

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, August 10, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motions; 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 Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bill: 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 Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 56, Section 1. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I think that I was just recognized before the lunch hour. I'd like to say that I miscalculated this morning. I was under the impression, and I still remember debating on the motion to go into committee, but this decision has passed -- I was under the impression that we would receive or I thought, or I was expecting that we would see the amendments, if any, coming from the government and also those coming from the opposition and I thought that I would have a chance to look at these different amendments, to consider the bill, to listen to the statements, if any, coming from the First Minister or the Minister piloting the bill; but this wasn't to be. It wasn't my intention and it isn't my intention to start debating on all the motions, the amendments that will be made. I feel that the only way that I can - speaking for myself anyway - deal with this is to deal with the bill, with the whole bill, and I know I can't do this at this time - I imagine I would be out of order - besides there are some amendments that will have to be clarified. So I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am choosing this method; that I will deal with the Bill at the first opportunity that I have - after I suppose that we will finish the clause by clause considerations, and at this time I will state my position as clearly as possible, and I'll try to give my reasons why I am deciding to move as I will.

But as this is the first amendment dealing with the question of monopolistic against the competitive plan, I think that I should say a few words.

Two little words "frantic fanatic" apparently is causing a lot of trouble. A certain Minister is not too happy and of course I don't blame him. I didn't expect him to be happy, not more than I was when - or that I am when I'm called "Judas", an opportunist and I'm told that all the people who voted Liberal are stupid or asinine or not sincere or that they are not interested in people.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I will.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether anything that I have said in this House would draw him to the conclusion that I had some problems with regard to words that he has used?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I haven't got a guilty conscience, for the information of my friend. Oh, I'm sorry. I haven't named anybody. I'm saying that I don't like it any more than he does. If anybody has a guilty conscience well then this is fine. I think that I'm saying in effect that I understand that my honourable friend did not like these terms, not more than I did when I was called - he knows that he's never called me a Judas, so he knows that I'm not referring to him on that, so I'm just explaining why I understand that he feels as he does.

Now it is not my intention to lose time, Mr. Chairman, by engaging in repetitious and pointless arguments on every motion that we're going to have, but if any members insist into forcing me to debate I'm saying at this time that I'm ready to accommodate him or them.

I think this may be, because it seems an indication - and I say it seems - again that these words will come back quite often that I said, so I think that first of all we should see in the context, in what it was said; in fact I will quote my exact words. I said that I liked the Minister,

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) I respected him, his sincerity should never be questioned, and he probably has more ability than anyone else in the House; but the fact remains that at times - it wasn't a blank coverage, I said at times during the debate on Bill 56 he was nothing more than a frantic fanatic, and that, Mr. Speaker, is scaring the hell out of Manitoba.

Well, Sir, what is a fanatic? The Minister said today or tried to - or he believed - I'm sure he believed, I said that I don't doubt his sincerity - that I was saying that because he had fixed ideas on something; because he was very strong - and I'm not saying that. To me a fanatic is somebody that says, that admits, that brags that they have prejudice, to start with - and that they will be guided by those prejudices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . to interrupt the honourable member but I would remind him that we are debating a section of the bill which deals with the question of monopoly or competition and I don't particularly see the relevance of his comments at this time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, if you'll bear with me, I think you'll understand exactly that I'm zeroing on Bill 56. I'm saying this, what in effect I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is that I respect the right of people to have fixed ideas on anything and it was suggested that why wasn't Mr. Lang called a frantic fanatic. Well, this would be hardly appropriate. Somebody who is a member of the Liberal Party, a Cabinet Minister of the Liberal Party who is in effect stating, was known as a supporter, usually anyway, of free enterprise, who is saying that he is ready to concede that under certain conditions a monopoly might be advisable, exactly what I said when I spoke on second reading, Mr. Chairman. Mind you, a man like that probably could be told that he doesn't know his own mind, that he's a Judas, that he's an opportunist, but hardly a frantic fanatic.

Sir, I say also that a fanatic as I said is somebody that works on his prejudice and admits it and says so publicly; and that says it's not important to talk to the industry, it's not important to talk to the people involved because on the last count ideologies will determine what we're going to do; that's the name of the game; that's final. This is what we must have. Well, Sir, I don't agree with this. I agree with the rights of people to have their own ideas. I agree with the rights of people to be determined, to know what they're going to do even before the bill is introduced, or at first reading, or at second reading. Mind you, most of the members of this House did exactly this. They said what they were going to do on second reading, and that was supposed to be final, and because I chose to accept the system that we have of demanding three lectures, three readings I should say - the first reading to advise the people that there was a bill coming, that it would be distributed; and then the second reading where all we're supposed to discuss are the principles and where oftentimes the people are either for or against principles, and this is a right; but also where some people will accept certain principles, reject others and saying that they are ready to accept certain principles when they have the facts. Now this is not knowing your own mind. Our old system is rotten and we've wasted 75 hours in a committee a few weeks ago. It was a futile exercise. But I happen not to think so. Mind you the fact it was so evenly divided, I might say, some for and some against, and the majority did not want to hear anything else, did not want to listen to anything that did not agree with what they thought. Now I don't think that this is right. This made it - well I shouldn't say that I don't think this is right, but I think that other people should certainly have the right to listen, and I think that it made it an awful lot more difficult for myself, for instance, because the people that were vitally affected, they were fighting for their lives - seeing how the battle lines were drawn - felt that you should - if you weren't a fence sitter you should know by then exactly what you wanted and you should never change; and I don't subscribe to that. I tried to say what I thought a fanatic was; and a frantic fanatic was probably one that's jumping up and down, that is not interested in even letting the other people listen to what is being said, and that seems over protective of some of the people that are wishy washy like myself, that want to know what's going on, and this is why I stated that. I might even say that this is constructive criticism because I do think that the people of Manitoba were afraid, were worried with the attitude that we had, and I repeat this. Where was that, in . . . in briefs.

A MEMBER: Not in my constituency . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, all right. Mr. Chairman, this is my feelings and I feel that I want to go through the exercise of going through the different readings before I make up my mind. I am not going to listen to the few who are quite anxious to place the rest of the people, to work in this hot debate that we're having, to maybe trying to precipitate an election. I don't think this is my duty, and I certainly don't think an election at this time would mean a damn

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) thing because the people of Manitoba haven't got the facts not more than I have, and I will do everything I can to prevent an election at this time. I know how far I can go and I expect that others have the same feelings as I have. If I can negotiate, I'm not hiding, it's not a question of ultimatums or deals, it's a question of trying to see if, I hope, people with a little bit of brains can get together and see what's good for Manitoba. And if we can't - and this is not the case where people are fanatics because they do not agree with me - but if we can't after getting the facts - after sitting together, trying to arrive at some worthwhile legislation, well then and only then do we have the moral right to go and call an election.

I'm ready for an election. It might be the best thing that ever happened; then I would have an excuse probably to quit and do away with all the things that we've been going through. But I for one am not ready to say like the Member from River Heights that the people are not buying this plan; nor like the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that they are buying the plan. I don't really know, because the people don't really know. Twenty percent maybe, but 80 percent of the people I don't know. And they want all the facts, they want all the facts. I'm not stick handling or wishy washy. I said that I have no big hang up on private enterprise, and I've said that many times. I could do like Lang, but not just because two or three Ministers are saying it or 57 members in the House are saying it. I wasn't elected to look around and be a rubber-stamp; I want to see what this means. Right now. I can't honestly say that we must have one or the other. I would prefer - it's no secret - I would prefer the competition, the free enterprise. I recognize that it might be difficult. And that has been done by others before, by the Conservative, by the Liberals, by the New Democratic Party in Ottawa when the Liberal Government brought in Medicare. And Medicare is exactly the same thing, exactly the same thing. It is a monopolistic plan. Sure you have a choice of doctors, but you'll be allowed to choose your own doctor for your car also, you'll get it repaired where you want, but where will you buy insurance. This is the important thing. This is exactly the same that we had. So I will not buy, I will not panic because the New Democratic Government is suggesting something that has got to be socialism or communism, when for years the Liberals and the Conservatives have been doing the same thing.

I was disturbed by the attitude of some of the members of the government, and I submit that many people are, because for one thing I have deep concern; I want to make sure that this is not the start of socialism just for the sake of socializing or for ideologies, ideas like some people want. It is now clear to me that some people want this and this is their right, but I have my rights; and my rights and my duty is to see, to try to get as much information to keep my options open and then to try and negotiate with some people, who are just as sure as others, just as sure as others that their way is the best way, but who are ready to start this dialogue that the people of Manitoba want; to change the attitude that we have, the atmosphere that we have; this question of hate and divisiveness - to change that - to sit down without being branded a communist or a fascist; without being branded stupid; and yes, I hope without being branded frantic fanatics. Where we could sit down and fight for what we believe in, but not expect everybody to look at the situation through our eyes and our eyes only; to try to see the problems; to try if we had prejudice and if we admit that we have prejudice, and we all have - at least to say, I will not base my arguments only on prejudice; I will try to look at things through the eyes of an agent who is fighting for his life, and is it worth it? And I will try to look at the people; not only at the agent, but the people affected and to see if they are getting a fair break. I think that if we do that we won't need this election. We could go on to bring in other legislation and we don't have to scare the people of Manitoba for partisan reasons. I think that the only way that we will be able to tell or at least that the people of Manitoba will be able to tell, or at least that 80% or even if it's 5% of the people of Manitoba, is when we get all the facts, and it would be wrong to try to push an election at this time, because we haven't got all the facts. I have nothing but respect and belief for the First Minister as you all know, but I am not obligated to say it's the best plan, because he says I am sure, I am positive, because he has the facts - I want to see the facts.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, I don't intend to prolong this debate, I'm not going to back down from any debate, I don't know if we are going to gain anything at this time. I wanted to explain, so we don't have this repetition about maybe the name calling, that I did. Maybe it was rough and I respect my honourable friend and maybe he'll never forgive me; but it was meant to be rough, because it's rough for the people of Manitoba, because it's rough for the agents and our attitude has to change completely. If we are sure of what we are going to do ourselves, let the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) other people have a chance to say what they think, what they want and mind you then, if we are still sure we can go ahead and vote as we want. And even if there was one member of this House who wants to take advantage of our parliamentary system, who wants to not make up his mind on second reading, because certain important principles to most of the people are not that important to him, he doesn't want to start a big war to fight to see if monopoly is going to destroy Manitoba, because he doesn't believe that, but he wants to get all the facts, I think that he should be entitled to do so. I think that the people that come here, that the time that we spend in this House where some of us, many of us were abused, where we stood for 75 hours in the week that we spent in the House last week and maybe the days, the hours or the days or maybe the weeks and months that we will still spend in this House, I'm not ashamed of keeping my option open. I'll never duck a vote and I'm not going to be scared by anybody that's going to try to brand me a Communist if I go along with this, but then I won't be a rubber-stamp either, Mr. Chairman. I don't intend to take part in the debate on all these motions, I know there will be a lot of amendments. I, this morning, recognizing the rights that the members of the Conservative Party had, nevertheless suggested that maybe it would be easier, it certainly would be easier for me, if I was given the amendments so I can look at them, and this has been denied me, so I'm not questioning their motive, that's up to them, but I know what I think. I think that maybe certain people feel that it would be more embarrassing if we don't see or if I don't see the motion before us, so I am not going to worry about it, I'm going to keep this thing open. I've tried - as you know I voted against going into committee at this time. I was alone on this. I suppose that my first occasion to choose the way that I want when I'm ready - I'm ready now mind you but after I heard the comments on certain amendments when we probably, I'm sure there will be many motions, but probably the one to report the bill, I will then say exactly what I intend to do and try to give my reason why in the meantime. Unless I am forced, or unless I want to ask questions for clarification, I don't intend to take part in this debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Chairman, I hadn't really intended to get into this debate at this particular point either, but the Member for St. Boniface indicated that something had been denied him, which was a distribution of the amendments that we had for Bill 56.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . I'm not suggesting that it's been denied me by right, I'm saying that a request was denied me.

MR. WEIR: I realize that, but I just want him to allow me to finish if he will, because I was standing up, I rose to respond to him, when I was interrupted by the House Leader, I was interrupted by the House Leader on another point of order to say that I shouldn't respond, notwithstanding the fact that the member for, I believe it was Churchill and yourself had been allowed to get in on points of order and I sat down in response to the request from the House Leader. Now we are quite happy, and we have our amendments ready, Mr. Chairman, we are quite happy to distribute them. Before we do, I would kind of like to have had an indication that we had all of the government amendments.

It's kind of hard to say exactly in terms of our amendments until we know what kinds of amendments there are coming from the government. Now it's fine for the Member for St. Boniface to stand up and say that something is being denied to him that we are quite prepared and willing to give and which I intended to do when I was ready to move our first amendment. As a matter of fact, we've got them all on two pieces of paper. We don't have that many amendments for the simple reason that most of it is voting against existing sections of the bill and the amendments are drafted in such a way, in such a way, Mr. Chairman, that it would leave a Crown corporation which could establish a voluntary plan; and if all of our amendments were accepted - we haven't changed our view, Mr. Chairman, we would still vote against the bill as amended - but we recognize what we are trying to do in our amendments is to take out the things that we like the least, to make it as palatable as we can, notwithstanding the fact that we don't like the principle in the first place. This is our aim, this is our objective and I'm attempting not to get into extensive debates on matters of this kind and to try and not repeat myself at this stage of the game, because I really think that unless the government has some more information to give us, that we have made up our minds, we would be prepared to reconsider on the basis of new information, but there really hasn't been a new word said in quite a little while, on the debate, Mr. Chairman, so we are not contemplating on lengthy debate unless we find

(MR. WEIR cont'd.): a reason for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Chairman, I apologize for the fact that I wasn't able to hear all of the remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, except the gist of it, as I have had it explained to me is that the Honourable Leader is wondering whether there are any more amendments yet to come.

I can advise him that all of the amendments which we propose to move have been distributed now, with the exception of the very last section of the bill which is the proclamation section. The Honourable Leader will recall that I indicated in my speech the other day that the proclamation would not be sooner than June 30, 1971. This would be the intention, and of course it has been pointed out to me that that hardly requires amendment because the proclamation date would be so set. It's been announced and would be so set not sooner than June 30th; any time thereafter it would be proclaimed assuming that all else proceeds to that.

Now it's a matter of indifference really, it's a matter of mechanics, whether the last section of the bill is amended by adding the words "not sooner than June 30, 1971" but in a sense that would be not required because it stated that it would not be sooner and the proclamation would not be made sooner.

MR. WEIR: . . . Mr. Chairman, that answers my question and the main reason for not distributing our amendments was that we might very well have amendments that conflicted and we've got enough trouble keeping order in the House without having conflicting amendments being placed on the table from both sides. With this indication I don't think there is anything that conflicts and I'm prepared to have our amendments distributed to the committee now to be considered as it comes along; but lest anyone misunderstand - I have been trying to speed up the work of the committee and enhance it, not be difficult.

MR. SCHREYER: Just one further point of clarification. I indicated in my remarks the other day that the plan would not go into operation sooner than June 30, 1971 and therefore it would be proclaimed in that way. There are sections of the bill, however, that have nothing to do with the operation of the basic auto insurance program as such but which have to do with, for example, the establishment of certain committees, boards and so on which would have to be proclaimed sooner. May I put it this way, the essence in terms of the operation of the insurance program would not be proclaimed prior to June 30, 1971, as I indicated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I have a few more words to say with regard to the proposed amendments and my remarks will be rather general and wide-ranging as well but they deal essentially with the suggestion, Mr. Chairman, that members of the government are not prepared to take advantage of all of the proceedings in the House. Mr. Chairman, I would urge that the Member for St. Boniface, in particular, pay some attention to my remarks, because he is the member who introduced this subject.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, at the outset that at no time have I expressed to my honourable friend in this House some notion that he should not have used words which he used towards me. I can tell him that I have no problem in this connection. He will find nothing in my speech of this morning, which indicated any feeling on my part that he used those words. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I, this morning attempted to show that I took the matter rather lightly rather than in the serious vein that he now speaks of.

However, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has seen fit to underline what he was saying and to give reasons, which is a good thing because I've had to live with this kind of remark before, and somehow I've waded through it, somehow in the last analysis, my constituents judge me, I attempt not to deal with honourable members on the basis of general remarks, I know that, as I indicated this morning, people thought that the way to get to the Member for Inkster if to call him a Doctrinaire Socialist, and they did that for a long time - I never ever complained about it - it never bothered me. Other people - yes it's kind of interesting, it gives me a mark of distinction.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): On a point of order, are we to hear another speech from the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources . . . because I feel he is not speaking to the subject before the House at the moment, and that has to do with the amendment.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm speaking on the debate with regard to the suggestion that the amendments at committee were not given full weight to and there is an amendment

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) before the House which the Honourable Member for St. Boniface said that he wants to pay great attention to, or that we should be listening. I'm attempting to suggest as to how I deal with those amendments and how I listen and if the Honourable Member asks me, do we have to have another speech from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the answer is yes, I'm going to speak . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the Honourable House Leader that there is a fine line between relevance and getting slightly off the topic and I would urge him to try and keep his remarks close to the amendment and not wide.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I find it rather amusing that the suggestion can be made, because perhaps the words of the Member for St. Boniface are now looked upon and detailed and torn apart almost as much as the words of Chairman Mao, and that I am not permitted to deal with this question; and I wish to deal with this question, Mr. Chairman, I wish to deal with this question.

The Member for St. Boniface this afternoon indicated that he thought that I was upset and I'm merely indicating to him that I at no time expressed a problem. That this is the kind of thing that has happened in the past; it's happened with my own colleagues and I have managed to survive it. It's not a problem with me and I assure him that he should not worry about me in that respect.

The Member for St. Boniface then says that he is taking advantage of the legislative procedure to keep an open mind, to get all of the information, and he appears to indicate Mr. Chairman, that somehow unlike the rest of us, he is giving this matter a much wider exploration, a much more unprejudiced exploration than any other member in the House. He's almost Mr. Speaker, suggesting a new standard for legislative behaviour. I know that the Member for River Heights when he went to his populace, to his electorate, he went on the basis of industrial development of Manitoba, through the best salesmen of the province. He wasn't objective as to whether or not this was the best approach; he told the people what he was going to do and he went ahead and did it.

The Member for Pembina he went to his people, and he said we have got to do something about all those freeloaders who are on welfare; that was his pitch to his electorate; he didn't come here and then say, well, I really don't know how I feel about welfare. The members of this party and other members in the House, and I deign to say the Member for St. Boniface, he went to his electorate on the notion that he had certain ideas and that he was going to work for the implementation of those ideas in the House. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, of a single member of any party who went to the electorate on the platform: I am going to go to the Legislature and keep an open mind. I have never heard it said; I have never heard that expressed as a matter of legislative program; that my job for you people will be that I will go to the Legislature; I will not tell you what I think now, but when I get there I'm going to keep an open mind.

Mr. Speaker, what I want the Honourable Member for St. Boniface to realize, is that all of us, unless we have read nothing, or unless we are completely idiotic and imbecilic, we have ideas about how things should be done and part of the political process is the sale of those ideas; and some sell a little harder, some sell a little less hard. But Mr. Chairman, of all people, the Member for St. Boniface is one of the hardest sellers - and if we take the word "hardest sellers", and I wouldn't be unkind to him, because I don't know whether he can withstand the kind of words that I have withstood, but if I was unkind I would say "frantic fanaticism" - for certain ideas that he has demonstrated that more than any member that I know in this House.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should know that when I came to the Legislature, the colleagues in my party told me that the Member for St. Boniface, he is the most uncompromising, the most singly directed person, that there is no use talking to him, he will try to get his approach across no matter what happens. Mr. Chairman, I know that members are asking what has it got to do with it; I'm talking about the approach to the amendment and I know they don't want to hear it. Well Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Boniface has just spoken for 15 minutes on this subject, and I have a privilege of continuing.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't object a darn bit. In fact I'm very happy.

MR. GREEN: The Member for St. Boniface doesn't object. I want to relate the member's attitude on this bill. And I don't blame him, Mr. Chairman, for not being fully in agreement on this bill, because I have always known the Member for St. Boniface to adopt propositions which essentially in their broad are contrary to what we are suggesting here. Therefore for him to say that he is not sure, or he has no idea, or he is not certain or that he wants to

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) be given proof, is perfectly understandable. The only thing that I object to is him saying that on this issue the rest of us are bigots and he is the one that is keeping an open mind.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I never said that. I never said that in my life. I said - on a point of privilege - just a minute now, just a minute. I called him a frantic fanatic but nothing else. I never said that in my life but I said - in fact I went out of my way to say you had the right to determine even before the Bill was brought in, but I, even if I was alone, had the right to take advantage of all the steps before voting on the final vote and I haven't ducked a single vote. But if I'm denied that right, or if I'm told that I'm wishy washy or I don't know my own mind, I object to that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I interpret the honourable friend's remarks, him to have said that a group of people were not prepared to listen; a group of other people were not prepared to listen and that he stands distinct in this Legislature in that he is prepared to listen, and all I'm suggesting to him is whether he knows it or not, he is . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: You might not be too far wrong, mind you.

MR. GREEN: Now I'm telling the truth because I put it in such a nice way that it makes the Member for St. Boniface appear to be head and shoulders above everybody else - he doesn't mind that. I'm suggesting to him that on this issue he is being as subjective as any other member, that every member in the House, in any political party, has to be talking from time to time about accepting a general program which he may not entirely agree with because it happens to be that he thinks that the party as a whole moves in a direction which he thinks is good for his ideas.

But Mr. Chairman, I want the Member for St. Boniface to contrast his present behaviour to the behaviour which he expressed when the Leader of the Opposition - I'll give him the word "gradualism". I've never heard such a violent attack as I heard from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface because the Leader of the Opposition was using a word "gradualism" when it dealt with the use of the French language in the Province of Manitoba, and the Member for St. Boniface at that time was not the "holier-than-thou", was completely objective, prepared to listen, prepared to wait, prepared to judge each step through each reading; he was, may I suggest, a perfect parallel, he was exactly as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is on the Bill, Bill 56, and what the public should do with regard to automobile insurance.

And I want the member to know . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Introduce aid to private schools now, that's coming.

MR. GREEN: And he'll be just as subjective on that. So, Mr. Chairman, I want the honourable member to know that what he calls this directed position, that he may not be aware of it, but that if it were not for a certain - what he would term "frantic fanaticism" on the part of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that one of the programs very, very dear to himself - that is the question of the use of two languages, of the fact that Canada is not an Anglo-Saxon country, that Canada is a country of two languages and many cultures, that it's that kind of frantic fanaticism on my part, which had something to do with that issue being a major issue of the New Democratic Party, not only in its policies . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. GREEN: . . . but in its election campaign. And I was the honourable member to know as well that very many of my colleagues and very many of his friends told me that on this issue I should tone myself down, that I should not be so outspoken as I was, and still I was outspoken and I went back to my constituency in the north end of Winnipeg which they said that I would lose if I used this issue, and Mr. Speaker, for some reason the voters in Inkster, despite this frantic display of fanaticism did return me with 71 percent of the vote, which is higher than any candidate in the Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, what he calls frantic fanaticism with regard to one Bill, let us at least recognize - and this is all that I'm asking - let us at least recognize that it's merely a subjective view of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface - nothing more - that this Bill is not important in his mind as it is in my mind; that this Bill is not as important in his mind as to demand that kind of push which he himself would give to other legislation which he is completely subjective about, and that we are all here relatively fallible human beings, relatively subject to the same emotions - perhaps the Member for St. Boniface and myself being a little bit more directed on certain issues than other members, but I, no less than him - because Mr. Chairman, he said and he was referring to the committee, he said that people were jumping up and

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) down in committee and he chose to single out two things that were said, one that was said by the Chairman of the Citizens' Committee, Mr. Hicks, who suddenly gave the Member for St. Boniface support for the fact that it's the position that he's taken, which I don't understand entirely, but I believe I have some understanding of, and words that I said. I said that the Liberal Party succeeded in getting only four members in the last election -- and Mr. Chairman, I wish the Member for Ste. Rose was here because I was dead wrong. He says I'm always right and I admit I was dead wrong, and the Member for St. Boniface

MR. CHAIRMAN: I again appeal to the House Leader, as I would appeal to all members, to attempt to keep their remarks relevant. I feel that the member is directing too many of his comments to another individual and that he should attempt to keep the amendment before his eye and concentrate on that.

MR. GREEN: Okay, I'll try. I'll try and complete my remarks, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I want to advise the Member for St. Boniface that he has indelibly put on my mind for all time, and forever and a day, that he was elected as a Liberal, that I will never forget that, and he has certainly done and I will never forget it and I won't make the same mistake

MR. DESJARDINS: And you were told that before.

MR. GREEN: That's right and I will never make that mistake again. So I want him to know that that is the case.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the conduct of people at committee because members of the government benches have been singled out, remarks have been made that "members of the government bench scare me."

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur - one of the witnesses at the committee said that the only difference between this Bill and what happens in Russia is that this Bill doesn't say you will get shot. The Member for Arthur

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I did not say that.

MR. GREEN: I never said that you said it; One of the witnesses

MR. WATT: All right. Well, retract it, then; retract that I said that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I never said that the Member for Arthur said it. One of the witnesses at the committee said that the only difference between this Bill and Russia is that in Russia you don't get shot. The Member for Arthur then said to the witness, "There is nothing in this Bill that says that you won't get shot." That's what the Member for Arthur said.

MR. WATT: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. I ask the witness if he saw anything in the Bill that said he wouldn't get shot. He was the one that said

MR. GREEN: Suit yourself. If you want it that way, the record will show what you said.

MR. WATT: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . member has a point of privilege here.

MR. WATT: My point of privilege is I want to ask the government on that side of the House if they're filibustering their own Bill and what for.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, if the members of this House unanimously tell me that they will vote right now, I will sit down. Does anybody else wish to speak? There's other members wishing to speak. I won't sit down.

The Member for Arthur said there's nothing in this Bill, or he said, Is there anything in this Bill

MR. WATT: There's a difference

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order.

MR. GREEN: . . . is there anything in this Bill that says that you won't get shot? Implying, Mr. Chairman, that the New Democratic Party would just as soon leave out of the bill that the witness would not get shot. Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't have said this but the member brings it up and I tell him that innocent people were shot in Canada in the streets, but not by New Democratic Party Government. I want to tell the member that he is now talking about his brother running for a party, because his brother in Arthur constituency now seeks the nomination, that he now talks about his brother joining that kind of a party that wouldn't guarantee that people wouldn't get shot.

Mr. Chairman, let's leave the Member for Arthur.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Order, please. The Member for Swan River is raising a point of order. The Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I am simply asking would you please exercise your authority in order that the business of this province can go ahead instead of having to listen to what we are listening to today and have listened to for so many times; we don't need to hear it again.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, where conduct of members and listening to people at committee is brought up, I think that's a general subject; we are now in committee talking about witnesses and people coming. The Member for Sturgeon Creek, because somebody was behind him and uttered a remark that he didn't like, this was a citizen member . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I'm not sure that a discussion of some of the goings-on in committee or some of the comments of honourable members is especially relevant to this amendment.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Boniface in both his addresses, in both his addresses, saw fit to comment on the fanaticism of not single members but other members of this party and I want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate his subjectivity . . . he takes himself to be objective and I have the right to comment on it too. That the Member for Sturgeon Creek - and let it be on the record - some person said something behind him, the Member for Sturgeon Creek said "If that guy doesn't shut up, I'm going to knock his head off." That's what he said about a citizen. That's what he said about a citizen coming to Committee meetings.

The Member for Lakeside -- (Interjection) -- Okay. The Member for Lakeside saw fit . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Whatever it is that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface said about a "frantic fanatic" obviously was correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I first say to the Member for Ste. Rose, that was no point of order. I would also like to say -- Order, please. I would like to say to the members of the gallery who are present that although they may have certain preferences and non-preferences, that they are not allowed to demonstrate by applause or any other matter their favour or disfavour of any speaker and I would ask you to please restrain yourself in that regard.

I would then also say to the House Leader that although the Member for St. Boniface may have deviated from strict rulings of the Chair, may have ranged a bit, I don't feel that I can allow every member to take advantage of another member making wider remarks or remarks off the subject because then there's eventually no control, and if everyone uses that as a precedent, I'm trying to draw the House Leader tighter to the resolution before us, because other members will be directed in the same manner. So although the Member for St. Boniface may have gone a little wider I would also ask the House Leader not to do the same.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I was only answering what was said this morning.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the fact is that I know that the members of this side have been maligned, have been referred to in this way, that their conduct is scaring the people of Manitoba. All of these things have been said. Nobody has indicated which portion of their conduct, nobody has thought to say at this particular time, this particular person said this, but our side is supposed to listen to the Member for St. Boniface and anybody else, and the Member for Ste. Rose, to the fact that we are scaring the hell out of the people of Manitoba, without chapter and verse, without anything of that nature; but when we start getting down to the specifics of what happened where and when, members of the opposition say no, don't say it, don't let him talk, and the reason they say it is because the specifics speak very loudly against them and not against the . . .

So, I won't say any more, Mr. Speaker, because I know that the very protestations from that side of the House and the very remarks that the Member for Ste. Rose made, because he still will not be able -- why did I demonstrate frantic fanaticism? Because I pointed out that the Member for Sturgeon Creek said of a citizen member who came to participate at the committee, said of him, "If that guy doesn't shut up I'm going to knock his head off." I never ever said anything like that in my life about a citizen coming before a legislative committee. Mr. Chairman, I know that you will not let me and I know that the shouts from the other side will drown me out, but I could go through every single member of that committee and show where the frantic fanaticism lies, and I could show it chapter and verse.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The proposed amendment. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): This probably will be the last time I'll speak during

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) the session so I do want to say a few words about the amendment. I can't match the Member for Inkster's sense of drama or his 71 percent; I only got 39 percent.

There were some points raised in the debate which I thought I'd want to mention. There's some confusion I know over the Saskatchewan results with regard to surpluses and savings and what have you and I thought I would just mention, as far as I understand, the facts are these: that the accumulated surplus of both the complementary and supplementary government insurance is in the order of 11 to 12 million, taking both into account. The annual savings in premiums is in the order of \$5 million; the investment since 1945 of the Crown corporation is about \$32 million. I could be wrong to a degree but I think those are generally the correct figures.

The Opposition has said over and over again why not try regulation; and I think that Mr. Tatlock the President of the Insurance Agents Association gave the answer. He said in a newspaper account that yes, the industry would like to co-operate in regulation and that over a seven to ten year period he is sure that some adjustments could be made. I think that is the attitude of the industry as expressed by its spokesman and that is what we have to contend with here with regard to regulation.

The Member for River Heights, absent as usual, talked about priorities in government take-over and he mentioned bread, milk, shoes and what have you, these are more important than automobile insurance and why don't we do those things first? Of course he's one to suggest these things to us. Of course there's a very simple answer, and that is that we know by the experience in other jurisdictions that there are major savings to be made in automobile insurance and we can't say that at this time about these other industries and that's why we can't proceed. We know by experience and by fact that these major savings can be made to the people in this area and we have proven it, and that's why we think we can proceed. We can't say that about other industries and of course, it would be the height of irresponsibility to proceed in these other areas without the kind of evidence that's required.

Now I want to make some general remarks about the amendment and about the bill. I think that there are four reasons why the bill is important and it is important to pass the bill the way it stands, with our amendments, and to defeat the amendment by the Member from Portage La Prairie. Many of these points have been raised before and I think I can go over them very quickly, but there is one that I want to say something about because it hasn't been mentioned here today and is rarely mentioned during the debate over the past few months. There is the question of savings to the public which the Minister of Municipalities has shown through the reports of the Superintendent. The Wootton Report has indicated that in their studies, and I for one would gladly stake my academic credentials that the evidence is there, the logical evidence is there, the empirical evidence is there and I don't think that there is much debate over that, regardless of the antics of the Member for River Heights.

I would say to him that if it isn't \$5 million savings it's only \$3 million savings, that that's still more than all the monies collected by mining royalties by the previous administration on an annual basis, and I think even that is a substantial saving for the people of Manitoba.

Secondly, however, there is the human factor, which again the Minister of Municipalities made so much of in his remarks and I think that everybody will understand his sincerity there, and that is of course the anxiety and the discomfort, the waiting, the never knowing whether or not you are going to be covered by a major accident and so forth.

The third argument in favour of the bill standing the way it is is the shifting of funds - 30 to 35 million dollars shifting from the private sector to the public sector. And I want to say just a few words about that because that seems to be a neglected factor here and, to me, that I think is more important than the savings. The reason why it's important is that here you have an industry with 30 to 35 million dollars available to it to invest according to where it can maximize its profits - and very often outside the Province of Manitoba, it should be made clear - and according to where the profits are greatest, which usually means meeting the several wants of people with money and neglecting the real needs of people without money, because profits aren't usually able to be made there, and what we are saying is that we are shifting that money, we're making those investment dollars available to meet real needs - public housing, education, public recreation. We think that's very important and that's why this industry is important to us, one of the reasons why it's important to us, because we are able to shift priorities in the Province of Manitoba by having these funds available to us to meet the needs that we feel are the real needs of Manitobans.

(MR. GONICK cont'd.)

Then there's a fourth matter, and that's the matter that I want to dwell on because I think that's been neglected entirely, and that is that we have an industry in this province which, like all other industries in the private realm, decisions are made behind closed doors, in secret board rooms, and usually outside the Province of Manitoba; in any case totally inaccessible to the people. I think what we have done here, what we propose to do here is to take this industry and open the door so that the decisions with regard to coverage and rates and all the vital matters that affect people will be accessible to them through their elected representatives, through the hearings that will be held, that will be held each year in reviewing the performance of the corporation.

I want to tell honourable members we held a meeting in Crescentwood, the NDP Association there, to which 500 people came and attended. Our association invited spokesmen from all the political parties and from the insurance industry and from labour and we had a two hour, three hour discussion and debate in which everybody, most everybody participated who wanted to participate, and after the meeting one person in particular, many people approached me but one person in particular approached me and said he wasn't convinced yet one way or another about our approach to automobile insurance, but he said this is the first time in his life that he had ever had an opportunity to discuss and hear arguments with regard to the performance and the approach of a vital industry, and he said that's all the difference in the world to him and on that basis alone - even though he didn't have the facts, the total facts, the total picture and couldn't make up his mind with regard to whether our approach was correct - the idea that he was able to come to a public meeting and discuss the merits of this program, discuss it with ministers and with members of the opposition and the industry, he said that was an opportunity he had never had before.

I recall myself during the hearings on South Indian Lake when the Manitoba Hydro decision was being examined, re-examined, the same thing occurred to me that we had here again, because it was a Crown corporation whose decision was being re-examined, again we had a review, a participation on the part of the people which simply isn't available through a private company - to the people through a private company. So what I am saying here is we have a kind of democratization through taking this industry out of the private preserve and moving it into the public preserve, which I think is an accomplishment which hasn't been given sufficient attention during these debates, that for me that is one of the most important reasons why it is important to proceed in the way that we have suggested.

Now this leads me to a kind of general comment that I want to make before I complete my remarks, and that is that the debate over public automobile insurance goes beyond economics, it goes beyond human suffering that has been given some attention to during the hearings and here in committee. It concerns I think the question of who are the real rulers of the Province of Manitoba. Until June 25th I am convinced the real rulers of this province was never the elected representatives, it was always that handful of men outside this Legislature who control the commanding heights of Manitoba's economy, the grain exchange - I'll name them - the insurance companies, the giants of the real estate industry and their associated law offices. This group I am sure, no more than 50 men along with their mouthpieces and the Free Press and the Tribune, have always been the real rulers of this province and the kingpins behind the Liberal and Tory parties. They always knew that, regardless of which of these two parties were to be elected, that their interests would always be well served. They knew that as few concessions as possible would be given to the people to satisfy sentiments for social change - and I mean social change which would hurt their monied interests. As long as Tory or Liberal governments were elected and re-elected, they knew that what the people were electing was nothing else than a kind of administration of the status quo. Of course some are better administrators than others, some are better promoters than others. One team may be better than the other team, but essentially it's the same program with a different administration.

Now we have a new government, Mr. Chairman, that appears to be no longer at the beck and call of the business community, the leaders of the business community of Manitoba. This government has taken something away from big business in Manitoba for the general good, as it sees it - and I think it proved over and over again that it is for the general good - but businesses will not allow government to take things away from them that easy and we expect that, and if we didn't expect it on this side then we didn't know what politics was all about. We understood full well that this would occur but that doesn't mean that we would therefore bow to their

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) wishes, and that is the difference I think between this government and the previous one.

It seems to me that the result of this struggle - and I think that's what it has come to be over Bill 56 - will determine whether anything consequential happened on June 25th last. It will determine whether a small elite of business magnates and their allies will continue to reign supreme in Manitoba or whether for the first time, since the demise of Louis Riel and the founding of Manitoba, the common people shall reign.

I want to therefore complete my remarks by a comment which was aroused by the discussion of the last few minutes which disturbed me, as I'm sure it probably disturbed other people. It seems to me that what is happening in this province is this, the business community no longer has its political parties, Tory or Liberal, in office and that's why, for the first time probably in the history of Manitoba, it is having so much trouble with the Legislature. But it discovered I think one last weapon, a member of the House that has chosen to act as a saviour of Manitoba against certain of his colleagues. What has happened I think is that he has seized control for himself. He has used his special status to take power. He's afraid that the leadership of this government has shifted to dangerous persons, and I think it has shifted in fact from the First Minister, but not to the dangerous persons he's talking about - not to the red radical from Crescentwood or the frantic fanatic from Inkster or the King Kong from Thompson - in fact I think it shifted to the Member from St. Boniface and it hasn't just shifted, I think he's taken it, and that's the situation that I think has developed.

MR. SCHREYER: I rise on a point of privilege because there is something implied in the last few remarks that would lead one to believe, to think that somehow the normal functions of the office of First Minister are being exorcised in a way different by me than is to be normally expected, and that the judgment which a First Minister is to apply with respect to problems and public policy, that I have somehow, in some way, given that responsibility over to someone else. If that is the implication I want a retraction; if that is not the implication, I would like clarification.

MR. GONICK: I'd be glad to clarify that and it won't require a retraction because that was not the intent. The intent was not that the First Minister had yielded any authority that he has but that a certain member has attempted to seize, through his own means, taking advantage of his own position, the direction, the political direction of Manitoba.

I only have one other thing to say and that is that I would prefer that the people of Manitoba choose its government, choose its program, choose its legislation rather than one member who seems to have become the political director of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I think rather than refer to a member, I wish the Member from Crescentwood would refer to the constituency please.

MR. GONICK: The Member from St. Boniface.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I ask the Member for Crescentwood to continue.

MR. GONICK: I have completed my remarks, Mr. Chairman.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize the Member for Lakeside, I would like to direct the attention of members of the Assembly to the gallery to my left where we have a visitor, Mr. Leo Bernier, who is the Member of the Legislature for Kenora in the Ontario Legislature. On behalf of the members of the Assembly we welcome you here today.

COMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE (Cont'd.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, it becomes very difficult for the members of the opposition at this particular time to stay glued to their seats in our effort to process this bill and get to what I am sure many people are waiting for - and when I say people, I mean the public of Manitoba - that is to bring this matter to a head and to begin voting on the bill when we are in fact subjugated to speech after speech by government members to the point where it can be legitimately called a filibuster.

MR. SCHREYER: How many?

MR. ENNS: Well, I can start naming them off by your speech, Mr. First Minister, of

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) some time ago which took in the afternoon and then a sudden adjournment, then followed by a speech by several others, two of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and we have -- but that's not the point. I don't want to get into the business of arithmetic but I do have a few comments to make, Mr. Chairman, with respect generally to the bill before us before we deal with the amendments, and, Mr. Chairman, they are sparked primarily because of the last speaker. I am very glad that he chose this opportunity to speak, because, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that since the outset, since the introduction of Bill 56, we on this side have called it a blank cheque. We have called it a blank cheque for numerous reasons, but the biggest reason is insofar as how it affected us as members in this Chamber in bringing about a reasonable level of debate to the matter before us. It was very difficult, we had few facts, a great number of assumptions, and the core of the matter being left to the government's judgement.

So what did we do, Mr. Chairman? We attacked it from all fields that we knew how and knew of - and, Mr. Chairman, I don't mind saying to you that some of the thrusts that were taken by the opposition, including myself, did not particularly satisfy me. I think I would also say generally that many of the representations made by the public, and in specific the insurance industry as represented by their agents, left a great deal to be desired in the sense that they were unduly personal, unduly vindictive, and in many instances, many instances brought in an aura or a level of debate, which ensued either between committee members at the committee hearings or here in the House, which again left a great deal to be desired.

But, Mr. Chairman, let me explain why. Let me explain why - and we attempted this at the beginning. We started calling it a socialist program, but that's when the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources got up and delivered one of his finer speeches this House has heard this session and indicated to us very clearly, very pragmatically, how and why they, that is the New Democratic party, arrived at the decision with respect to Bill 56 and how he himself arrives at any particular position, whether it's socialist or capitalist or free enterprise, it doesn't matter according to his reasonably well thought out speech that he gave us on that particular day.

But today, Mr. Chairman, at this late stage of the bill before us and of this session, we now have the other member of the G & G caucus getting up and telling us what so many of us have felt, what so many of the public have felt generally, that really better automobile insurance coverage is not the main consideration by the government opposite, as he expressed it, that to him the shifting of funds was equally important and indeed he said - and I don't want to misquote him but I'm going by memory only - he said that it was just as important, if not more important if in fact there was any cost saving involved, that this wresting away of control from the past vested interest was really what attracted him to the bill and what made him proud of being a member of that government at that day. This is fine, Mr. Chairman, but, Mr. Chairman, I have attempted on numerous occasions, only to be labelled as somebody pulling a red herring across the path, to label that government, as they probably should be labelled as a Socialist government for the Socialists that they are, and now we have proof of it in the closing speech by the Member from Crescentwood who laid it on very clearly, it is really the class struggle that he wants initiated in this province, the wresting away of controls from those 50 people . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Will the honourable member permit a question? Well, it's just a question, Mr. Chairman, to ask the honourable member if he would not agree that in every political caucus that there is a spectrum of views and that in a Conservative caucus there would be those who are more conservative than others and that in a caucus such as this there is the same kind of phenomena?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the First Minister's difficulty, but you see the spectrum, that rainbow spectrum that we're getting over there makes it very difficult for those of us that are colour blind, and I may say that I am to some extent colour blind. I keep seeing Tory blue, you know, only and I admit to that.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the point that I want to make and I don't wish to argue with that point, I have tried to make it, I've tried to ask them to be - and I was called up short - I don't recall, Mr. Chairman, whether you were in the Chair or whether it was the Speaker, I had to make a retraction I believe. I used the word "deception" with respect to how this program was being brought forward and promoted by this government to the people of Manitoba.

Now they can't have it both ways, Mr. Chairman. They can't have it both ways, Mr.

August 10, 1970

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) Chairman. If this government wants, on the one hand, to have most believe that auto insurance is a good program, public auto insurance is a good program because it makes economic sense, because it makes administrative sense, because it can be delivered better, that's one set of facts. However, if they at the same time also want to have us believe that this is the first big step in wresting away control of the vested interests, in tearing down our structure as we know it and in accusing and pointing the fingers of guilt to the Free Press, the Tribune and the 50 beautiful people in this city, that's fine too; that's fine too, only I, as a member on the Opposition, I just want to play the game fairly. I don't want to accuse my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources for taking an ideological approach, a doctrinaire approach to this if that's not the case.

I'm simply asking, Mr. Chairman, in order to keep politics honest in this province, in order to keep politics honest in this province from an ideological point of view, that that's important that that be straightened out, because today again - and we've heard it and we've seen it come I think more and more to the fore in the last speeches of the House Leader - that really in effect what we are having here is the drive, the culmination of an ideological approach to this piece of legislation, and it was strictly supported by the speech by the Member for Crescentwood who, if nothing else - I think it was attempted earlier on in the session by the Honourable Minister responsible for this Bill, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs - but certainly in the last half hour the Member for Crescentwood has set out the class struggle that we are apparently entering into, that this government is prepared to enter into.

MR. GONICK: On a point of privilege, the struggle that I discussed was a struggle which was initiated, not by us but by the people who opposed this Bill. If there's a struggle it certainly wasn't one that was initiated by this government.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't take argument with the Member for Crescentwood, I think the Hansard of the day will show precisely what the Honourable Member for Crescentwood has indicated with this respect. But I only want to point out, and this is really the only reason why I got up, because it does, you know, it does have a cleansing effect on my own person and those of us who have charged this government with approaching this, of rushing onward into a Socialist program in the Province of Manitoba, as being vindicated for having taken that position with respect to our debate and discussions not only on Bill 56 but on other bills that have been presented before us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that you yourself would have to - although you can't nod in agreement because we would not want to violate the impartiality of those servants of this Chamber or those that are in the Chamber or those that are not in the Chamber - but I recognize that you, as a fair Chairman, do appreciate what I'm trying to suggest to you, that the struggle that I speak of has been initiated by the spokesmen for the government opposite.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make one final remark because I see the Minister of Finance resuming his seat, and I want to indicate to you, because others have made some general comments with respect to the Public Utilities Committee hearings, and I want to indicate to you that the thing that frightened me most about those hearings was initiated by a line of questioning that the Minister of Finance chose to pursue at the Public Utilities Committee. I must say that I took advantage of, and that -- but I've already said that I didn't particularly care for the level of many of the representations, but they did not concern me. I could understand that coming from people that were vitally concerned, that saw their life savings disappearing, saw their pension plans disappearing. They had reason to be exercised. I have had occasion to see other people when they're exercised on other issues, so I have some compassion or some understanding for people who feel that their very livelihood or their very way of living is being threatened or changed, so we can expect intemperate outbursts.

But what the Minister of Finance indicated early on in the hearings before we broke for the interlude frightened me most when - I forget and I suppose I should check with the transcripts just who the person was he was questioning, but I'm sure the Minister will recall - we were attempting to establish the income levels obtained from this particular representative of the agents, and he wasn't the only one that indicated this, but he indicated that he worked, 60, 65, 70 hours a week in an effort to develop this business, in an effort to earn this income - and the income wasn't very high - and the Minister of Finance questioned him, why, why would anybody work 60, 65, 70 hours for that particular income.

Mr. Chairman, that question, that question frightened me the most. That question frightened me the most with respect to having an insight and an understanding of what that

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) government and what that Minister's attitude was with respect to those individuals in our society who are prepared to work hard, to work diligently for something that they feel that they are capable at in the effort to develop something that they can call their own. Every farmer does it at one stage of his life. I know the Minister does it himself. I'm sure he's working 70 hours a week right now and has probably done so in the tenure of building up his own private practice, but you see this is the all-powerful government approach to the people of today, that they will build up a government elite and as long as we can regulate the masses to 35 hours a week, we'll regulate them into a nice gray mold. Don't give us any opportunity for that individual to surface and to aspire to those things that he's been led to believe are available in this country.

Mr. Chairman, those are the very things, that is that very intangible thing that has brought so many people to our shores in the first instance, the question of opportunity, the ability to be able to put in hours, long hours, not regulated by government, not regulated by organized labour, if one so chooses - if one so chooses. But the incredibility as expressed by the Minister of Finance that somebody in this day and age, in 1970, would be prepared to work 50, 60, 65, 75 hours a day in an effort to build up a private enterprise - or a week - that astounded the Minister, Mr. Chairman, and that astounded me, that that should be coming because it is indicative to me, it is indicative to me of the attitude the government has towards those in our society who prefer to work for themselves, who prefer to do something for themselves and not lean on big brother, not lean on big government.

I felt so sorry, Mr. Chairman, for those many individuals who attempted to put on a good show of independence in front of the government and us legislators, who proudly said that we do not want welfare, we do not want to become dependent on the state. They didn't realize, Mr. Speaker, that's precisely what the government wants. The Minister of Crescentwood earlier said in an interview to the papers, he said let the agents work for the government, because of course that is the Socialist answer to all the problems of manpower, all the problems of unemployment these days - let everybody work for the government. Let everybody work for the government, and in that little innocent by-play of questions between the Minister of Finance and this particular witness, some of that philosophy, admittedly well below the surface, but some of that philosophy showed through and it disturbed me, Mr. Chairman. It disturbed me principally because it came from a source that I have a great deal of respect for. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I think that all of us who have worked on behalf of what we thought were the people of Manitoba in respect of improving their quality of life, making their lives meaningful, have always thought in terms of having proper hours of work, a decent return on their efforts, a proper wage so that they could bring up their children and live a full life within their society within their families. I don't know any member of the Opposition or anywhere in this House who doesn't believe that there are many many things in this world that are worthwhile but that many people don't have the financial opportunity or the hours available to take advantage of the fine things.

Now the Honourable the Member for Lakeside tried to interpret what I said in his way. I don't accept that. It's true I've worked many many hours in a week but I was fortunate that I could work many many hours in the interests of society and in the interests of people and not only in the interest of earning a livelihood. Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside, he too has been in the same position. I don't believe he begrudged the time he spent and I think he would like to have more time available to him to do it, but certainly for the hours he works at earning a livelihood, he would want to get a good return on his effort and I would support him in that, I would support anyone in that, but when I hear of people who are working 60, 70 hours a week and maintaining just an ordinary living with a poor return at a low hourly rate, I feel that those people are entitled to have a better return and I have a right to indicate that I think it's a pity if people do not get paid properly for the effort they put in. If that's the line of questioning that frightened the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I'm sorry, but I feel that that was important.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a bill, we have before us an amendment. The principle is very clear. The principle is whether we do proceed by way of the plan as proposed by this government or whether we do that which this government feels would destroy the effectiveness of the plan, that is to bring in just another company into the auto insurance field. I think the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) question before us is clear. I think it's not that simple because the fact is the Bill is an extensive one. There are other amendments that are proposed which will indicate from the government's standpoint how the government feels it can proceed with integrity and with a plan which is feasible. The government now asks the Legislature to give us that authority to proceed with the Bill, to expand on its plans, to review its plans, to present its plans as they are developed, and that is what the government would now like to do. I believe there's been ample debate. I hope we can go on with the question so that we can deal with it and see whether the government has the authority of the Legislature to proceed or not. I would hope that we have that authority.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly on the motion before us brought forward by the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party to amend Section 1. At first I wondered just what position to take, because as a member of this House I am completely opposed to business being established by a government and to be run by government and therefore I didn't know whether I should support amendments at all. But on the other hand, if I can improve the Bill if it has to be passed, then I think it is incumbent on me to support such amendments and I even might bring forward some amendments myself later on because of the situation that we're in, that we are facing.

Certainly the amendment before us would make the Bill more palatable in that it would provide for competition. I agree with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when he says that this just makes for a duplication of services if we set up a corporation and have it compete with private enterprise. I've maintained all along that there's no need for such a public corporation, that we are being serviced and I think fairly satisfactorily. As I have mentioned previously, there are ways and means of improving that service to our satisfaction if we so desire, and we can amend other Acts accordingly so that this can be done.

The amendment before us will allow for the private insurance companies, for the other carriers to provide a service in addition to the Crown corporation and I certainly subscribe as a member of this House to competition. I know the other day when I spoke, the First Minister pointed out that the private insurance companies had combined together and that there was in fact very little competition. However, I felt that if you make it a Crown corporation there is no competition.

I would like to read some paragraphs of an article of the Free Press, June 8, 1970, entitled "Champion of Individual Freedom." This is reported by F. S. Manor and carries excerpts of what Mr. Ludwig Erhard said when he was in this city some time ago. He first refers to Keynes and then the article goes on: "Professor Erhard had little time for the new economics, econometry and similar doctrines. 'Reject this,' he said. 'The only way to maintain prosperity for all is to ensure that there is vigorous competition. This will never change. There can be no freedom without competition, no free society that does not accept individual achievement as its moral standard.'

"During the Prague's reign the Czech Communists tried to adapt socialist market economy to the Communist system and the Czech economists even went to Germany to consult Professor Erhard but it could not be done. Competition requires freedom as much as freedom requires economic competition. This of course does not mean that Professor Erhard would advocate a laissez faire policy. The strong must be curbed and the weak protected, but they must be protected as much against strong corporations as against a strong state. Today, the community requirements in public health, education, transportation, etc., grow apace and to meet them the state needs more and more money, but when the state begins to take a huge chunk out of the citizens' income to meet commitments dictated less by economic criteria than by the . . . that strange spirit of our times, then is the time for the citizens to cry halt. One must not accept this. One must oppose it. Otherwise the free citizen will soon become an obedient subject of the state."

I think I should read a few more paragraphs because I think they are so relative to what we are discussing in this bill and what is being brought forward and I continue.

"Professor Erhard, a cheerful man whose entire philosophy is based on his optimistic faith in mankind, confided at the end of the interview that his own optimism was wearing thin. 'I cannot deny that I am deeply concerned' he said. 'Authority is disintegrating everywhere and democracy is being clothed in a very strange garb. Democracy is an abstract term but it is being turned into an active verb. The modern slogan is to democratize, and by democratizing

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) we lose the democracy in the process. Everything has to be restructured but we are given no hint of what the new structure is to be. The young are afraid of life, they are frightened of the insecurity inherent in human existence, and this leads them into a trauma.' "

There is one further paragraph I think I should read into the record too, because I feel that that is also very worthy of note. "Professor Erhard reminded his audience - this is at a further meeting made up of members of the learned societies meeting in Winnipeg and of a large number of students - "that since he had opposed the regimentation imposed by the Nazi totalitarianism, he cannot feel happy to see western society fly into another variety of an all-embracing collectivism. Personal freedom should never be sacrificed to growth for growth's sake. Voicing the same concern that he expressed to me earlier in the afternoon, Professor Erhard lamented the loss of faith by the western world in its own moral philosophy and political foundations. 'Western society appears tired and guilt-ridden, ready to make room for minorities that have no creative capability. There has been too much compromise with the enemies of freedom. A life worth living is only that in which a citizen's own achievement and merit count and can assert themselves against the power of the state.' "

I think these statements are very true indeed and, as we have seen, the people that are being directly affected by Bill 56 certainly have brought this out in the committee hearings. They came out very strongly and in large numbers to tell us in no uncertain terms what the effect of that bill would be on their lives and on their particular enterprises, and I for one certainly cannot subscribe and go along with taking away these businesses from them, to write them out of existence by the stroke of the pen and by accepting the bill that is before us. Certainly the amendment that is being proposed here will allow them to function and to continue, and as I have pointed out, I don't see the reason for establishing a Crown corporation to compete with them because the services are already there. I don't think they need be duplicated, but certainly under the circumstances I will support the amendment that is being proposed by the Liberal House Leader.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the proposed amendment. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we have had an interesting debate this afternoon and if my deskmate and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will discontinue their debate, then I'll talk to you. I would ask, though, that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources hold back a bit, because it's darn hard on my cigars. The Member for St. Boniface is going through them like a bat out of hell.

I think one of the other bright prospects, Mr. Chairman, was that the Minister of Finance got up just a few minutes ago and advised us that he is prepared to bring forth a raise for MLAs. He said no one should work these long hours, and I would hope that this message will get through to the reporters, the people who hire the reporters and such on, and perhaps we'll all get a raise - and that does help on these long, hot summer days.

Now we'll come back to Bill 56. It's quite an interesting bill, and particularly so when I went back and with the help of some of the assistants in the House I read my first speech on Bill 56, and some people may not feel I am as consistent or I am inconsistent, but maybe that's why I'm an Independent - and that is not a lead as to how I am going to vote. I feel, if you are talking about philosophy, Mr. Chairman, that I have a right to listen to people and if I didn't change my mind once in awhile, or if I didn't review my thoughts, then I would be living 100 years ago or I'd be living into what happened when I was a youngster, so I don't go for consistency. The Member for St. Boniface always wants to be consistent, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources wants to be consistent; well, I say, let them be consistent. Maybe they're consistently bad.

I don't really think that Bill 56 is very desirable in my mind, but I live with many things in this life that really aren't desirable, and unfortunately for me, many of the things that aren't desirable for me are desirable for many other people. So where do we go from there? We have to make up our mind as to what to do with Bill 56. The Leader of the Liberal Party says vote for your friends and I'm just not sure who my friends are. It's very difficult. I think we should have a caucus of two or three. It's hard to make up your mind you're talking . . . one.

I think, though, that in Bill 56, and in getting to the amendment I do believe that in speaking on whether it be monopolistic or whether it be competitive, we have to consider several things; and (1) - I may wander a bit but I think that (1) should be, what action are we going to have for the relief of the Town of Wawanesa? I believe the second is, what action for the relief

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) of the car insurance agents? And I believe that this is one of the important things that will be passing through my mind as we go through the remainder of Bill 56. I believe that there is room for action in co-ordinating industry and government to develop good legislation. I think as it was first developed there was room for improvement. I think with the indications from government that they have moved, and this takes the arrogance out of the bill that made me speak the first time as far back as May 15th; and I hate arrogance although I may be arrogant, but I hate arrogance in others, and I would hope, I would hope that they would continue to look into what has been done, to stop referring back and using as a crutch what other governments have done.

I don't think that the people of the Province of Manitoba want an election today. Maybe there are some politicians that would love to get out and campaign - I'm darn sure the car insurance agents want to campaign and I'm sure there are people supporting government that would like to get out and campaign. But what does this represent? Twenty or 25 percent of the people of Manitoba? I don't think so, not even that many. So there are 80 or 85 percent of the people in Manitoba that have not indicated to us in any way that they want an election, nor shareholders in Manitoba and taxpayers and the ones that are eventually going to pay the bill for this election have indicated that they are willing to pick up the tab for an election. Besides, I don't think the political parties have got enough money to put up a good show. Certainly I think, in looking at the gallery these days, that we are outdrawing Rainbow Stage and -- (Interjection) -- that's freedom of choice.

But the big hang-up, one of the big hang-ups has been, of course, regulations and whether we should pass the bill allowing government to go ahead with the bill without knowing the regulations, and I have sat in this House long enough to hear it prior to this government coming into office, and unless we change our ways we will hear it when other governments are in this office, but I just wonder whether we don't see a change, because when I look at the motions that are being considered I feel that possibly here, where we have Bill 56 coming before us now, not until June of '71, assures us that this cannot in effect become effective until that date, and in between that time there will be an advisory committee which would be set up to bring in regulations of which we hear so much about, and I would presume that we will have the right to debate those regulations at the next session.

So I think this is a step, a step in the right direction, and I certainly am prepared to give the First Minister credit, along with his Cabinet in bringing in that forward-looking type of approach, and I think this has come because of hard, long talks of probably some negotiation, of listening to the Utilities Committee, and while many of us thought that that was many long hours of repetition, then I think that in many cases it has proven that repetition is good and can become effective.

I would also congratulate the government in deciding to accept the fact that perhaps we weren't all right and perhaps there was room for improvement, and if this is the case, then I have come a long way from when I spoke on May 15th. I think there are many ways to skin a cat, and I am very ready to listen, and I have tried to think that this would be my approach throughout this bill. I have changed, as I listened through Utilities, and felt that rather than take that hard-nosed approach of either I am going to be for it or I am going to be against it, I would like to give the opportunity for further negotiation because I like to refer to it in the fact that we are in a postal strike now because people have given up negotiating, and strikes continue because people say, "We can no longer negotiate." If we can continue to talk and government can continue to listen, then perhaps we can come to that position, that happy position, where we can find a meeting place - not for everybody, because there will be many who have made up their minds and if they have made up their minds then there's nothing I am going to say this afternoon to change their minds, and I'm not going to stand here and try to change their minds. All I'm trying to do is justify the road that I will take in the next few days. I think that in being ready to listen that we will hear probably things that we may not have heard before, because we often listen and we don't hear the real things that are important.

Personally, I would like to point out that there's been not too much pressure put on me; there's been none from my constituency - and I had to throw this in to make sure that you, Mr. Chairman, realize that the supposed poll that was taken in Churchill did not change my opinion because I'm just not sure, and it was my friendly colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs who first told me about it but I don't know whether it was after I had voted or whether it was before. I'd like to think it was after I had voted the other day. But the beautiful part is there

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) isn't a road from Churchill, outside of Churchill, to southern Manitoba but I think the Minister of Transportation may be helping us along that way. That wouldn't be a reason for supporting Bill 56 but we always live in hope. Most of the communities in the Churchill constituency don't have a road, if you did have a car to drive.

MR. SCHREYER: Inasmuch as the federal Minister of Transportation has suggested that there might be some merit in considering the possibility of discontinuing rail passenger service if whatever was saved by way of discontinued subsidy there, would be applied to road construction, and knowing the views of the people of Churchill, could I ask the honourable member what sort of Churchillian he is, whether he is one who prefers high calibre rail passenger service or a road instead of.

MR. BEARD: We would like both, Mr. Speaker. So I don't know; I haven't run any statistics on it, but I suppose it's safe to say that probably 80 percent of 75 percent of the people in the Churchill constituency don't own an automobile and with their skidoos the Minister isn't going to licence them up in that area so we're safe.

I was kind of interested in the Member for River Heights' discussion with the Member for Crescentwood on the cost of bread, etc., and what should be done about it. I just throw one question out to them: The bread in some places in Northern Manitoba is 50 cents a loaf so maybe we would like to have something done about it.

The Member for Crescentwood referred to the Minister of Municipal Affairs' speech the other day in tackling this from the humane factor and the fact that there are accidents every day, and I would say yes, that's right, but let's also not forget the anxiety of agents and those people in the car insurance industry who have had to live with this and who will have to live with this for a year. So we have them on both sides, and anxiety of agents may in fact cause as much damage as some of the accidents to the people that are involved in them.

In the reference to South Indian, I would say that we said that we had no right to expropriate that area until we had compensated the people and had negotiated that compensation in a proper manner before Hydro were allowed to carry on with their work, and Hydro had five years to ask for that permit and Hydro didn't, and consequently the people of South Indian lived with that hanging over their heads. . . . rumours to be true, as I have said before, the people were not as consistent that were working for Hydro - and this was not the top level; I'm talking about surveyors and such on who went out there and said, "Well, you people had better learn how to swim because that rock up there, that's 35 feet, that's where the water's going to be." Or, "You better build canoes big enough to put your boats on." "You better buy a bathing suit."

So compensation, I believe, has to be an integral part of the Bill 56, and the negotiations between this government and the insurance agents, and it's unfortunate, I think, that really we hadn't had a trial run such as the Utilities Committee before the Bill was introduced. If that had been a fact, then I think perhaps we could have looked at it and would have been looking at it in a much different manner, but be as it may, we can't change that and we can't change the suspicion in the minds of agents, and this is what bothers me. If we, as Opposition, become deeply entrenched in the fact that we are against Bill 56, that it cannot be monopolistic, then we are in fact saying we want an election. But if, on the other hand, we vote for it and we can trust the First Minister and his Executive Council in the proposed amendment in which there will be an Advisory Council set up with wide terms of reference to negotiate the many things that we have talked about, then actually what the government, I think, have done, whether they like to think of it or not, they've agreed to give it a six months' hoist -- June of '71. So I give them good marks for it; I give them very good marks for it; and it's a good way of getting around it, but I don't think you're going to get a pat on the back from the people of Manitoba for this, from the agents anyway, the insurance industry. They're going to say, "Oh, just a minute; who's going to be in this Advisory Council? How do we know what their integrity is going to be?"

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the honourable member again -- that he is, I think, dealing with something in the future and that he should attempt to relate his remarks -- he's dealing with a proposed amendment; we're dealing with another amendment dealing with competition.

MR. BEARD: Well, the only thing I was dealing with was my anxiety about Bill 56 and the fact whether it should become a monopoly or whether it should be competitive, and I say that it ties very closely to that, the resolutions must follow, and I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, but the way I vote now is going to be in fact dictated by what I feel, the confidence I have in

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) government, in their integrity or in the integrity -- not in the integrity of government, pardon me, but of the Advisory Council that is appointed, and I'm just trying to get the message across that I feel that if we are to carry through with this we must make sure that the committee will be made up of people that are respected by Manitobans generally and we wouldn't want to feel that it was a political move, because come next session I suppose we would be voting against the regulations if we do feel that they are unfair.

I think that in respect to this that we've got to consider what government are prepared to do, in voting for a monopoly, Mr. Chairman, on the assurance of compensation, for the anxiety of the people that are in the insurance business to date. We've been told that they're on six-months contracts that cuts their revenue in half. Some of them are going to have problems in looking after their payments, and I think that is where this Advisory Council is going to have to get down to work almost immediately, to interview probably people along this nature that have built-in problems, through no fault of their own but through the disturbance of government entering into what could be a monopoly program. If it has to be I suppose it has to be, but I think if there has to be a monopoly that we have to make sure that they are going to be looked after.

Mr. Chairman, while I will be listening and watching the amendments, I do not intend to have it affect my position until third reading of this bill because I feel that is the time when I'll have heard both sides of the story in its completion; I'll be able to make up my mind, and I will vote then. I suppose you would say it's sitting on the fence, if you wish, and I suppose others will say it. I don't feel I am. I think it's important. I think it's important for all Manitobans because on it will be a decision as to whether there will be an election or not, and I think that we should give it careful consideration and leave it until that time, and I will be more prepared then to give my answer and the reasons that I am voting the way I will.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question. I wonder if he could indicate how this House will vote on the regulations?

MR. BEARD: I suppose that would be up to the Conservative and Liberal Parties; I can only speak for myself.

MR. SPIVAK: No, I think the Honourable Member for Churchill may have misunderstood my question, and if he did not, then I pose this to him: the regulations may be promulgated or by Order-in-Council after the Bill is passed, but then having now been declared, may I ask the Honourable Member for Churchill how he expects the House to vote on the regulations. We may debate them but how do we vote on them?

MR. BEARD: There's always the vote of non-confidence after we hear the regulations or see the regulations in Gazette, and I would be just as prepared to move a vote of non-confidence as I would a vote of confidence if I didn't feel the regulations were fair to the insurance industry and to the people that are affected by it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The proposed motion of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party, that Section (d) of Section 1 be amended by adding after the word "incorporation" in line 1 the following words: "or by any licensed insurer."

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia) Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ayes and Nays? The member has supports? Call in the members.

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

Yeas 27; Nays 28.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

Section 1 (d)--passed; (e)--passed; (f)--passed; (g) as deleted --passed; (h)--passed; (i)--passed; (j)--passed -- (Interjection) -- (g) as amended passed. I have a deletion on (g). I would ask the Attorney-General to give an explanation if he is making one.

HON. AL MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): The figure "12" has been deleted and the figure "11" substituted. It was an error in the number.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1 (g) as amended--passed; Sections (h) to (q) were read and passed) Section (r) -- The Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I presented a group of amendments that will be moved from time to time, and I would like to move that clause (r) of Section 1 of Bill 56 be amended

. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It is difficult to hear.

MR. WEIR: That clause (r) of Section 1 of Bill 56 be amended by striking out the words "whether voluntary or universal and compulsory."

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, just before you take that resolution; as I understand it, the House is not supposed to debate the matter which has been decided, and I just ask - I don't want a wrangle about it - as to whether this resolution is the same subject matter of the debate that we have gone through on the Member for Portage la Prairie's resolution. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't want a big argument about it. If the honourable members assure me that it's not, if the honourable members assure me that it's not, that they think it's not, then let's go ahead with it.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, the answer is, if I had thought it was I wouldn't have presented it, but generally speaking it's related to the definition section and I don't think that any of them can be said to stand together. I think that they all, while they have a certain significance, I think they stand alone as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I think that the Minister's, the House Leader's statement is rather unusual in view of what has taken place here. We have just heard a presentation by the Member from Churchill which indicates that the First Minister may in turn be giving us some more information -- I'm on the point of order . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order on the remarks that are being made by the Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm up on a point of order and I would like to be able to continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would rather like to hear them in sequence. Then I would ask the Member for River Heights to make his point first.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, we have had an unusual procedure. The Member from Churchill has indicated, and he may have some knowledge, that the First Minister is going to be indicating information to this House that -- Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's relevant, because the matter has not been decided. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the matter has not been decided because the matter is not closed, because there is already an indication that additional information is to be given to this Chamber and to this committee and until we have all the information, Mr. Chairman, we cannot possibly--(Interjection)--I'm on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, there is not a point of order before the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would ask the Member for River Heights whether he is in fact speaking on the point of order which is . . .

MR. SPIVAK: I am speaking on the point of order on the question . . . that the matter has been debated and decided.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, would that relieve the honourable member of making a speech? I will withdraw the point of order that I got up . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will allow the Honourable the House Leader to withdraw it but let him allow me the opportunity of finishing my remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well perhaps the member could simply make a comment and not make a point of order.

MR. SPIVAK: Well it is on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The matters that have been decided have not been decided; there has been an indication that there is more additional information to be given this committee, and until we have that information, there is no matter that will be finally decided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the proposed motion of the Leader of the Official Opposition. The question. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the matter should be disposed of that readily, that easily. This is a very important matter to me. I recall dealing with it in Utilities Committee but only the members of the Utilities Committee were there and could debate. Many of the other members were missing. Not all the members of this House were present when this matter was debated and I feel that they have every right to debate the issues that are being put forward in this bill and have every right to put forward amendments, even if some of them might be repetitious. And on those grounds, I would like to make a further amendment to the amendment: that clause (r) of Section 1 of Bill 56 be further amended by adding thereto immediately before the word "plan" where it appears for the second time in the first line thereof, the word "voluntary".

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the reason I am amending the amendment is that I want it completely understood that this will be a voluntary plan and that it will be in competition. We had the other resolution, or amendment, before us before, where other insurers, licensed insurers would be able to provide a service, but this motion is to define the plan and make sure that this will be a voluntary plan and that only those people that want to contribute or only those people that want to buy from the government plan may do so. I believe in this matter of having voluntary Crown corporations and not compulsory. Certainly, people should be free to decide on their own merits whether they want to buy from a government Crown corporation or not, and this idea of making this correction in the definition or a change in the definition, this would certainly make it clear beyond any doubt that it's a voluntary . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Would the honourable member permit a question? The way the honourable member uses the word "voluntary" in the context of his amendment, sub-amendment, does he mean the word "voluntary" there to connote that the insurance plan would not be - that insurance would not be a condition of driving? Does he mean it to be voluntary, does he mean the word "voluntary" to connote that? Because, as I understand the concept of voluntary automobile insurance, it is that kind of scheme or system where the driver has it open to him whether or not he will drive on the road with or without insurance. Is that what the honourable member means?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, this same question was posed in committee and legal counsel gave a reply at that time. Maybe he could repeat the reply that he gave at that time in order to be correct in the summation, but the way I understood it too from the legal counsel was that it . . . be a voluntary plan and people could on a voluntary basis subscribe to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the sub-amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition. Are you ready for the question, that clause (r) of Section 1 of Bill 56 be amended by striking out the words "whether voluntary or universal and compulsory"?

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

MR. WEIR: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 27, Nays 28.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

I would again ask citizens in the gallery not to applaud or indicate their approval or disapproval.

(Sections (s) to (y) of Section of of Bill 56 were read and passed.) Section (z)--

MR. GREEN: I believe the Leader of the Opposition wants the Chairman to put the question on the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : I intend to put the question on a voice vote, but I think that if anyone wishes to speak before that then this is in order. The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to move an amendment to Section (z): that Section (z) of Section 1 of the Bill be amended by adding the following words at the end thereof: "but also including insurance sold by private insurers".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: On a point of order before the . . . is received -- this time I am right. The Leader of the Liberal Party indicated with his amendment to the very first section of the Bill that he felt that that section would be the section whereby the question of private insurers would be debated, the competition with the rest of the industry. I asked him at the time whether that was the case. If that is the case, Mr. Chairman, then the debate has taken place on that section and I would think that a further amendment which has the same effect in terms of debate is out of order. It doesn't matter -- the section can be voted again but a further section trying to reinstitute a debate that has already been concluded is, I believe, not in order.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to debate the matter. I think it has been debated. I do intend at a later time in the proceeds of this Bill to speak on the subject; at this time I had not intended to do so. I just wanted to make the amendment because I think it is a proper amendment and I move it in that sense without any intention of debating it at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, it may well be that the Member for Ste. Rose - I'm speaking to the point of order - it may well be that the Member for Ste. Rose may wish to reflect further and debate on the question or the subject matter of the question that has been put before us, and inexperienced on the rules as I am, I am not in the habit of making reference to citations from Beauséne, but I think I do understand clearly and I suggest, Sir, that there is a valid point of order here. I do suggest that it is not in order under the rules to move the same substance in a motion that has already been taken under consideration by the House and disposed of by the House one way or the other, and my colleague the Minister of Labour does have the citation from Beauséne which simply goes to back up the point I am making. I shall not read the citation but I believe that it is Citation 148, and if need be, Sir, a further elaboration can be given on the point of order, which I state again is simply that it is not in order to have a motion received that is the same, in essence, subject matter as one that has already been taken under consideration by the House and voted on.

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

MR. MOLGAT: On the same point of order, I think it is open to any member of the committee at any time to amend any clause of a bill that is before us, and all I am proposing right now is an amendment to a clause. I'm not referring to a previous clause or to a previous decision or to anything that the House has done. My motion is very clearly purely on this clause, deals only with this clause, does not reflect on the previous decision, and I think if it is dealing specifically with a clause of the bill it is in order in committee.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, may I in addition to making reference to Citation 148 of Beauséne, refer the honourable member to our own House Rules Book Manual, Rule No. 54, and ask the honourable member, ask if you know Sir, if Rule 54 does not in effect substantiate the contention I just made in respect to receiving of a motion of essentially - not essentially - of the same subject matter, of the same proposition, twice during the same session.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, if one were to take the position taken by the Premier and the House Leader, then once one votes for a clause in the bill, technically you are accepting the whole of the bill, if that's the decision of the government. Each clause stands by itself, and each clause is subject to vote for or against or amendment. Each single clause. And so, I submit if we are dealing with a clause by clause discussion, that then in each part -- because there are variations. At this particular point the amendment that I am proposing is not identical to the one that has been previously settled because this would permit a variation of what private insurers might be able to sell, and I submit that the government may in fact want private insurers to sell something different than what the government itself is going to sell.

Now, I will admit readily that that is not my point of view. My point of view is there ought to be competition, but the amendment nevertheless permits a variation of what the government might want to do, which was not necessarily the case in the previous amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, very briefly on the last point; the rule, as I understand it, and which has been elaborated on by the First Minister, is that an amendment cannot be introduced even to a different clause which has already been debated and defeated, and what my honourable friend says is that on each clause, every time we come to a new clause, he could tack on an amendment which would contain the same subject matter as was defeated on the previous clause, and I just don't think that that's possible.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to extend debate on points of order and so on, or rules, but surely if it is proper for the government to reintroduce, as the government is telling me now, the same subject matter, if they tell me I can't amend something because it's already been decided, well then by what right has the government got to introduce it once again? Surely it goes both ways. If it's the same subject matter and it's already been decided under Section (d), then how can it be the same subject matter introduced under Section (z)? It's got to be one or the other.

Now, if it's not proper for me to bring a matter up under Section (z) because the government says the same thing was decided under (d), then I suggest that the government shouldn't have (z) in there because it obviously is deciding the same thing as (d) was in the first place.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, surely the honourable member is being facetious. I'm not saying that the clause that is being moved is the same subject matter; I'm suggesting that the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) amendment is the same subject matter, and if what you say is correct, every time we come to a clause, we could come to Clause 5 - "The corporation may prescribe the duties of the general manager." You could put in, "The corporation, which shall operate in competition with other corporations, shall prescribe the . . ." and I would say that 5 is not the same subject matter but your amendment is the same subject matter, and that is what is being objected to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, there are two points: first, 148(1) states: "It is a wholesome restraint upon members that they cannot revive a debate already concluded and . . . be little use in preventing the same question from being offered twice in the same session." If this was carried to its logical conclusion, then dealing with the question of monopoly in second reading would prevent us from dealing with it in the Committee of the Whole.

But, Mr. Chairman, I now refer you to Citation 119 and I'd like to read it for the Honourable House Leader and the members on the opposite side: Citing from 119: "One of the main functions of the House consists in debating public issues, a function which can only be filled by complete freedom of speech. There will always be contests between groups and parties, minority and majority, and in the debates that follow the rules of procedures are all-important. Delays, multiplicity of amendments and even obstructions must not always be regarded as illegitimate political weapons." Mr. Chairman, I suggest that that indicates that there can very well be a multiplicity of amendments dealing with the same subject matter.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, may I, speaking to the point of order still, may I suggest that the last citation which the Honourable Member for River Heights referred to, which my colleague is looking at now, in no way comes to grip with the specific point of order that is before us now, because of course everybody understands that in the normal course of parliamentary procedure there can be multiplicity of amendments proposed dealing with different subject matters on a given bill, that of course it is normal, under parliamentary procedure, to have as wide-ranging debate as possible, but on the specific question as to the acceptability of an amendment that is in itself the same in subject matter as one that has already been moved and dealt with by the House, then there is Rule 54 of our own Rule Book that must be looked at closely, Sir, and also Citation 148 which has to be considered, along with whatever other citations and rules the Chair would regard as being germane to the point of order raised.

Having said that, I really don't know that there would be much more guidance offered to the Chair if I were to say any more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, my colleague the Member for River Heights has dealt with two of the citations from Beauchesne that I had intended to deal with, but since the First Minister has spoken again and referred to Section 54, might I just deal with that for a moment.

Section 54 of our rules says, "A motion shall not be made if the subject matter thereof has been decided by the House during the same session." But if you read Section 53, 53(1) says: "Motions shall be moved and seconded before being debated. (2) Motions shall be put from the Chair before being debated." What the Leader of the Opposition has moved is not a motion but an amendment to an existing clause in the bill. Now there is a difference, and I suggest to you, Sir, that a motion to amend is not what Section 54 deals with. Section 54 is dealing with a motion, a substantive motion, that has been dealt with by the House on a previous occasion, and not an amendment to a clause in a bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the Honourable Member for River Heights. . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I have one other citation I would like to refer and read into the record, and that's 119(2), and I think this is extremely relevant to what has taken place so far. "The mere object of shortening sessions may lead to an undue curtailment of the freedom of speech. The duties . . ." -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I'd like to read this fully into the record. "The duties of a representative parliament are too important to be performed in a hurry. No question should be decided until it has been fully discussed. Although some effort ought to be made to economize time, every shade of opinion has a right to find expression and members who desire to give their views should not be prevented from doing so. Canada is a vast country, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. The problems of the west are not those of the east; the viewpoints of Members of Parliament from British Columbia and the Prairie Provinces differ from those of Ontario; Ontario differs from Quebec

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) and Quebec from the Maritime Provinces. For this reason, debates in the House are necessarily lengthy. A two months session, if it is mismanaged, is more wasteful of time than a six months session during which no time has been lost. Debates have to be free and they must also be relevant. In Parliament, every corner of the country is represented and no rule" - and this all applies to Manitoba - "no rule should silence elected representatives when they think they have a message to deliver. Freedom of speech is a sacred principle and if there is a place where it should be fully respected, that place is the Parliament of the nation, and it is the Speaker's responsibility to see that this principle is not infringed upon."

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Transportation would like to hear that read again.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, it's very interesting to hear my extra-learned friend the Member for River Heights as he reads Citation 119 of the Fourth Edition of Beauchesne on Page 110. I suggest that it should be read and thoroughly analyzed by every member of the House. Read in its entirety, it really relates to the proposition contained in Section 148. It deals with the question of freedom of speech, and in the citation just quoted by the Member for River Heights it also indicates that there are privileges to all members as well. I'd like to make passing reference to the Member for Morris. He seems to differentiate between an amendment and a motion insofar as the rules of debate. An amendment, when proposed, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest, does become a motion insofar as definition is concerned and the application of the rule itself.

But to me, the prime rule is that quoted by my Leader, Citation 148, because it is implied in 148 that if the proposition of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose was accepted, we could continuously on any clause or any subject have a repetition of debate already concluded, and it could be that instead of a two-months session being mismanaged, as the citation quoted by the Member for River Heights as being more wasteful of time than a six months session, the next edition of Beauchesne or some similar authority would say instead of a six months session it would be a six year session if we were permitted to continuously revive debates that have already been concluded. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I am not learned in the law. I do respectfully suggest that I have a reasonable amount of intelligence that allows me to interpret the purpose of the citations that have been quoted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I feel that if this amendment should not be allowed, then the definitions should be combined, the one that we were voting on previously and the one that the amendment is attached to right now. Certainly we should have every right to put forward amendments on the various and different sections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that the intention of Beauchesne 148 (1) and our own Rule 54 is clear, and that is that if it's an attempt to prevent repetition, since we have already had a motion by the Leader of the Official Opposition which was defeated, and an earlier one by the House Leader of the Liberal Party, I think that this would indicate that the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is in fact similar or identical to the other motions and consequently I would rule it out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to conduct this debate on the basis of points of order or challenges to your rulings, and I accept your ruling. I would only like you to give consideration to the fact that, having made this decision, then how is the House to deal in the future with any motions on second reading, or Committee of the Whole, or third reading, which are in fact the same motions which you've always accepted in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose would mind restating that last point he made, because I tried hard to comprehend him and I didn't quite completely succeed.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Chairman, my point is that in the past it has been accepted that, for example, on second reading of the bill, one can express, by a motion on second reading, a statement of principle, of principle only, which in this case, for example, would be the principle favouring competition in the industry, and this would be accepted. Now my understanding of the rules has been, even if that were decided on second reading in the negative, that one might still in the Committee of the Whole, or Law Amendments committee, or on third reading, be free to move a similar motion, because it is dealing with a different stage

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) of the bill, and I think that this has been our practice in the past, that this has been accepted. But I repeat, I'm not asking now, Mr. Chairman, because I don't like instant rulings, quite frankly, because I think there's a tendency to make bad rulings. I'm not asking for an instant ruling, but I merely pose the question, and I'm not going to challenge your ruling because I want to deal with the bill really on the basis of the merits of the bill, not on the basis of points of order, so I merely request from you, Mr. Chairman, an investigation of this matter, along with Mr. Speaker, so that we may set this up as future proceedings of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member is making a valid point and he's -- but I think that my ruling perhaps, unclear as it is, deals with within the committee, and I would make a distinction between the Committee of Law Amendments and the Committee of the Whole House, and perhaps that is the resolution of the issue.

The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, I would like to just speak briefly on the section that we are dealing with in this bill, firstly as an agent, and secondly as an MLA in this particular debate, and hope that I can get the information that I think is necessary before we can deal satisfactorily with this section of the bill, and if the Honourable Member for Churchill has some information that I haven't got or the agents of this province haven't got, I ask him now to lay it on the table, because he has said a few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, that there are many ways to skin a cat, and I wonder who he is referring to with those remarks. Is he trying to skin men like me? Is he trying to skin men like Mr. Harbun? Is he trying to skin men like an independent or a friend of his policy holder, or people that are advising their clients with their insurance needs, or people right now that are wondering what's going to happen with their renewals? And before we get to the third stage of this bill, or third reading, I humbly submit, Mr. Chairman, that this member should lay on the table, if he has information, because he has said, if I'm correct, that he has seen a change. I haven't seen that change, Mr. Chairman, and I don't see how I can possibly deal and vote on this section of the bill if he has information that I haven't got, and I would ask him to give it to the committee.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I realize that it's not a point of privilege so much as a difference in interpretation of words that arises now. The Honourable Member for Roblin has taken his seat. I suspected he had finished his remarks so that I'm rising just to say a few words, without speaking to any point of privilege.

The honourable member uses the expression "change" - he's seen some changes. Yes. Well, but the word "change" - is the honourable member referring to changes in the bill? Well, amendments have been circulated to my honourable friend; or was he referring to changes in attitude? Well, the Honourable Member for Roblin is quite good at playing on words. Sometimes I think that he equals Shakespeare in that regard; at times, in his better evenings, he can rival Shakespeare in plays on words, like the way he just has demonstrated on the word "change". The proposed legislative change, amendments have been circulated, so he has what everyone else has. If he's talking about a change in attitude, if that's his interpretation, I have no quarrel, because quite frankly I don't see anything wrong with making changes from time to time. Some changes come harder than others, otherwise we wouldn't be having this present difficulty with the bill.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, can I ask the First Minister a question? Are you speaking for yourself or are you speaking for the Honourable Member for Churchill?

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, the first problem that the Member for Roblin poses is that I lay on the table and I can assure you that there isn't room for me to lay on this table. And secondly, I've got no information that he hasn't got. I would suggest that he read the amendments and particularly this amendment. I don't know, what's the number? If you've got the number -- the proposed amendment to Bill 56. The Automobile Insurance Act which lays out the Advisory Council, etc., and its recommendations and studies; it's the one that I have referred to and I believe that you have a copy of this. I have no secret information.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the honourable member to explain to me the last six words of that amendment where it says "or of leaving such coverage optional"?

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, we are not dealing with the amendment but the last six words is one of the parts that leaves me very optimistic.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I had one more question, and the reason that I rose, Mr. Chairman, on this section was, how can we stand up here and deal with universal

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) compulsory automobile insurance when that clause is at the end of that amendment?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order, not to try to answer the last question, although I'm quite capable of answering it, but rather to point out that the honourable member is now referring specifically to amendments that, while they have been circulated, do not come before us until certain clauses in the bill have been reached, and so therefore I think that in terms of the rules of procedure it is not in order to start making extensive reference and, in fact, debating them at this point in time, but in addition to that, I would suggest to the honourable member if he wants to raise a substantive . . . it would be out of order for me to try and answer right now but I certainly intend to when we get to that . . .

MR. McKENZIE: I thank the First Minister for his words but I don't see how any member of this Chamber can vote on Section (z) without knowing what those words mean, "or of leaving such coverage optional" and it's very difficult for me to make up my mind what I should do or how I should vote, and I was humbly submitting to the House that the Honourable Member for Churchill must have some information that I haven't got.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Your committee has considered certain sections of Bill 56, reports progress, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, 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 8:00 o'clock Monday night.