

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 o'clock, Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister for Cultural Affairs that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following bill: No. 56, the Automobile Insurance Act.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 29(1)(j)--passed. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Chairman, on uninsured motorists - are you planning on using the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund or what method are you planning on paying the payments on people that have no assets?

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Chairman, if I understood the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, he's asking whether or not there will be retained the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund in order to take care of the problem of that small percentage of uninsured motorists who remain uninsured and who do not have assets against which an injured party has a valid claim. Well I believe that the Minister of Municipal Affairs has made reference to this point before and indicated that there will be the retention of a fund, by whatever name it may be, for this specific purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section(j)--passed; (k)--passed; (l)--passed; (m)--passed. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Under (l) dealing with the rights of non-residents to receive benefits, is there a reciprocal arrangement here with other, let's say the province of Saskatchewan, or just what arrangements are we talking of under this regulation?

MR. SCHREYER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland, was he asking a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could the Member for Rhineland repeat his point?

MR. FROESE: I wasn't sure whether to direct the question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the First Minister. Under (l), we are talking here of determining the rights of non-residents to receive benefits under the plan. Are we talking in terms of having a reciprocal agreement with the province of Saskatchewan, where they have a similar plan of this type, or just what is intended under this section?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Well, Mr. Chairman, in reference to clause (l), determining the residence of persons for purposes of this Act, it will be important, as the details and the regulations are established, to work out some criteria by which residents can be definitively specified. This is important in view of the fact there will be the rating areas as mentioned earlier, so there could be problems in respect to those that have a farm, for instance, close to the Winnipeg area yet living in the City of Winnipeg part of the year, part of the year in the rural area, but the question of residency would be involved and also the question of non-residence would also be a question of concern that would have to be dealt with by way of regulation. The rights of non-residents to receive benefits or payments of any kind whatsoever under any plan, those, I think, are self-explanatory and these matters would have to be dealt with by way of regulation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section (l)--passed; (m)--passed; (n)--passed; (o)--passed. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to 29(1). I move that Section 29(1) be amended by adding at the end of the section the following words. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, I have to deal with (p) which is also an amendment. Would the House Leader make his motion then? Section (o)--passed; Section (p) as amended--passed. Section (p) providing - as follows it reads: "providing for and prescribing the conditions

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.). . . . governing a refund or rebate of the whole or part of any premium paid to the insurer under this Act and any plan." The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. AL MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, there are two amendments that have been circulated, amendments to Section 29 which add further clauses (q) and (r), and the Minister, I believe -- well, I'll be happy to move them or the Minister can move them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Subsection (1) of Section 29 of Bill 56 be amended by adding thereto immediately after the clause (p) thereof the following clause (q) "respecting the appointment of three or more persons to a board to be called the Transitional Assistance Board, for the purposes of receiving and considering applications on the basis of a formula established by the Lieutenant Governor in Council for the payment of such sums of money as transitional assistance to any person who, on or after the coming into force of this Act, suffers loss of income as a result of the implementation of any plan of universal compulsory insurance."

Mr. Chairman, this amendment I think is self-explanatory, the establishment of a board that would deal with the . . .

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We went through this exercise last evening and I haven't heard a further message from His Honour. It would appear that there was an indication by the Chair and by the House last night that a further message from His Honour was required, and I don't know, Sir, I haven't been able to find out how it can be done at this stage but the rules that I have been looking at, and I admit that I haven't had a proper search, and if there is some other reason I'd be happy to hear it, but I point out the rules as I've seen them: Subsection (3) of Citation 246 in Beauséne, found on Page 207, says, "The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown, is that the communications to which the royal demand of recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down, once and for all, unless withdrawn and replaced, not only the amount of the charge but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. In relation to the standard thereby fixed, an amendment infringes the financial initiatives of the Crown, not only if it increases the amount, but also if it extends the objects and purposes or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a charge, and this standard is binding, not only on private members, but also on Ministers whose only advantage is that, as advisors of the Crown, they can present new or supplementary estimates or secure the royal recommendation to new or supplementary resolutions."

And Mr. Chairman, May on Page 803, where he talks about amendments in committee, there is a fairly long section but I'll just read one sentence for the moment, that says it would be a strange anomaly to extend a greater latitude to amendments than to the original provisions of a bill. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I ask the Honourable Leader where he is reading from?

MR. WEIR: I'm reading from May, top of Page 804, half way down the section at the top of the page: "It would be a strange anomaly to extend a greater latitude to amendments than to the original provisions of a bill by allowing the former; while forbidding the latter, to exceed the terms of the resolution agreed to by the House up to the limits of the resolution recommended by the Crown. The likelihood of a difference between terms of the initial resolution and that agreed to by the House has been reduced by the general adoption of the procedure under Standing Order No. 88." But that really contains the point, Mr. Chairman, and I raise it because of the decision that was made last night, . . . the House ruled it being a money provision, and as such I ask your opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well Mr. Chairman, the argument that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition puts forward now, he put forward last evening as well, the contention being, in his view, that if there is any amendment to a bill that either increases or decreases or in any way impinges on the financial responsibility of the Crown, that it requires a message from His Honour. I, Sir, put forward to you the contention that the bill, having been introduced with a message from His Honour, that that message from His Honour encompasses all subsequent changes that might be proposed by any member of the Treasury Bench. I say that without in any way prejudicing our right to bring forward a message from His Honour, but Mr. Chairman,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) again I checked with those learned in parliamentary rules and the long-standing practice is, or usage I should say rather than practice, usage is that any amendment to a bill that has in the first instance been introduced with a message from His Honour, requires no additional messages or amendments thereto, and without going into the details of it, perhaps one of my colleagues can do so, it seems, I am advised that in the case of the Sales Tax Act that was introduced by the previous administration, which is a revenue matter, a money bill if you like, that there were all kinds of subsequent and consequent amendments made by the administration of the day to their own bill, and in no case did they bring forward additional messages from His Honour. If I am wrong, let me be so told.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: On a point of order, I don't recall that particular occasion and it may very well be, and precedents do have some effect but so do rules, and when our own rule book doesn't govern we have a habit of going back to Beauchesne and, if that doesn't cover, of going back to May and so on, that we have a precedent, and I asked for guidance in the light of a citation that I read and if there isn't an expenditure of money, then, Sir, I can't understand the -- if it isn't an extension of what the Act contained, I can't understand the attitude of the House towards the amendment that I moved last night, and the position was established in terms of it, and so on. Now, the rules that I've had indicate that if there is an area, and I haven't noticed anything within the existing bill that calls for the establishment of the committee as is envisaged by this amendment, or we'll be in the same problem when the next amendment comes along only more so, because it's certainly more definite money than this one is, but the approach last night was that both, in fact, were related to the expenditure of money. That being the case, it's an extension of what was contemplated in the bill and the effect, whether it's been changed through usage in this Legislature or not, is maybe another point, but in the rule books, as I look at the rule books, it distinctly, Sir, indicates that the matter should really have a message.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman it would be presumptuous of me to in any way suggest that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is wrong in putting forward this point of order. My only point, Sir, is to submit that when a bill is introduced that has a message from His Honour, that that message encompasses all subsequent amendments that might be moved by a member of the Treasury Bench since the bill in the first place was moved by the Treasury Bench, and I put forward as precedent in this House, not to mention a precedent in other jurisdictions, in the Canadian parliamentary system, the fact that at the time of the passage of the Sales Tax Act by the previous government, that there were amendments that were moved by the Treasury Bench at that time which did not have any message, any further messages or additional messages from His Honour, yet amendments, many of them, did have a money impact and that precedent surely cannot be ignored.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, to go just a bit further, I would suggest that in the last four years, including the two sessions of this new administration, there have been money bills which have received messages. I venture to say that there were amendments on many, many occasions, and we could go back to those occasions, and not once has there been a message from His Honour. And the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that I think it would be almost a thousand to one shot that none of these amendments would have affected the Treasury in any way, but the bill was originally introduced with some amendments, Mr. Chairman, and I can say that in my memory, in any event, in the last four years no amendment to a money bill has been introduced with a message from His Honour - and there have been many amendments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I would just like to ask for further guidance because it seems to me, I would like to make this point and perhaps members could comment, that only the Treasury Benches can introduce resolutions or motions which require a message from His Honour, and I think that applies particularly to the ruling last night. The problem this morning is the one raised by the First Minister and challenged by the Leader of the Official Opposition, namely, if a bill has been introduced with a message from His Honour, do further amendments to that bill require further or additional messages from His Honour? It seems to me that is the problem.

MR. SCHREYER: If that is the problem, as I suggest it is, then I would ask you, Sir, to consider whether or not there have been in recent years, or in any year of the existence of this House, instances where bills introduced by the government, by the Treasury Bench, with a message from His Honour of course in the first instance, required and had submitted additional

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.). . . . messages from His Honour for all subsequent and consequent amendments. I submit to you, Sir, that was not the case and there are literally hundreds of precedents in that respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, to raise a point of order, I don't think the motion is properly before the committee as yet. The Honourable Minister read out the motion and immediately started debating it without you ever indicating whether you accepted it or whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the member is correct, namely, that I have not yet accepted the motion and that is what I am now pondering. The Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Chairman, the bill dealing with sales tax, 1967, there were amendments put by the Opposition at that time, I can remember so well. Now I don't know whether they were legal or not but they were amended. Now I can't remember how they or what type of amendment they were, but they did put amendments, the members of the Opposition, at that time.

MR. GREEN: Would the honourable member permit me to refresh his memory?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Because I remember very clearly what occurred and I think that the honourable member, if he checks, will see that I am right.

An amendment was tried to be put by members of the Liberal Party at that time and the Chairman ruled it out of order. This was followed by a series of amendments which contained the phrase "consider the advisability of" and I at that time objected to the. . . . I said that an Act couldn't be amended by putting in the words "consider the advisability of" but this was done and, in my opinion, improperly. This session, the House ruled that such an amendment would not be acceptable but that's exactly what happened to every one of the Opposition amendments which were put, and we put many and the Liberal Party put many that said "consider the advisability of amending the Act so as to read" - and the fact is that no such amendment could be drafted on to the legislation if it were passed, and at that time I considered it out of order and this House has so ruled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I just want to make one brief point in relation to the statement made by the First Minister that there are ample precedents in the rules in this House which indicate that amendments containing some differences in the amount of money that will be spent, in a particular bill, have been introduced in this House on numerous occasions and that he said he could find precedents, and I daresay that that is probably the truth. I ask you to consider whether or not any of those proposed changes were challenged, as they are being today, on the basis of an authority. You can establish all sorts of precedents if nobody challenges the right to establish that precedent. We now have an authority in May, quoted by the Leader of the Opposition, that is being challenged, and so it has to be -- any decision has to be based on the authority that has been quoted rather than on established precedents that have never been challenged.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the Honourable Member for Morris that where there is long-established precedent of numerous occasions, that that in itself serves as more than a counterbalance to any citation in any parliamentary reference book such as Beauchesne, Bourinot or Erskine May, or whatever. If the precedent in question has been a long-standing one going back many years, as I submit it is in this case, many, many years and on numerous occasions, that establishes parliamentary usage and convention which I submit, in the final analysis, is stronger than any citation from a parliamentary reference book, but I submit that there is no conflict in fact, anyway. And furthermore, may I make this point to you, Sir, that it is really a contradiction in terms to say that a member of the Executive Council that has introduced a bill to which has been attached a message from His Honour, cannot then later introduce an amendment without a message from His Honour, for the simple reason that His Honour in any case acts only on the advice of his Ministers, and having given a message upon the advice of his Ministers, then it follows that if, in the purest of theoretical terms, it is necessary to have additional messages from His Honour, they would be forthcoming because it is the obvious practice under the British parliamentary system that His Honour acts on the advice of his Ministers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: One more point and then, as far as I'm concerned, I await your judgment,

(MR. WEIR cont'd.). . . . Sir, and that is that in terms of the Sales Tax Act, and I'm not trying to go through all of the other precedents that there may very well be, I'm not prepared to argue the point, that so far as the Sales Tax Act is concerned, the amendments as moved by the government were I think all within the scope of the original message which was contained within the Act. They might vary in degree but in terms of the scope of the Act they were all within the scope of the Act and they were amendments in detail. The motion here is a change that, in my view, is outside the scope of the Act and not contemplated within the Act itself at the time it was distributed after first reading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, may I submit, on the other hand, that it is again commonplace, upon the establishment of a public corporation or a Crown corporation, to have advisory committees and the like established pursuant to an Act establishing a public or Crown corporation, and just as the bill does provide for the establishment of a Board of Directors to advise policy with respect to the management of the corporation, so the bill can conceive of the establishment of an advisory committee to that board or to the Minister responsible in reporting, etc. etc.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I would rule as follows, that first, I think, it is clear that only the Treasury Benches can obtain messages from His Honour and I suppose that by a strict and literal interpretation of the rules, one might argue that each additional message or amendment to a bill which does have a message from His Honour should have additional messages, it would seem to me that the fact that the entire bill, or the original motion, did receive a message from His Honour would preclude the necessity of having each additional amendment to that bill have attached to it a message from His Honour. It would seem to me that when the bill itself has that approval, the additional approval could be obtained but would really be a perhaps cumbersome method of procedure, so consequently I would rule that it would be understood that, when the Minister moves this amendment, that the original approval from His Honour would cover any additional amendments made to that bill.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Chairman, not in any way questioning your ruling but just from a point of view of clarification; where, as an example, and I make this as simple as I can, a message from His Honour and a bill is introduced setting up a board, a specific board on which there are five people involved, if, as an example, the Opposition moved an amendment saying that the board should consist of seven, which would increase the expenditure, there would be no question, I think, if the House in a majority view, even though the motion was introduced by the Opposition, approved it. I'm not debating the ruling, I'm. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: My ruling has been made, but I assume the member. . . .

MR. SPIVAK: I'm just asking from a point of clarification because I want to understand the principle. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . is raising a theoretical point. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: May I rise on a point of order, because you have made a ruling and if the Honourable Member for River Heights is attempting to get some additional ruling from you on a hypothetical situation, may I point out to you, Sir, that it is not in order to raise questions on hypothetical situations.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I posed the question on the basis of your ruling as to why you ruled yesterday that the Leader of the Opposition was out of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, this is presumptuous in the extreme for anyone to question. You can challenge the ruling if you like but to question the ruling. . . . -- (Interjection) -- But you do not ask questions on rulings of the Chair. I've never heard of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would ask the Honourable Member for River Heights if and when we come to that situation that he should raise the point at that time, but it seems that by raising it now he is reflecting on the ruling of the Chair. I would ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs to proceed with his amendment.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't certain whether I had completed the reading of the -- has the amendment been accepted as read?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I now indicate that I am accepting the amendment.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Well, Mr. Chairman, I think maybe you should read it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That subsection (1) - and of course members may indicate to dispense -

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.). . . . that subsection (1) of Section 29 of Bill 56 be amended by adding thereto immediately after clause (p) thereof the following clause (q) "respecting the appointment of three or more persons to a board to be called the Transitional Assistance Board for the purpose of receiving and considering applications on the basis of a formula established by the Lieutenant Governor in Council for the payment of such sums of money as transitional assistance to any person who, on or after the coming into force of this Act, suffers loss of income as a result of the implementation of any plan of universal compulsory insurance." The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is quite clear that there should be established a board, named as in the resolution, that would deal with applications that would be made by those in the industry that feel that because of the passage of this legislation that their financial and economic income — that they've suffered a loss of income as a result, of the passage of this bill. The Board would be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and they would be working within the guidelines of the formula that would be established by the Cabinet, and the First Minister last week gave a clear outline as to the main parameters of the guidelines under which this particular committee would be working. I think it's important because the people who feel that they have suffered a loss of income should certainly be in the position of being able to go to a board, to present their case to that board, to have it clearly and earnestly looked into by the members of the board, and the board to make its findings known.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move an amendment to the motion that's before us. I would move that the proposed new clause (q) of subsection (1) of Section 29 of Bill 56 be amended by striking out all the words following (q) and substituting therefor the following: "appointing a board to be called the Transitional Assistance Board, consisting of three members, one of whom shall be a Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench for Manitoba who shall act as chairman, for the purpose of hearing and determining all claims for compensation for loss arising from the implementation of any plan of universal compulsory automobile insurance, such compensation to be awarded on the basis following:

(i) compensation shall be paid to any person who by reason of implementation of any plan of universal compulsory automobile insurance suffers financial loss by way of loss of income from employment, depreciation on the capital value of an insurance agency business, the relocation costs for loss of employment or of business, insurance or otherwise, reasonably required by persons to relocate their residence to a point within or without Manitoba;

(ii) the compensation to be paid in the case of a person who has lost income from employment shall be such sum as in the opinion of the Transitional Assistance Board is reasonable, having regard to the length of the person's employment in the insurance industry, his age, the availability of alternative employment to that person, the need for retraining and such other factors as the Transitional Assistance Board may determine at the rate at which the person was paid or earned immediately before the coming into force of this Act;

(iii) the compensation to be paid in the case of a person who has suffered depreciation in the capital value of an insurance agency business shall be the difference in capital value between what it would have been had no plan of universal compulsory automobile insurance been implemented and the actual value it has at the date of implementation of the plan of universal compulsory automobile insurance;

(iv) the compensation to be paid for relocation costs shall be the actual costs of relocating reasonably incurred and such depreciation, the value of real estate owned by the person relocating or his spouse, as a consequence of the effect of the implementation of the plan of universal compulsory automobile insurance and the economic viability of the community in which he resides;

(v) any town, village or rural municipality which suffers a loss of real property, tax revenue by reason of the effect of the implementation of a plan of universal compulsory automobile insurance, shall be paid compensation on such amount as the Transitional Assistance Board may determine as reasonable;

(vi) the compensation assessed under this section shall be paid by the corporation within 28 days of the award of the compensation, or the final disposition of any appeal therefrom out of the fund.

In the event of the absence or inability to act of any member, or in the case of a vacancy on the Transitional Assistance Board, the remaining member or members may exercise the powers of the board."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, before you even begin reading that motion, whether you read one word, five words, fifteen, twenty-five, thirty-five, may I raise the point of order - not that it should make any difference whether you have read one, five or forty-five words - that this motion presumes to do something which has been ruled on already in that it does require certain funds to be paid out of public sources, whether it be Consolidated Revenue or sources of the Crown or public corporation, and therefore, for the same reasons, I submit it is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: May I, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, indicate that this is not the same thing. As a matter of fact, it's an amendment to the amendment that was made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and follows along those lines and the money is being already provided within the terms. As a matter of fact, if anything, there is a possibility of a decrease because there's an indication that a Judge of the Court would be chairman and as such, wouldn't qualify for additional remuneration, so if anything, in that context, there might very well be - there may very well be less cost than in the one that was presented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, so I would say, Sir, that this is the same type of an amendment as if it was applied to any of the other sections of the bill which were brought in under the original section of the Act and intended to be complementary to the amendment that was presented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, even though there is reference there to a person from the third branch of government, and therefore, in the contention of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that in itself might not seem to require funds from the Crown per se, nevertheless there is reference to compensation being paid, certain adjustments being paid, and I submit, Sir, that is clearly involving the expenditure of public funds and therefore can only be moved by a member of the Treasury Bench.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, now having accepted the principle that the amendment introduced by the Minister of Municipal Affairs was within the scope of the bill and did not require a special or additional message from His Honour -- Mr. Chairman, will the First Minister allow me to finish? He can certainly reply afterwards.

Now, having accepted that position, I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that an amendment which deals in greater detail with the principle which has now been accepted within the scope of the bill cannot be introduced by the Opposition, and I pose again the question of whether you vary this from three to five, as we have in the past, with variations of the numbers of people to be placed on a board and approved by the House, is not within the scope of the bill, and that's been accepted; it has happened in the past; and therefore on that simple principle, that the government introduces a bill which says that there will be a board of three who are to be paid for their services, and an amendment is introduced saying the board should be five, there is no question; it's accepted. The five, if the House in its majority do... it, the five will be paid. Even though the amendment was introduced by the Opposition, it's within the scope of the bill and you have ruled that the amendment proposed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs is within the scope of the bill and on that basis the amendment, which deals in greater detail, by the Leader of the Opposition, surely must be in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I think my point was very simple and that is that only the Treasury Benches can introduce motions or amendments that require a message from His Honour, and on that particular point I ruled that the fact that the original motion had a message, that additional amendments would not require additional messages, and the point here being that if the Opposition proposes an amendment which requires a message from His Honour, that this can only be done by the Treasury Benches.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you understand what you've suggested.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think I do.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, you're suggesting that the government and the Treasury Branch could only introduce a message from His Honour, and we accept that, but then you are suggesting that the members in the Opposition are not in a position to amend it, because obviously if there is an amendment of it, if there is any variation....

MR. CHAIRMAN: They have the right to propose amendments and if those amendments

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.). . . . are accepted by the government, then that in effect indicates that the government approves of that and can obtain a message. . . .

MR. SPIVAK: That's exactly what we're doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: but the Opposition itself cannot obtain the message.

MR. SPIVAK: No, but we're not suggesting that the Opposition is obtaining the message. We're suggesting, and what has been introduced is an amendment by the Opposition which can or cannot be rejected by the House, but assuming the House was to vote in favour of this amendment -- (Interjection) -- I'm not debating the Chair, but assuming that the House was to vote in favour of this amendment, then having voted in favour of the amendment it's the extension of the original message from His Honour. We are not introducing this as something new. This has been introduced by the government and you have already ruled that it's consistent with the general scope of the Act and therefore does not require an additional message from His Honour. Having said that. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have not ruled that it is consistent with the general intent of the Act. I have not ruled at all.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I assume that if you do not believe that an additional message from His Honour is required, then it must be within the scope of the Act, otherwise an additional message would be required. Now having said that, we have a function and our function is to, in fact, introduce amendments. They may be rejected, but the amendments that are being proposed are within the scope of the Act and therefore, if in fact the House in its majority view would accept them, it's consistent with the general scope of the Act and the message from His Honour. Therefore, if you preclude us from doing this, there is no function that the Opposition can possibly perform except voting nay to everything introduced which reflects a money bill on the part of the government, and this is not the case, nor is there a precedent. We have had other examples, and I bring the example of where boards have been changed as a result of proposals from this side that it will be increased, and I refer last year, Mr. Chairman, although it was rejected but the principle was never involved, to the whole issue with respect to the Fish Marketing Board and the declaration of a redundancy. The Act, and I want you to recall this, Mr. Chairman, the Act specifically stated that a redundancy was to be declared at the discretion of the Minister. There was an amendment proposed which indicated that a person who has agreed or believed the redundancy occurred, could go to the County Court, have the judge of the County Court declare redundancy, have the Land Appraisal Branch then make a valuation with its recommendations to the Minister. This involves an expenditure of money and at that time, although the government did not accept the amendment, there was no question of our right on this side to introduce that amendment. Now having accepted that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is now in a position to introduce an amendment under (q), surely you cannot deny us the opportunity to amend this as we see fit. We are proposing something which will be an extension or an additional sum of money to be in fact spent, but it's consistent with the message from His Honour and the scope of the Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, there appears to be a contradiction between the thoughts that are expressed by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for River Heights. The Leader of the Opposition indicated that in fact there could very well be less expenditure under this amendment than under the amendment that I had presented to the House in that a judge would be acting as the chairman of the committee and therefore not be entitled to receive money. The Member for River Heights has just acknowledged that there would be an additional expenditure of money, as I understood him, over and above that which was indicated in the original amendment; and I agree with him. Certainly (iii) involves an expenditure which is not indicated in the original amendment; (iv) and (v) likewise would all involve an additional expenditure of money by the Crown as a result of the undertakings of the board in question; and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think that it should be clear that as it involves an expenditure of money which certainly was not included within the original amendment, an attempt to commit the government into other possible areas of expenditure not entertained by the original amendment, that the amendment is in fact out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the . . . to clarify the point for me as to whether or not his amendment involves the expenditure of money. If it does not, that would seem to me to lead to one conclusion; if it does, another.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, all that my amendment does is, the Minister of Municipal Affairs introduced an amendment which provides for a board. My amendment spells out the

(MR. WEIR cont'd.). . . . makeup of the board of the same size. His board is given certain broad responsibilities actually without limitation. Mine proposes some definite limitations, that it doesn't have a high and a free hand all the way down the line; as a matter of fact, it could be restricted in the sense of what his is to a certain degree. I think that probably this spells out the type of thing that the Minister contemplates within his Act except it spells it out rather than leaving it in general terms. Now I submit, Sir, that it doesn't necessarily provide for any additional expenditures of money that are not contained within the motion that was presented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that the key words of differential in that respect are first, in respect to the amendment that I have introduced, there was included the words "suffers loss of income". It contemplated that there would be compensation in respect to the affecting of one's loss of income by the passage of the Act. In the amendment proposed by the Official Leader of the Opposition, (iii) deals with the depreciation in the capital valuing of business, not contemplated by the original amendment; (iv) deals with relocation costs, of re-locating reasonably incurred and such depreciation, the value of real estate owned by the person relocated or his spouse; and there I see an intention that in the event of selling one's home and moving to another site because one feels they're unable to carry on business because of the passage of this legislation, the compensation would be paid, certainly not intended by the earlier amendment. Ald also (v) is very clear: "any town, village or rural municipality which suffers a loss of real property tax revenue" - and there is no reference in the earlier amendment for compensation to any town, village or rural municipality, but here there is a specific intention that municipalities and towns and villages would be in line for compensation because of a loss of tax revenue. And I note that even Clause (i) deals with depreciation of the capital value of an insurance agency business. So there are a number of very specific areas not covered by the earlier amendment where it is indicated that there is to be an expenditure of money, and the most obvious being that even those that are entitled to such assistance is being broadened to include rural municipalities, towns and villages within the Province of Manitoba; and certainly those parties were never contemplated as being within the ambit of the indicated legislation that I had earlier moved.

MR. WEIR: I'm glad to have this later definition of what the Minister and the government were talking about in terms of compensation. The way I interpret the Minister's amendment is that the Transitional Assistance Board, for the purpose of receiving and considering applications on the basis of a formula established for the payment of such sums of money to transitional assistance to any person - any person - my recollection of the definition in The Interpretation Act is a corporation is a person. If there's a loss of income to the Village of Wawanesa as the result of it, it could come within the ambit, it could come within the ambit of this resolution that you've got here. As a matter of fact, its interpretation could be very broad because a reduction in capital, or a reduction in the value of capital in its return to the individual is a potential loss of income. I defy anybody to place any other interpretation on it. The loss of that asset is a loss of income just as surely as anything else is lost income.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask for clarification on this point. If the government has established a fund with certain purposes, is it in order for the Opposition to bring in proposals which would indicate how that money should be spent or under which conditions or where? Because it seems to me that's roughly the position that we're in. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, if I may refer you to Citation 246 of Beausiesne, Paragraph 3, wherein it states: "The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication to which the royal demand of recommendation is attached must be treated as laying down, once for all, (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of a charge," - and this is the part I stress, Mr. Chairman, "not only the amount of a charge but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. In relation to the standard thereby fixed, an amendment infringes the financial initiative of the Crown, not only if it increases the amount, but also if it extends the objects and purposes or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a charge."

And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I go on to say that when an amendment is proposed by the Treasury Bench, it is understood as axiomatic that it has attached to it a recommendation from His Honour, because the fundamental principle of our parliamentary system of government is

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.). . . . that His Honour act only on the advice of his Ministers, and we have, and I don't believe that it's required but we do have a message from His Honour in this respect, but the putting forward of it is simply redundant to the fact that the bill as originally introduced did have a message from His Honour. Any changes or consequent amendments there- to would have a message from His Honour, and we so do, but the fact remains, Sir, that His Honour acts only on the advice of his Ministers, and furthermore, an amendment from other than the Treasury Bench that either impinges on the amount of the money involved, the public purse, or which in any way changes the conditions or qualifications, as I indicate from Citation 246 of Beuchesne, is not in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I think maybe we're losing sight of the fact of what 29(1) is. 29(1) states that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations establishing, amend- ing, revoking such plans of automobile insurance, and goes through the various sections. The power is with the Lieutenant Governor in Council; the power is with the government. The charge that will be in fact incurred on the public purse is an action of the government that is not subject to the review of this Legislature. This is permissible legislation allowing them to determine, as they see fit, the charge that is to be made, and on that basis the criteria that the First Min- ister has mentioned does not follow, because we do not have the amount of the charge. The objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications are simply the detailed regulations which the Executive Council, or the Lieutenant Governor in Council, will determine as they see fit. There is nothing that the Leader of the Opposition is introducing that becomes a charge until the regula- tions are promulgated by the Executive Council. Now, having agreed that a message from His Honour has been given, and having agreed that the amendment to be proposed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs falls in the scope of the Act, it would be ridiculous to assume that we on this side are not in a position to propose amendments to this, because the action of the Lieutenant Governor in Council will be the action that will cause the charge and all that we have here before us is the manner in which those regulations may or may not be determined by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I've been trying to speak to the very point of order before us that has been raised by other members. When the amendment was brought in by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and which was accepted by you, Mr. Chairman, this amendment indicated additional expenditures, and by accepting the amendment you accepted the principle of additional expenditures. We have precedent under Section 2 the other night, when additional members were allowed to go on the board. This was accepted, and certainly there's. . . . -- (Interjection) -- Sure there's money involved when you appoint more members on the board of a corporation. This is additional expenditure. It was agreed to. So I do not say that Section 2 did not require a message from His Honour. It was passed by this House and I see no reason why we cannot put forward an amendment as is now being proposed by the Leader of the Official Opposition. We are not aware that one will cost more money. There's been no indication as what the govern- ment's amendment will mean in the way of expenditure, how much is going to be spent, neither the Minister nor the Leader of the Official Opposition, so I don't think that can be held as an ob- jection in overruling the Leader of the Opposition's motion or amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are two points that I would like to make here. One is that an amendment which deals with or is involved with expenditures can only be made by the treasury benches. That is one point. But my main point is this, that the effect of the proposed amend- ment of the Leader of the Official Opposition is to effect the objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications of Section 29 (1), proposed amendment (q); and either the amendment is altering the purposes and objects of that section, or it is setting them, and on either count it would seem to me that this is in violation of Beuchesne 246(3) and I would consequently rule the proposed subamendment of the Leader of the Official Opposition out of order.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I regret I must challenge your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, while considering in the Committee of the Whole House the proposed amendment of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that is subsection (q) of Section 29(1) of Bill 56, the Leader of the Official Opposition proposed a subamendment

(MR. DOERN cont'd.). . . . which I ruled out of order on the following grounds: (1) An amendment involving the expenditure of funds can only be introduced by the treasury benches; and (2) the subamendment cannot extend the objects and purposes of the expenditures of the fund when proposed by members of the Opposition, Beauchesne Fourth Edition, Citation 246(3).

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before a vote is taken, I believe some of the wording in the motion is not correct, because if I heard it correctly it stated that only Ministers of the Crown may make amendments with respect to money. Added to that should be "on condition that they have a message from His Honour," which is not in the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe that the Chairman is at liberty to state his case to the Speaker in whatever manner he sees fit.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I realize that, but I'm rising on the point of order that the case as stated is not accurate, because even the Ministers are subject to the rule that it must be on the message from His Honour. And I think that we are in a bind on a previous ruling this morning, indicating that the Ministers did not need a message for new expenditures, because the very same rule. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope the honourable member realizes that in speaking at this time I have the impression that he is violating one of the rules governing our procedure at this point, and that is that no discussion is to be allowed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, surely a point of order can be raised on the statement made by the chairman of the committee. If a member of the committee disagrees with the statement that the chairman has made of what has happened in the committee, then it is proper for a member to raise the point, and the reason I raise the point is because of the citation that the Chairman has used, which is Beauchesne 246(3) because that one, if you read the concluding sentence, states that Ministers must bring in messages even for new appropriations. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . so we're out of order in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I still do believe that we are venturing on a very dangerous precedent, because the rule in Beauchesne simply states that no discussion is allowed on the appeal, and it makes no exception to it, and I doubt very much whether debate on points of order or whatever a member may wish to speak on, ought to be allowed at this time. Shall the decision of the chairman be confirmed?

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

MR. WEIR: Yeas and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question: shall the decision of the Chairman be confirmed?

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

YEAS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Beard, Borowski, Boyce, Burtiak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Molgat, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 29; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the decision of the Chairman confirmed. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, from memory, I indicated that my recollection was that the Sales Tax amendment did not have messages. I am now advised, and I so inform the House, that messages were introduced with the Sales Tax amendments. Therefore, I don't wish to leave a statement of mine, which may have misled, to be on the record without correcting it at the earliest opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, just to make a point of clarification because it may have been left in a way that was not entirely clear or satisfactory, and the question's raised as to

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) whether it required a separate message from His Honour on any amendment that may be moved by someone of the Treasury Bench. I indicated to you, Sir, that it was my interpretation of the rules and practice that amendments introduced by the Treasury Bench, subsequent to the bill of course, subsequent to the bill, did not require separate -- did not necessarily require separate messages from His Honour because His Honour acts only on the advice of his Ministers, but lest there be any insistence on the form thereof, I can advise honourable members that there has been filed with the Clerk, or with the Chair, a message from His Honour, His Honour acting on the advice of his Ministers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister's proposal that subsection (1) of Section 29 of Bill 56 be amended by adding thereto immediately after clause (p) thereof the following clause (q). Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that all those people that will be affected under this Act once it's passed will have to make application to this Board for assistance, or compensation? Is that the intention of this?

MR. SCHREYER: That is the intended procedure, Mr. Chairman. We intend to, as far as possible, follow the same administrative procedure in the case of the U.S.-Canada Auto Agreement regulations for a Technical Assistance Board which was established, and then all those with alleged cases of dislocation and transitional loss of income apply to that board.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one word. I think that this is certainly a very welcome amendment as far as I'm concerned. I don't think it can really stand by itself. I think that the next amendment that we've had the chance of reading, perusing, I think will be very important, and I'm eagerly awaiting the information of the First Minister on that. But what I like about this present amendment that we're dealing with is the broad terms of reference, and although there are certain things that were circulated awhile ago that would seem out of order that I certainly could accept, but I think that it is dangerous to tie anybody's hands. I think that if you have confidence in the people, if you're asking them to do a job, if you appoint the right people - and we'll come back to that on the next motion also - and if the terms of references are wide, I think that we could safely accept this and I'm ready to do so at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, one further question. This particular amendment refers to a formula that will be established. Can the Minister give us any indication just what this formula will be, and although we've had some remarks and statement by the First Minister in connection with compensation, is there anything in addition, any additional information that the Minister could give us at this time?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the details of the formula which the honourable member is asking about, he will understand, of course, that following the same procedure, the formula in its specifics will be set forth by regulation again just as in the Canada-U.S. Auto Agreement, Transitional Assistance Benefit Program regulation; but the outline with respect to employees is one that follows the U.S.-Canada Auto Agreement Pact, and with respect to self-commissioned agents is based not as a percentage of time served in the industry, but a percentage of sales, rather than weeks or years of employment, which I outlined in my speeches last week.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would move that subsection (1) of Section 29 of Bill 56 be amended by adding thereto immediately after Clause (q) thereof, the following clause: "respecting, after consultation with all interested persons, the establishment of a committee, to be called the Advisory Committee, comprised of not less than five persons to which the Minister, the corporation and the Transitional Assistance Board. . . ." - you will note there that the words "public insurance" has been deleted and "corporation" is substituted therefor, from your printed sheet. ". . . and the Transitional Assistance Board shall refer such matters as they may deem necessary for the purpose of advising the Minister. . . ." (the corporation and the Transitional Assistance Board rather than the words "Advisory Committee" on your printed sheet). ". . . on the nature of regulations required for the practical and effective administration of this Act, and notwithstanding the generality of the foregoing,

(i) to advise the Minister and the Transitional Assistance Board on the nature of regulations required to administer and provide transitional assistance benefits, the issuing of motor

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.). . . . vehicle license plates, basic compulsory automobile insurance, and supplementary optional insurance by licensed agents, and the eligibility for licensing of such agents and the fees to be paid to them.

(ii) to advise the Minister and the Transitional Assistance Board on the feasibility of the sale or resale of agent's licenses and of the practices in other jurisdictions where publicly issued licenses are issued in the sales of private property."

Sorry, I apparently used the word "issued" rather than "involved". It's "involved" as on your sheet.

"(iii) to consider regulations on transitional assistance or similar . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, could the Minister just repeat that correction?

MR. PAWLEY: I gathered that when I was reading I used the word in the second last line, the word "issued" rather than "involved".

MR. CHAIRMAN: And you meant "involved".

MR. PAWLEY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. PAWLEY: "(iii) to consider regulations on transitional assistance or similar programs, wherever any such programs may have been established by the government of any province, the Government of Canada, or by industry, and to advise the Minister as to their comparability with and their applicability to the requirements of this Act.

(iv) to consider the annual reports of the Superintendents of Insurance and in particular to advise the Minister on the comparison of ratios, of claims and miscellaneous cost to premium dollar revenues; and

(v) to advise on regulations pertaining to collision insurance and the no-fault principle, and to advise on the relative merits of introducing the no-fault principle to collision coverage or of leaving such coverage optional."

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, there's a message from His Honour. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this Bill, recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I don't know if I should begin my remarks by making reference to what is obvious, that the message from His Honour is something that is given on the advice only of his Ministers. This is the point in contention before. The message was received and tabled in both cases, but I repeat again that it should be clear to the point of being axiomatic that a message from His Honour and the actions of His Honour are based only on the advice of his Ministers, so

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that point has been established.

MR. SCHREYER: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the subject matter of the amendment that has just been moved by my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I want to begin by saying that it should be obvious to all that we are in fact prepared to have some of the basic assumptions and statistical data, information and conclusions drawn during the course of study of the past several months, looked at again in as dispassionate and objective a manner as possible. There are some who have alleged that we were proceeding with legislation because, even though we were not able to establish any basic proof, we were proceeding nevertheless because of some absolutely fixed predetermined ideological motivation. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if there are many precedents. I suppose - well I'm sure there are some but not very many - where a government has demonstrated that even though it is satisfied to the point that is the limit of what is humanly possible, satisfied that the assumptions and the data and information upon which they have proceeded is correct and accurate, are nevertheless prepared to have it looked at and analyzed once again in a way that can only be described as reasonable. Some would say, of course, that a government when it proceeds with legislation should be absolutely certain. We are, Mr. Chairman, as certain as is humanly possible to be, and I suggest that there is no room for saying "absolutely certain" because absolute certainty does not belong to the world of mortal men.

Now may I say that, Mr. Chairman, there have been alternative proposals put forward by honourable members opposite wherein they suggest alternative means of proceeding. Some have suggested, as the Member for River Heights, that we proceed by way of regulation. Mr. Chairman, this government has considered regulation, and I want to advise the Honourable Minister that what we have seen of efforts of regulation in the automobile insurance industry to

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.). . . . the best of our judgment was found to be unsatisfactory, because even by using that approach there are indications that the automobile insurance industry is either incapable or not desirous of operating happily within such an arrangement. As an example of that, I want to make reference to two items: one, an article which appeared just a few days ago indicating that in Massachusetts which, by the way, has had, has pioneered compulsory automobile insurance and has had it for many years. It has had that, however, under private multiplicity of firms' aegis. Has it worked well? Well, it has resulted, according to my information, in rate structures that are among the highest in North America.

But that is not the only point. My information also tells me that when the regulatory body established by the State Assembly of Massachusetts set down certain criteria and requirements, then some companies stopped sales and threatened to stop sales. So that the world we live in is one in which it is difficult, to say the least, to get agreement with some of the insurance, certain segments of the insurance industry. So I just mention that in passing, that the regulatory approach to automobile insurance rates is fraught with many difficulties - many. And not only have some companies attempted to defy the will of the State Legislature of Massachusetts, they have also made things difficult over the years.

But let me just dwell for one more moment on this aspect of regulation. I've said before and I feel it is important enough to bear repeating, that if a law-making body imposes regulations that are effective and thereby have the effect of reducing the rate of return that is enjoyed by any insurance firms or companies, then they have an argument that, because their rate of return is being impinged upon and reduced from one level down to a lower level, to that extent they are having private property and assets taken from them. Has it occurred to anyone -- well, of course, it hasn't occurred to the Member for River Heights because he wishes not -- he doesn't really wish to be enlightened. I try again to make this point, that if an industry is enjoying a rate of return, let us say, of 25 percent or 22 percent, and it has by regulation that rate set or limited or fixed at 10 percent, then to the extent that there has been a reduction from 22 to 10 or 12 percent return on investment, they have an argument that they are having their freedom of enterprise, the potential for earning assets and additional property taken away from them, and they would probably ask for compensation - probably would. Certainly they would not accept such regulation lightly and very happily.

But that's one example. I want now to refer to the Province of British Columbia. British Columbia is only one of several provinces that has established committees of one kind or another to look into the auto insurance industry and into the auto insurance system. And I am positive that no government takes action of a major kind unless it really believes - and this is legitimate enough - unless it really believes that there is dissatisfaction on the part of the public to which it is responsible. Well, this is perfectly in order and perfectly in keeping with democratic government. There's nothing wrong. Well, so there have been in many provinces committees of investigation and study of one kind or another. Some have been under quasi judicial aegis, others have been performed by committees appointed outside of government and others have been internal. And, Mr. Chairman, I venture to say that in a number of provinces of this country there is growing realization that there must be some fundamental reform and change made in the system of automobile insurance underwriting and the delivery thereof. And in British Columbia they have set out on the road to bring about some of these changes. Subsequent to the tabling of the Wootton Commission Report, the government of British Columbia drafted some legislation, and the whole purpose of the legislation that was introduced by the government of British Columbia about a year ago was to attempt to reduce rates to the motorists of British Columbia, to introduce certain no-fault features, and to provide for a Rate Review Board, which I presume would have a semi-regulatory function.

But what has been the experience in British Columbia subsequent to the passing of that legislation? There has been a situation in which the Attorney-General of that province, who happened to be the Minister reporting for insurance and piloting the insurance legislation, a situation whereby he was made to look by the insurance industry as though he had not kept his faith with the public and the Legislature of that province; because, at the time of the passing of the legislation, the Attorney-General acting, I am convinced, satisfied, acting in good faith, on March 29th, actually, of 1969, said that he had reason to believe that with the passing of this legislation there would be a reduction in rates, that the industry would cooperate, and that therefore these economies could be realized, etc. Just before the end of the year - in fact, just around the Christmas season of last year, 1969 - the industry announced what its intentions

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.). . . . were, what its rates would be for the 1970 season - announced it just before. And the announcement was to the effect that rates, rather than being reduced as they had given the Attorney-General to understand, were being increased by something in the order of \$13.00 to \$20.00, in that range.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's difficult for the Chair to sometimes interpret comments, but it seems to me that he is covering certain ground that has been covered before and I would ask him not to reopen some of the older arguments that have been repeated in the Chamber, but to attempt to deal with the Transitional Assistance Board and to only make comments which are related to that.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I accept....

MR. FROESE: I think members are interested in the experience of other provinces. I certainly don't take exception to the First Minister giving.....

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly accept your words of caution, but I point out to you, Sir, that there is involved in this amendment not just a Transitional Assistance Board but also an Advisory Committee, and I'm trying to make the case as to why I feel an Advisory Committee is justified at this time, and it has to do with this Advisory Committee being enabled to look at the experiences of other jurisdictions where they have attempted other approaches, including that of regulations.

So, Mr. Chairman, I go on to say that because of this rather unsatisfactory situation which developed, certain members of the Legislative Assembly in British Columbia took another look at the Wootton Commission Report and at the course of events that transpired in most of 1969. And one of the members of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, who happened to be a Liberal member, was moved to say that the approach, the experience or the experiment, if you like, of reform that was being tried in British Columbia was not working that well, in his view, a view that was shared by many, and that therefore the government should consider the advisability, and he recommended that the government should move in such a way as to set up an arrangement whereby the government would tender out, would call for tenders on all underwriting of auto insurance and auto accident risks, and that the government itself should function in the nature of a distribution agency. Now that is a novel kind of proposal which I don't mind anyone in the world considering, including an Advisory Committee, if it has merit or not -- I mean, to find out whether it has merit or whether it does, in the final analysis, not have merit.

Now if I, or any one of my colleagues, had made such a proposal it would of course be met with cries of accusation, of acting in a callous way, in a way that was dangerous to free enterprise, etc., etc. But the proposal has been made by others, the proposal that government tender out the underwriting of the risks, tender out to the successful firm, the lowest bidder, to underwrite all risks and then the government would act in the function of agency distribution.

Now, we are not proposing that particular course of action in this bill, but I want somebody to look at it calmly, coolly, dispassionately, objectively, to see whether it has merit, and since it has been proposed by a Liberal, I take it that there is no ideological connotation there that should frighten anyone. Now there have been other proposals too, other actions and experiments tried in other jurisdictions. These should be considered as well.

Mr. Chairman, I could go at great length, but I respect your words of caution about attempting to keep to a minimum any comments that even appear to be digressing, but I have here photostatic clippings that run to many pages about the rough sea that the government of British Columbia got into in its certain approach, which I do not reject out of hand or criticize without consideration, but difficulties were encountered; certain things that were going to be done did not work out that well; so there were charges and counter charges by members of the Assembly across one party to the other and so on, and some rather unique proposals put forward by other members of that Assembly, pretty unique proposals which at least deserve some objective analysis.

Well, I'm not going to go into all of these press photostats and clippings because that, I would hope, can be done by everyone here in their own time and by whoever will be involved in the Advisory Committee and in the insurance corporation. So now I leave all that. I leave all that and I come back to the bill that is before us now. It is suggested that we have not proved our case to the basic principle that is before us. I began in the first place, Mr. Chairman, by saying that we are as satisfied as it is humanly possible to be that we have proved the basic accuracy of our position. We have put forward data which shows that the ratio of cost claims to

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.). . . . premium dollars is much more favourable in the public interest under a public plan than under the existing approach, an existing approach which in other places have already been deemed to be less than satisfactory and so changes were being made. And members on the other side have said, "But you haven't proved your case; you have not shown that there is a substantial cost differential or efficiency differential as between your proposals and the existing approach to the provision of automobile insurance." And I have said, and I say again, that the reports of the Superintendents of Insurance, supported by allied documentation - official sources, in other words; official documentation - do show that there is a significant differential. Instead of a ratio of 62 or 64 cents to the dollar, under a public plan it is something in the order of 85 cents to the dollar on the long term average with respect to the basic plan, and when taking the supplementary coverage, and therefore the total package in its entirety or totality, it is still in the order of 81 or 82 cents on the dollar on the long term. If these figures are disproved, then the right course of action is to say that we were wrong, but if those figures cannot be disproved, then I cannot accept the criticism from anyone that we were wrong, because we will not have been wrong.

Now the Member for Riel

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would again caution the First Minister that although he is dealing with the proposed amendment and a section which talks about annual reports, he is coming close to reopening the question of first principles of the bill which has been, I think, lengthy and I would urge him to attempt to stay close to the proposed amendment and not to reopen the original debates on principle.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes. Well, Mr. Chairman

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, if I may

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . the Chairman and the members that there are . . . in the amendment that needs an awful lot of explanation, and indeed one must say that certain principles are certainly involved in here and I intend to take part in this debate and I hope that I'll be permitted the fairly wide range, and I think that the First Minister should be allowed - this is quite important - I don't think that there's that much repetition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that there can be a full discussion on the proposed amendment and that it is not necessary to dwell at length with the original debates which we've heard many times in this Chamber and which I am attempting to limit for fear of reopening them and hearing again all the arguments that have been put and all the counter arguments that have been put. I think we've had enough of that, so I think members may allude or may make brief mention but they should not get back to first principles.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I would understand your position, Sir, if it was your understanding that we were proceeding to deal only clause by clause at this point in time, but the motion has been moved as an entirety and my remarks are very directly relevant - my last few remarks were very directly relevant to clause (iv).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree with the First Minister. I just said that there is a fine line, and he was in fact dealing with that section, but that at the same time there's a fine line between moving from that to first principles.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I have never, I've never

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I think members of this House, in connection with this amendment and any proposition that the government has in connection with the compensation, we want the fullest explanation that can be given to this House and I think latitude should certainly be given

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that the member can have a full explanation without going back to the origins of the bill and the original principles and going through every clause up unto this point. The Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): On the same point of order, certainly from our group here we would certainly want to indicate to the Chair that we are always prepared to listen to the Premier of this province explain any or parts of the legislation that is being put before us.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, Premier of this province or not, under the rules of this House we are all to be treated equally and fairly, and so I do not really question your admonitions, and in any case I was never as expert on the rules as you, Sir, and therefore I bow to your admonitions. May I, however, insist that the remarks of the last few minutes and what I wish to go into now are directly relevant to Clause (iv), sub-clause (iv) of the amendment,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) because we were talking in this debate, and it became a very important feature of this entire debate, as to whether or not the case was proven, whether or not any information of a statistical kind was given or was available, and Mr. Chairman, I say with all of the emphasis I can muster that the official documentation and reports of the Superintendents of Insurance Offices were at all times available to honourable members, and we rest much of our case on the accuracy of these official documents which do show costs and claims ratios to the premium dollar in respect to the provinces.

But, one of the terms of this amendment is to enable yet another body to go into these figures in an objective, calm and systematic way and let the facts be made clear once again, and therefore it is necessary for me in this connection to make reference to the Member for Riel because he attempted to use certain figures which were quite important to the argument he was making. The figures that he put on the record, they were not from the official reports of the Superintendents of Insurance Offices. They were not official figures but figures that had been arrived at by mathematical calculations, interpolation, etc., and of course, there's nothing wrong with that; that's the way a good deal of reckoning is done in the world, in business. You make decisions and judgments, etc., but the sad fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that they were not accurate. And I would like those figures to be also looked at by this Advisory Committee. In fact I would certainly hope that the Member for Riel would make those figures available to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, if he hasn't already, so that they may in a very deliberate way be referred to an Advisory Committee so that they can be analyzed in an objective way.

So much has been said here back and forth that this was not proven, that was not proven. Basic data has been challenged from official reports. Other figures have been brought forward in counter contention. I want all those to be looked at. And in the end, if the objective analysis shows that the basic data, that data upon which we have made our assumptions under this legislation, are incorrect, I want to know too. But if they are correct in terms of the substantial differential, then I certainly cannot be moved from the position that doctrinaire positions of days and years gone by should stop us from proceeding with legislation which I regard as being right.

Now it has been suggested - leaving that subject aside for the moment - it has been suggested that we were following a course of action that would jeopardize the general economic well-being of the Province of Manitoba. The Member for River Heights made that argument the other day. It has been put forward by certain of the - certain, I say, not all, because I do not know by how many that view is shared - by certain persons of the insurance industry. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not surprised that that argument is put forward, but let me say in return that there have been in recent months indications that the economic climate of this province, actual economic performance of this province is standing up well in the face of national trends, and in fact, when we were accused in a specific way, a few weeks ago, of taking action that was going to frustrate and endanger the mining industry of this province, just two or three weeks later an announcement of \$60 million of capital investment. That is only one example. There have been others. Protestations from the member opposite that if we followed a certain course of action there would be certain machinery firms leaving this province. That hasn't happened. Protestations that if we followed a certain course of action, then there would be other negative effects. That hasn't happened. And similarly with respect to this bill; a point of view being taken by others, by members opposite, that it was somehow incompatible with the economic well-being of this province, industry in it, and the like. Well I want others with a more objective view, with an ability for greater objectivity, to go about in a systematic way the analysis of figures which we have put forward, and which others on the other side have put forward. Let's look at them all. But once it's established, I certainly would not be patient with any fixed positions that we shouldn't do it because -- well, "because someone might not like it."

The question of the agents. The advisory board under the motion that is put forward here, will be able to consider, will have referred to it by the Minister this question, because it is my contention, Mr. Chairman, that with respect to the agents, the basic proposal and outline that I put forward last week and which we had been working on for some time has great relevancy for agents. I have to admit, as I have already, that the proposal which I put forward back on the 24th of June had relevance to employees only and not to self-employed commission agents, and the basic policy intention with respect to the latter has now been outlined and it is a case of having this advisory group look at that in an objective and systematic way as well.

Now, of course, I know that there are some agents who are not in favour. That is patently obvious. But I believe it to be a fact that there are many agents who regard the general outline

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) of policy which I've put forward in recent days as being acceptable enough under the circumstances and something that they can live with without great hardship, without any enduring hardship to themselves. Perhaps there has been, perhaps there has been some anxiety that could have been dispelled if this had been made known earlier, but Mr. Chairman, may I point out to you and to members of this House that I am aware of many, many cases where programs have been implemented and it was a case of months having to elapse before regulations were drawn up dealing with the problems pursuant to the passage of that particular bill or program, problems of dislocation deriving therefrom. I mean, it is commonly known, for example, that regulations having to do with technical assistance for those displaced, job displaced, as a result of the going into effect of the U.S.-Canada Auto Agreement, the regulations did not come into effect and were not promulgated until many, many months after the going into effect of the pact itself. I do not know if that is adequate justification in itself, but certainly it is a factor which must be considered.

So we have been accused of being callous, inhuman, because we have taken a course of action which for a period of time caused some uncertainty with respect to the fate, with respect to the position of the agents, but I have demonstrated, I think adequately, that in the course of our political history in Canada, without going elsewhere in the world, but in Canada, that the political history of Canada is replete with cases where major programs came into effect and there was some dislocation caused. I don't know of any program that can come into effect without some ripples, even waves. Well then any conscious modern government must try to cope with those, and that is precisely what we are attempting to do and we seek the advice of others, as long as that advice be given in an objective and dispassionate way and is not coloured with poison, venom and invective.

A few years ago the insurance industry in this country decided that the agents were getting too much money, so they cut the commission. They just went ahead and cut it from 15 percent down to 12 1/2. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if what the agents were receiving was too much or too little, but the fact remains that the Insurance Bureau, or what at that time served as the insurance industry clearing house, proceeded to just cut the commission for agents from 15 to 12 1/2 percent. Others have made changes such as paying 15 percent on new policies written and five percent commission on renewals - and there are some variations in that respect. But they went ahead - just to show you the great compassion or private enterprise - they went ahead and without any debate in any Legislature or in the public forum of discussion, went ahead and cut the commission from 15 to 12 1/2 percent, and if they didn't like it I suppose they could lump it. Was there any kind of transitional assistance? Not your sweet life. Not your sweet life. But we are accused of being inhuman, or inhumane, because we put forward a formula which is based on that of employees in industry and in the federal civil service. Well, we have made proposed modifications, regulations shall be drafted, and we shall seek advice in the drafting of these regulations.

Some have raised the question of collision insurance, first party coverage. Mr. Speaker, I fear that you may want to rule me out of order as saying something that has already been debated in this Chamber, the question of third party liability being compulsory but first party or collision coverage not being. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I point out that Clause (u) of the proposed amendment is germane to this very point and in that connection I want to say that there are some very good arguments that one can put up for having at least a basic amount of collision coverage as being a requirement, or a condition of driving on public roads, that argument being that in having at least a standard basic minimum of collision coverage, it will be very helpful with respect to reducing litigation, litigation costs, and if that happens to a great enough degree then it is to the general benefit of the motoring public.

But I realize full well that there is on the other side the fundamental point, and I admit it is a fundamental point, that a person, while he should have to have insurance to protect others against his actions, that he as an individual should not be required to have protection against himself sort of thing. This is a position that some can argue. It really, it depends on your, sort of your mental set; it depends on your outlook on the individual in society. You know, the role of the individual in society is not an easy one to define. There are those, if I might be allowed to wax philosophical for perhaps just one minute, Mr. Chairman, there are those who have the interpretation that the individual in society should be allowed maximum freedom of action and if it comes to that fine line where his actions are impinging on the well-being of the entire society of men, well, you give the benefit of the doubt to the individual.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) And there is the other point of view that the individual in society should be given maximum freedom possible, or individual initiative and action, but when it comes to that fine line where his actions may tend to impinge on the well-being of the society of men, you give the benefit of the doubt to the society and you legislate in society's interest. And so there you have that unending philosophical difference in view that has existed since time immemorial and will continue to exist to eternity.

In a sense, the argument here with respect to first party coverage, at least to a basic amount, really derives from that difference in approach to life and the role of the individual in society. But it's difficult to be dogmatic about these things. I can respect the point of view that would argue the way the Member for Arthur did yesterday, and Riel, with respect to this question of collision coverage, but there are other very compelling arguments as well. I think this Legislature, both sides of this Legislature, can well afford to have, again, a group, an advisory group look at this question in a calm, dispassionate and objective way and to advise thereon.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think government should seek advice. I think government should seek advice, and of course this happens in any case. That is why there are boards and commissions appointed by government with respect to different matters, water resources, hydro development, telephone system management, educational matters, curriculum, etc. etc. It has a right to hope that the advice will be given objectively, otherwise it isn't worth that much, and therefore I wish to indicate to honourable members that the advisory committee which would be established would be so constituted that it would be representative of the different interested groups in this connection. It is commonplace for governments to do this. We are prepared to do it here.

Unless there be anyone here who thinks that we would be inclined to somehow appoint to it people who are only on one side ideologically, they can disabuse themselves of that right now, because I don't believe there has been any government that has been as fair in respect to -- (Interjection) -- Well, I didn't even finish, so how do you know? I hadn't even finished the statement and the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney is already questioning it. I know of cases in the past, not particularly pleasant, which I don't want to go into now, about governments, when they come to office, immediately or almost immediately replacing all persons on advisory boards and commissions and boards and agencies, and packing it with their own supporters or those who are favourably disposed, either partisan with a capital P or in the generic sense with the small, whatever it is, small letter. Mr. Chairman, I point out that this government has, since it's come to office, retained many of the people who have been, who were on the boards and agencies. We have retained many of them and we have appointed in our own right people, some of whom were not, not only not members or supporters, but who in fact have an established career with another political party, or other political parties.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one who is partisan in the blind kind of sense that used to prevail in politics of years gone by. We do have a right to expect respectable, calm and dispassionate judgment from people whom we appoint. That is all we ask. That is what shall be done.

Having said all this, Mr. Chairman, the following should be clear, that we are satisfied, on the basis of the best judgment we have, that the data and the statistics, the figures in other words, that we have brought to our attention are accurate and that the judgments we have made thereon are the right judgments, but because we are not arrogant in the sense that we believe that we are absolutely right, we are willing to have others take yet another look - but systematically, Mr. Chairman. Systematically.

Those who were afraid of things being rammed through and going into force, into effect without proper time for checking and re-checking, can again disabuse themselves because I have already indicated that there will be no going into force or into effect of a universal compulsory insurance plan until after a certain date, which I have indicated, until after there has been some systematic additional study and until after this Legislature has had time to ponder and reflect on their own judgment and on the calm objective judgments of others. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Member for Crescentwood have a question?

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): The question, which I have written out so that there would be no possibility of it being misinterpreted: Will the preparation of the regulations by the Cabinet and the putting into operation of the corporation await the completion of the study of the advisory committee, or will it go ahead notwithstanding the possibility that the committee will not have completed its work as defined by the amendment?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I understood the honourable member's question

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) correctly, I am able to advise him that this would be under-way concurrently, that the drafting of regulations will be done in the normal way but there will be cross reference back and forth with respect to the advisability of these regulations and in any case the regulations respecting the universal compulsory insurance aspect of this will obviously come before this Legislature in some form or another for debate, honourable members by substantive motion or Throne Speech or whatever, so there can be no misunderstanding about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, tempted as I am to enter into the full-flown discussion following the First Minister's statement, I am going to not do that; just point out that I hardly think that a close scrutiny of the appointments by this government would warrant the pious approach that he has taken, that I think all governments appoint people that are -- your own stripe people shouldn't be disqualified, let's put it that way, from doing their service through public office as a result of belonging to a political party. Those of us that belong to political parties should be the last to feel that people should be discriminated against for that reason, and there is no -- (Interjection) -- same thing. - opposite parties. It shouldn't matter less. And I have never complained on the basis of the appointment of somebody who is a member of a political party of the government on the basis of that alone, or in opposite parties, as long as the prior qualifications of his ability to serve being the ones that govern, and any pious approach, and may I say that the close scrutiny of the orders that have been passed in the last year, I don't know that they are all that much worse, but I don't think that they are any better. I certainly don't think that they are any better than the history in Manitoba has proven when you see the kind of contribution that has been made by boards and commissions, and members of boards and commissioners, in the history of the province of Manitoba and the contribution that they have made over the past number of years. I think by and large the contribution that people that have been appointed to boards has been recognized as being a very satisfying one and that, generally speaking, they have done a good job and there shouldn't be slurs cast about the appointment of those people if they have done a good job while they were in office, and I wanted to set the record straight on that.

As the Chairman has said, it's been gone over in quite a number of ways and from quite a number of directions during this session of the Legislature, and I have looked at the First Minister's amendment; I've listened to him; and I think I know what he is attempting to achieve, and if I do, then I agree with what his aims are. In coming to that agreement, I have some suggestions to make in terms of how the committee might be made up and on what the terms of reference should be in relation to it.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have a motion that I would like to move now and I have a further motion which I would move later, but the one would depend on the passage of the other. To be fair to all members I would like to distribute copies of both. If the first motion is ruled in order and if it is passed, then I would move the second motion when we reach Section 64 of the Bill. If it is ruled out of order - and I'm sometimes wondering what's in order and what's out of order these days but I await the judgment of the House on that matter - then of course my amendment to Section 64 would go by the boards because it wouldn't be applicable in that case. And so, without going into any further detail, and I think based on the explanation given by the First Minister . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): . . . to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I had several questions I would have liked to ask the Minister to clarify, things in my own mind - could I have leave to ask them? because . . . ?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I don't think, being in committee and the First Minister being a member of the Treasury Bench, I think at any time following he's at liberty to ask the First Minister questions so that my speaking in between makes no difference in that relationship. -- (Interjection) -- No, it wouldn't, because it's on the same subject matter, on the same point, and I don't think it makes any difference. If it was an ordinary member of the House, then I think that you would be in difficulty possibly in addressing questions related to remarks that have been made, but I think they could be framed in such a way that the same answer could be got from any member of the Treasury Bench.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that the Member for Churchill address his question or make a statement after the Leader of the Official Opposition has completed his remarks.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I move that the proposed new clause (r) of subsection (1) of Section 29 of Bill 56, be amended by striking out all the words after "(r)" and substituting therefor: "appointing a committee, to be called the Advisory Committee, comprised of a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench for Manitoba, one of two persons nominated by the Insurance Bureau of Canada and one of two persons nominated by the Insurance Agents Association of Manitoba, and two persons appointed from among such persons as the Lieutenant Governor in Council considers advisable; such Advisory Committee to enquire into such matters as are set out in Section 64."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . before you start to read, whether it be one word, five words, or thirty-five words, of the amendment, that it might be just as well to take this under advisement and, since it is approaching -- since it is the noon hour, to simply have the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise? Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, your committee has considered Bill 56, reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. GREEN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Cultural Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

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