the statements made by the previous speaker.

MR. EVANS Would the Honourable Minister support a measure to take away the right to vote of the 18 year olds?

MR. JOHNSTON I do not believe that the 18 year old's ability to vote, to drive a car, to take on payments or any of those things has anything to do with liquor. I believe that drinking by the 18 year old is not good because he can't handle it, he can sign his name when he's 18 and he can do a lot of other things, if he's sober.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would yield to a question. He made the statement that it was a mistake to reduce from 21 to 18. Following his reasoning, does he not feel, to be consistent with his own position, that we should now amend the entire bill, and all those privileges that are granted and the responsibilities imposed on the 18 year olds should now be removed so that it goes back to the time prior to 1970, rather than just pick on one aspect of it and say, "This will no longer be allowed."

MR. JOHNSTON Mr. Speaker, when the age was brought down to 18, and I remember it very clearly because I was in the opposition then and I remember the discussions, there was some discussion about the drinking age at that time. The bill came in originally for the drinking age only and was amended to include the whole of the age of majority at 18, as I recall it.

MR. MILLER Then will the member not recognize that to be consistent he should therefore now be proposing that all the privileges and responsibilities laid upon 18 year olds at that time should now be removed.

MR. SPEAKER Order please. Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that what he is making is a proposal and not a question. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER Mr. Speaker, the member made a speech in which he referred to a number of things. I am trying to seek clarification and a better understanding of what he is saying.\$

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made it as clear as I possibly could. I see no relationship of the ability of a person to take on responsibilities, to be sued, for everything else. I am saying the 18 year old, the age for drinking at 18 is wrong and should be raised. It was wrong to lower it in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS Mr. Speaker, I have a question if the Minister will accept it. I can assure you it is for clarification, because I find myself in a — I don't know if I should find myself in a difficult situation. I was led to believe, and it is treated as such by the members of the opposition, the official opposition, that this was a free vote, that it wasn't a government bill. It wasn't brought in —(Interjection)— Well, that's what I thought. It wasn't brought in by the Minister; it was brought in by a backbencher, but the Minister who spoke talked about this practically as if I didn't have any right to vote as I wished, and that I was stuck with it, and then that this is what we did, and so on. I always felt that those bills, in the past, have been a question of conscience and a question of a personal matter, and I want to make sure.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON I don't know if he wants me to clarify that it's a Private Members' Bill; I will clarify that, if that's what the member is asking.

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

MR. DOERN Mr. Speaker, unless some other honourable member wishes to speak, I intend to adjourn the debate, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER On Bill No. 6, The Freedom of Information Act, the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER On Bill No. 12, An Act Respecting The City of Brandon, the Honourable Member

for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER On Bill No. 18, An Act to Amend The Brandon Charter, the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN Stand, Mr. Speaker.

PUBLIC BILLS — SECOND READINGS

MR. AXWORTHY presented Bill No. 32, An Act to Amend The Human Rights Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY Mr. Speaker, the word "freedom" has been much used this afternoon in a variety of different ways, and I think that this bill that I'm introducing for second reading also deals with the subject, I hope, in a perhaps slightly different manner than the way in which the issue has been brought to the House up to this point in time. The bill is basically an amendment to The Human Rights Act, designed to prohibit the use of economic business contracts as a way of discriminating against individuals or third parties according to their race or religion or even the place where they want to do business. It's a very simple amendment utilizing the full sanctions and administrative machinery of The Human Rights Commission as a way of dealing with what I consider to be an increasingly serious problem in the use of economic needs as a form of discrimination in this country.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, was in part initiated by concerns expressed to me by members of my own constituency who have become particularly concerned about the effects of the economic boycott applied by Arab states against Canadian businessmen and also by several people in national organizations who have the same concern. I think the most obvious example of how economic discrimination can be applied is in the area where the use of boycotts or blacklists by those who are in Arab countries, whether they are state corporations or agents acting on their behalf, have applied different ways to their business contacts, of trying to insist that Canadians become party to their own particular economic warfare that they are waging, one set against the other.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think, or intend to get into a major debate about Middle East politics. I am concerned, however, when efforts to use the leverage sponsored or leverage acquired through a large economic power begins to intrude into Canadian affairs, particularly into Manitoba affairs. And that really is the circumstances that we are facing today. The economic boycott applied by Arab states against Israel, or Israelis, or those even of Jewish origin, has been around for some 30 or 40 years, but it's only become a matter of very serious consequence in the last three or four years because of the immense wealth acquired through the petrol dollars and through the surpluses gained by Arab states. What has really taken place, as we all know, Mr. Speaker, is a major revolution in the economic affairs of the world, that the economic centre or capital is largely being centred in the Middle East. Huge surpluses of dollars, billions of dollars, are now available for recirculating as a result of the increase in petroleum prices that began in 1973. So, to the point where you've got massive expenditures of money being exercised by Arab states and the necessity, in many cases, of Western nations having to trade and deal in economic matters with the Middle East. We really don't have a choice any more, Mr. Speaker. It is a matter of sheer economic survival for Western industrial countries to come to grips with the fact of that huge amount of wealth.

And so, knowing those kind of circumstances, there have been efforts, in many respects, to apply the provisions of an economic boycott against nationals in Western industrial states to go along with this kind of economic boycott that the Arabs think is one of their ways of dealing with the problem of Israel. It is a problem in this country, Mr. Speaker. Last year, in fact it was January, 1977, there was a report by a Commission on Economic Coercion and Discrimination in Canada, a commission that was set up with some, I think, some fairly distinguished Canadians on it: Dr. Irwin Cutler from McGill University Law School; David Lewis, the former head of the NDP Party nationally; the Honourable Emmett Hall, the former Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada; Professor Harry Crowe, the Dean of Atkinson College; Yves Caron, from McGill University, a specialist in corporate law, were members of this Commission, and they brought to attention the fact that

there are a number of ways in which the kinds of boycotts are presently applied in Canada. They have put them by categories:

They said that in one case Canadian firms, as a condition of doing business with the Arab countries, must agree to refrain from doing business with Israel or an Israeli company. This is known as a secondary boycott.

Another kind of boycott that's being applied is that Canadian firms, as a condition of doing business with Arab countries, must agree to refrain from doing business with any other Canadian firm that does business with Israel or otherwise.

Furthermore, they ask, in many cases, the Canadian firms as a condition of doing business with Arab state countries must supply information on the religious affiliation of the ownership or management of the company, or of employees of the company, and the Canadian firms, as a condition of doing business, must agree not to use carriers which are on the Arab boycott list.

And in many cases, many of them major national banks, chartered banks in this country, provide credit requirements, honour letters of credit which contain these conditions.

They also point out in this Commission report a somewhat striking fact to me, Mr. Speaker, and that is that companies, even in Winnipeg, have been put on the boycott list or have been required to sign these kinds of compliances as a measure of doing business. There are a number of consulting firms, engineering, architectural firms, that have bid for contracts in the Middle East countries, to put up buildings, develop engineering works; there are a number of businesses that are trying to sell goods and services, and as part of their contract, conditions are applied saying you cannot do this unless you sign one of these, sort of, agreements, that you will not do business in Israel, you will not have a Jew on the board, or whatever it may be. All these kinds of conditions.

So what it really means, Mr. Speaker, is that we are setting up a set of, you know, two classes of corporate citizens in this country, and the issue really is, how do you prevent that from happening? Canadian business wants to get into the marketplace with Arab countries and as the Commission itself reports, that necessarily should not be prohibited; it is a major economic trading partner. But it is a denial of the basic traditions of rights and freedoms of this country to have to accept the conditions of Arab countries as a means of doing that business.

The report of the Commission further states that one, perhaps the only way to provide any protection is that we need some form of legislative buttressing to protect against that. Now, the Federal Government last year issued a series of guidelines for Canadian companies and also indicated that it would no longer provide federal support, federal systems to any company that agreed or complied with these conditions. They also provide for requirements of disclosure of any attempts to enforce these boycott measures against them.

What they do point out is that because property and civil rights is a provincial matter, that in order to provide some legislative buttressing that it is incumbent upon provincial legislatures to provide protection in that area of contract law which comes under provincial jurisdiction. And to that extent, Mr. Speaker, a bill similar to this was introduced in the Ontario Legislature last year by Premier Davis and only, I think, died on the Order Paper when the election was called, and Premier Davis has indicated that he intends to reintroduce the bill.

Now, I looked at the Ontario bill, Mr. Speaker, which is a much more extensive bill; it's an act to prohibit discrimination in business relationships and it has a variety of means and techniques of setting up a new tribunal to deal specifically with this matter. In consulting with the legislative council here in the Province of Manitoba, and with lawyers working in the field, they indicated that the same kind of protection, the same kind of prohibition against this form of discrimination, could be handled simply by amending The Human Rights Act and using the Human Rights Commission as the form in which any measures could be sanctioned, or any form of compliance could be introduced, that The Human Rights Act contains all the powers necessary to bring this kind of prohibition against this form of discrimination about.

So, taking that, Mr. Speaker, I felt that it would be probably quicker in this day of austerity, rather than setting up a whole new set of government machinery, to utilize the machinery of The Human Rights Commission and the sanctions contained in Section 21 of that bill, as a means of bringing about compliance with the orders against this form of economic discrimination.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it's quite clear that the discrimination can appear in a variety of forms and in a variety of ways. I suppose that each generation of legislators has to deal with different forms of discrimination, but one that is becoming prevalent and seriously dangerous in this country is the one that attempts to use this kind of economic force, this economic leverage, as a way of requiring Canadians, Canadian nationals, Manitobans, to accept in effect a foreign policy decision

of another country, and in so doing you discriminate against fellow citizens simply because of a particular ethnic, religious background or affiliation that they have, or even, Mr. Speaker, that they may want to do business with another country, that one of the primary requirements under all the boycott laws is that you can't even do business with Israel, or do business with another company that may do business with Israel. And so that's the most blatant and flagrant example of how this kind of economic discrimination is being employed. I would want to say, Mr. Speaker, though, that I would hope that this legislation would not be construed simply as being only focussed on that one issue alone. It's the most obvious issue, the most flagrant, and perhaps the one that comes most readily to mind, but I think, Mr. Speaker, it has obviously other applications and a wider scope than that. It can be applied to any form of contract, business contract, that attempts to impose discriminatory relationships or discriminatory clauses upon anyone. So it is not simply a matter of an Arab-Israeli dispute that it deals with or that discrimination that arises out of that issue, it can deal with all kinds of economic relationships, where one says that you have to sign a contract. Now, where, Mr. Speaker, there may be some problem associated with it, and I admit it, is that in areas where companies are set up, let's say, in attempt to sign a contract only with people of one ethnic background or one religious background. But I think that under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, the Human Right Commission in judging or applying itself to a judgment in these cases could provide for that kind of discretion to deal with those instances, because it is a matter that could be referred to the Commission and if they feel an act of discrimination takes place they could then refer it under Section 21 to an arbitration board or to the court. So it does have a wider scope and a wider application, but I think it is primarily in this case directed towards that one issue of the economic boycott that is presently being applied.

I would also want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that I realize and recognize that in many cases the limitations of introducing a private member's bill in this area. Governments are not necessarily prone to accepting the initiatives of private members, particularly if they happen to be on the opposite side. I would only request, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite deal with this in a somewhat different flavour and with a different dimension. This is not being introduced as a partisan matter by any means; it is being done because I think that there is a serious threat to some fundamental rights taking place and unless we provide some legislation to protect against it, that discrimination will be continued and perhaps become more serious. But I would say that if they feel they can come up with a better Act or a better bill to deal with the same problem, then I would certainly be more than willing to support whatever initiative they wish to take or to supercede this one and withdraw my own bill.

My interest purely, Mr. Speaker, in this case is to get something on the books in this province, to take some leadership in this area against what I consider to be an increasingly difficult and a kind of a human problem that I think we in this province shouldn't be allowed to tolerate. So I would say to the members opposite, that if they like, they could take this particular measure as a signal that something must be done, and if they feel that it is sufficient to provide the protection that's needed, then I would hope that they would support the bill. If they feel that they would like to provide a bill different than this, but with the same intent and same purpose, then they will receive no argument from me, Mr. Speaker, and I would be more than happy to agree to any measure that they would want to introduce. The fact of the matter is that something should be done, and should be done in this session, and they have a bill before them that does, I think, meet the problem, but I don't pretend to be an expert on legislative drafting. If they can come up with a better idea then I am certainly prepared to buy that idea.

I would also hope, Mr. Speaker, that the same invocation would be applied to members of the official opposition. There are members in this House who perhaps have a much deeper and more profound sense of the importance of this bill than I do, and I would hope that they would take a look at the bill and see if they could also provide their support and encouragement for it. And again, if there is a better way of doing it, if amendments should be made to it that anyone else in this House can think would make it stronger, more effective, or a better bill, then again I would be more than happy to agree to anything that would be within reason.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that I think really simply adds to the corpus of law in this province and in fact, in this country, to prohibit a form of discrimination that's becoming more widespread. I think we can take some leadership in this field; I think it's something that every province will eventually have to go along with. It does complement the actions being taken on the federal level and I think, Mr. Speaker, it would indicate to provide some important and useful leadership across the country in dealing with the problem that I know many people feel very troubled about. So, Mr. Speaker, I recommend this bill to the House; I hope that members will take a hard serious look

at it and be prepared to accept it.

MR. SPEAKER The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge would answer a question. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge indicated his concern of economic boycott and a number of other items. I wonder if the honourable member would advise, is he in favor of removing all tariffs on imported goods, say?

MR. AXWORTHY Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the intended purpose of the member's question is. —(Interjection)— Well, as a classic Liberal, I guess I am certainly in favor of free trade and I suppose our party has been in favor of it for a hundred years. I think if he reads this bill closely, he will realize that discrimination now is based upon sort of religious or ethnic affiliation and that I think is the important thing. It is also an act of discrimination within the country itself, between those within Canada, and I think if he'd listen to my remarks he would discover and perhaps he would be prepared to read them in Hansard, that the reason why the bill is necessary is that this is now a matter which is beginning to impact upon the domestic concerns of this country, not our dealings with other states.

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. JORGENSON I wonder if the honourable members would be disposed to calling it 5:30.

MR. PEAKER The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.