

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, June 22, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Could I have leave to have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion: Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Could I have leave of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debates . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . Bill 56, please.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 56, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Morris in amendment thereto. Are you ready for the question.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There appears to be some difference of opinion - I don't know whether you took this under advisement during the dinner hour or not - as to whether or not I have the right to speak at this stage. I contend that on the occasion that I spoke, which was a week ago tonight, I spoke on the main motion, so therefore having moved the amendment, I am now entitled to speak on the amendment.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rather sympathize with my honourable friend, it's the kind of a rule that I never understood but it is the rule - and apparently, the Minister of Labour whispers to me, at Ottawa as well - that when a member speaks in the presentation of an amendment, whether he is speaking on the main motion or not, that is his speech on the amendment and he is not entitled to reply in speaking on the amendment, as indicated by rule No. 45: "Subject to sub-rule (2) a member who has moved a substantive motion or the second reading of a bill may reply, but not a member who has moved an Order of the Day, not being the second reading of a bill, an amendment, the previous question, an adjournment during a debate or an instruction to a committee." So a person who has moved an amendment is not entitled to reply which means that he is not given the opportunity to close debate and my understanding of the situation is that the moving of the amendment is then his speech. Mr. Speaker, I buttress my understanding by what has definitely been the practice in this house in the four years that I have been here and apparently much preceding that; so I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member, though I may sympathize with him, is not entitled to speak in this debate at this stage.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, debate be adjourned.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, do I take it then that the Honourable Member for Swan River is accepting the fact that the Speaker has ruled that the Member for Morris is not entitled to speak?

MR. BILTON: . . . I didn't realize that we had got to that stage. I'll hold that pending the Speaker's ruling.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point of order. I would hope that there would be a clarification of the situation by Mr. Speaker, not simply an adjournment. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that you may not be prepared to make the decision at this time and if you want to take it under advisement I think it would be well considered.

It seems to me the matter has come up in the House in the past and that there may be some precedents in our own House on the subject. I have been searching through my notes in Beauséjour to see, because I normally make notation as to when a precedent is established. I regret I cannot find it. I would be prepared to go back through the Journals and see what precedents I can find but possibly, Mr. Speaker, you have those or the Clerk of the House. But I would hope that there would be a ruling, if not now, tomorrow, so that the matter can be settled.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as you know, Sir, I have never posed as an expert on the rules. Let me just say in speaking to the Point of Order that if there's ever been a situation where an honourable member has spoken on a motion and moved an amendment and then subsequently at a later date spoken on the same motion of amendment that he himself introduced, I would certainly like to hear of it, because I don't believe there is any example or precedent that can be shown for it anywhere, whether at the federal level or here.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, if I may, on the point of order. The House Leader is perfectly correct. There has been precedents established in this House ever since I came in here. There is a difference in the rules of procedures in respect of amendments here than those that prevail at Ottawa. I understand from Beauchesne's and other citations that it is the custom in Ottawa for a member to move an amendment and then speak to his amendment. The custom in this House, well established, has been that a member speaks to the main motion and then presents the amendment which precludes his having the right to again speak to the amendment.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, this is a well honoured custom as far as this House is concerned. It may be that the Committee on the Rules of the House may take under consideration a different approach but I am positive in my own mind, Mr. Speaker, that never in the years that I've had the privilege of being a representative in this House, has a person who has moved an amendment then be able to speak to that amendment subsequently. I'm sure that my honourable friend the Member for Swan River would bear me out in this matter.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, this seems to me rather an unusual situation. As I recall it, the last word of my honourable friend was the last word of the motion that he made. He really didn't actually speak to the motion whatsoever. However, it's a ticklish one and I think it should be well looked at because I'm not too sure myself. I don't think it happened during my tenure of office.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I just ask you to consider, in the light of the remarks just made by the Minister of Labour, his comment was to the effect that having spoken and moved the amendment I had then spoken on the amendment and I'm prepared to accept that. I'm prepared to accept that I have spoken on the amendment, but I still have the right then to speak on the main motion. Now he can't have it both ways. If I spoke on the amendment then surely I have the right to speak on the main motion. My interpretation was and the reason I moved the amendment at the latter part of my remarks was because I wanted to be sure that I would have the opportunity of making further remarks on the amendment. Now if the Minister of Labour wants it one way, it doesn't matter to me, I'll take it the other.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, my friend tried and I give him full credit for trying, but he must recognize I'm sure that he did speak to the main motion prior to moving the amendment and the very fact of moving the amendment has been considered in this House as speaking to the amendment as well.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well in that case, Sir, in order to get this matter clarified and to give you further advice so that you'll be thoroughly confused by the time you take it under advisement, then in the future I would assume, following the logic of the Minister of Labour, that having spoken for 40 minutes on the main motion and then move an amendment, I can immediately then speak again another 40 minutes on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I certainly would be quite happy to give the honourable member leave so that he could speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to thank the honourable members for their comments. I can certainly sympathize with the Honourable Member for Morris but I do believe that if the Honourable Member for Morris were allowed to speak at this time it would be in violation of our Rule 45 (1) which reads: "Subject to sub-rule (2) a member who has moved a substantive motion or the second reading of a bill may reply but not a member who has moved an Order of the Day not being the second reading of a bill, an amendment, previous question, adjournment during a debate, or an instruction to a committee." The honourable member having moved an amendment I believe that this precludes him from rising to his feet to speak again. I believe that Citation 165, subsection 9 of Beauchesne also bears that out and that has been the practice which we've followed in this House, on the Throne Speech debate, on the Budget Debate, and I'm sure that all members can distinctly recall a situation arising out of private members' resolutions where that has been the practice and I believe it still is. I do agree that perhaps

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) it's a procedure that ought to be reviewed but it is my belief that that is the practice and that is a practice that will have to be adhered to at this time.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment briefly, I can't help but comment what a rapidly changing world we live in these days. A few days of absence from the House has brought about all kinds of changes. The Member for St. Boniface fell upon me in that crucial game that we were engaged in some time ago and caused severe personal injury to myself in a sprained ankle. I'm happy to report to the House that I had the former Minister of Health look at it during the supper hour adjournment and he suggests that with some caution in staying off the track during the next few days will see it heal.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): . . . say that if I had fallen on my friend he wouldn't be here today. I think he just . . .

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't argue with that point. I was agile enough to dodge but my leg got caught. It was of course during that same time that the government suffered a severe defeat in the game of baseball that we engaged in and the Labour Government in Great Britain, God bless those people, and I was around to make comment, they also suffered defeat and I know the reason why.

A MEMBER: They didn't have auto insurance.

MR. ENNS: They didn't have auto insurance and they didn't introduce it in the last seven or eight years. That must be the reason I'm sure.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to address myself seriously to for a few moments is the fact that we have probably arrived at a rather futile point on the debate on Bill 56, in the sense that everybody is tuned off; it's become patently obvious to us that the members opposite are not really prepared to listen to us in any constructive way as we try to fulfill our role or function as a responsible opposition. I could accept their attitude towards perhaps 70 or 80 or 90 percent of the debate that took place in this Chamber on Bill 56, and I include my own remarks in that statement, prior to the speech of my Leader the other evening as being difficult or not substantive in meaning, but the replies given today -- and while of course we haven't heard from the Honourable the Minister responsible for shepherding this bill through the House, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, we have heard from such eminent spokesmen of the government as the Minister of Finance -- that it would surprise me greatly if we had any other great revelations from the other side other than that that have already been expressed by the Ministers and spokesmen that have spoken since the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, that essentially relegates the hard work and the great amount of research that went into the proposals that were submitted the other evening by the Leader of the Opposition as at best gimmickry or belated afterthoughts or what have you. Certainly our distinguished members in the fourth estate, the press, is tuned off on Bill 56 and the efforts of my colleagues such as the Member for Fort Garry or the Member for Brandon who made most distinguished efforts in espousing in more detailed fashion some of the features, and my colleague the Member for Morris was set and prepared to attempt to do it tonight, some of the specific features of the proposals of the PC auto insurance plan that was introduced in this House a few days ago, and really, Mr. Speaker, what we're left with is that we think that we have a very sound, reasonable proposal, a proposal that we could offer the Premier of this Province, the administration of this province to give serious consideration to. But it's amazing, it happens all the time, I suppose, people get boxed into corners and into positions from which, for dogmatic reasons, dogmatic maybe from both sides, nobody's prepared to listen, nobody's really prepared to tune in on any more, and I rather suspect we're at that particular stage with Bill 56 at this particular time. So I would suspect that within a very short time from now we will have said our say on this issue and we will proceed to the vote and we'll see where the matter lies.

But, Mr. Speaker, at least it behooves me to indicate to, particularly the First Minister, a few comments, a few concerns that I think are worth making at this time. Mr. Speaker, whether or not the proposals of our group are sound in all respects, are certainly open to question. It's been indicated by some spokesmen I believe, including the Premier, that there are some aspects of the proposals that were introduced in this House the other evening by the Leader that are certainly worthy of further consideration and perhaps even implementation into schemes that they may be considering in the government scheme. If there's some good to be found in the plan, then why not, you know, why not retrace our steps? Why not come back to a position of reasonableness? Why not get back from the dogmatic position that we find ourselves

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) on this particular issue — and it has to be said, it is a dogmatic position. The First Minister made that very plain in his speech as late as last Saturday, I believe, or a few days ago in the Auditorium here celebrating some event of some consequence that took place in the province about a year ago today.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's natural for the government of today to say to us, or to look at any suggestion from us and question the validity thereof and say to us, you know, why now come up with suggestions or with schemes when we didn't do anything about it at the time that we were in administration. And I know I won't make any mark, but for those of us in this Chamber, there are a few that will appreciate the fact that there were specific reasons.

No. 1. The committee was set up, and as it was read into the record by I believe the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, it was a Conservative Minister that recognized the fact that in the latter years, the last three or four years, that there was a growing uneasiness and dissatisfaction about the auto insurance industry generally in the Province of Manitoba. It was a Progressive Conservative Minister in that administration that set up a committee to study these events. It was done at the same time that a similar decision was being made in the Province of British Columbia, and it was also ascertained that this study taking place in our sister province at considerable expense, in excess of a million dollars, that in the light of that a committee decision was reached. I'm not suggesting that the members of the New Democratic Party of that committee were agreeable to that decision, but nonetheless if they have any appreciation for the democratic process, that I'm quite correct in saying that this special committee that was set up to study auto insurance, that committee reached a decision to delay further action until the Wootton report in B.C. was available to us.

Not unlike at all, Mr. Speaker, and here's a reference — and my agrarian background keeps coming to the fore and I apologize — No, I shouldn't apologize for that. You see we had the same committee set up to study about the problems about farm implements, some of the member will remember, about the same time that the Federal Government set up a Royal commission to study the situation on farm implements and machinery and repairs and warranties — the Barbour Commission. And what did we do in that committee? In that committee, as the Minister of Agriculture is very well aware, we made roughly the same decision, that it would be pointless for us as a Manitoba committee to go through a whole exercise of hearing briefs and examining the whole farm implement industry at the time the Federal Government was doing this in the same area, so we suggested in the agricultural committee that we await the production of the Barbour Commission on farm implements.

And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that's only a sound and reasonable and sane way of approaching it. After all, we're all the same taxpayers. If on one part we as Canadians are participating or putting out the costs for multi-million dollar studies by one level of government, I suppose perhaps — I was the Minister of Agriculture at the instigation of that committee, the Member for Arthur was later on the Minister — I suppose if we had wanted to cover ourselves in glory and proceed with our own little study and put everybody through the same hoop, make them jump simply because we like to have them jump, I suppose we could have done it, but nothing would have been gained. We arrived at the conclusion that let's await the publication of the Barbour Commission, see what their recommendations are, they have much more funds and staff and research material at their fingertips, and then we could make reasonable decisions with respect to the kind of action that we could take in this Legislature with respect to the acts and the jurisdiction that we are responsible for.

Now nobody has really severely criticized that position with respect to agriculture, but everybody has accused us of foot dragging and everything else with respect to auto insurance. And why? Why? Because again we come into this dogmatic . . .

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Because you did with medicare.

MR. ENNS: Well no, my friend the Honourable Minister of Finance says we did it with medicare. That's of course utter nonsense. We introduced medicare, and I'm forever grateful that I was part of the administration that brought medicare to the people of the Province of Manitoba. I argue with him just differently, differently on how the matter was to be funded, and to suggest that I was naturally happy with the manner in the way it was going to be funded or that was a permanent arrangement, is of course also not correct and not true.

However, Mr. Speaker, I'm being shifted off course again by these gentlemen in the front bench. Having reached that decision, that it was a reasonable route to take, to delay

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) extensive, exhaustive studies that were being made into the auto insurance industry at the same time that a sister province was doing it, we of course had our own priorities just as this government has their priorities, and obviously auto insurance is one of their priorities. It's more important than relief to the aged in their housing problems; it's more important than education in terms of relief of assessment; it's more important than many other things.

Now I can hear the reply, "but we shifted \$20 million in medicare premiums," and that absolved them from all their shame, but that's neither here nor there and I'm not arguing with it. I'm just saying we had our priorities, and our priorities were still in entrenched programs that we were hoping to bring to a conclusion. And of course, Mr. Speaker, there were different things. Let's look at the same period of time, the same period of time, and I recognize that this is not weighty material to excuse the government for inactivity in any shape or direction, but there was of course major changes taking place within the government of that day - leadership changes, a new leader was being brought in, a new feeling of getting to ride in the saddle, breaking in a new leader into office, getting him oriented to the kind of programs and positions that he particularly wished to bring forward into this program. These were all taking place at the time that the honourable members opposite accused us of not doing anything about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, you talk about nine years' apprenticeship. That's here nor there and I'm sure the First Minister is only aware today that your apprenticeship begins from the day you're sworn in as Premier and not too much before, because it is a singular job and it's a lonely job and it's a job that you gain experience from nowhere else but in that Chair, and I'm prepared to accord the First Minister that that probably is a fact, that at least it seems to be true in all other forms of leadership.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we really have here in Bill 56 at this particular stage of the game. We have a situation that the government, pre-committed to a specific course of action - and I've been one who have made no bones about the fact that I've never challenged the rights of that party or that group of government to do that - I've challenged and I've seriously chastized the members opposite for the manner and the approach that they have taken in introducing the bill and I won't repeat some of the devious - I used that word once before and I was called out of order, but I'll retract it before you call me out of order. Mr. Speaker; I'm rather suspect of what can be used or not - but some of the methods that were chosen, some of the methods that were chosen by the group opposite to introduce this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd really like to offer to the Honourable the First Minister for a few minutes a little bit of guidance and outline of why, why would he want to persist in this course that he's chosen for himself, because, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference. I am sure, I'm sure that he had hoped that we would have played the traditional opposition role to oppose anything at all that comes from the government side, to be absolutely devoid of constructive programs on our own part, and that on that basis hopefully, hopefully find himself perhaps in a position, Sir, where even you may have played a prominent part if he did in this House, and then go to the people of Manitoba on the clear issue of auto insurance, on the clear issue of the government being the only one with some positive thoughts, some positive thinking on this, and Mr. Speaker, quite frankly had that been the case, well I think I would have got in a few more steers this fall and looked at the welfare of my family a little bit more seriously and what I could do to ensure that.

But of course that is not the case. Throughout the session, Mr. Speaker, this opposition has demonstrated a degree of responsibility that has not been seen in this Chamber for some time. Certainly has not been seen - and I say it with some reluctance - by my honourable friends to the left when they were the members of the official opposition, because, Mr. Speaker - and we can cite these off - never before in the living, at least since the 80-hour rule, have we gone through as many departments in estimates, and we have not attempted to -- right now on Bill 56, we are not filibustering this bill . . .

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): What are you doing?

MR. ENNS: Oh no, this is not a filibuster, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you're aware, I'm sure you're aware after the seventh amendment is introduced to Bill 56, what a filibuster can be. There is no filibuster attempt here; this is a very serious program that we're talking about and certainly the 22 members of this Chamber, many of them who have very very personal and very very deep regard and concern with respect to the changes that are

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) going to be brought by Bill 56, certainly have a right and a privilege to speak on this matter, and the fact that we are going to seriously - you know, seriously disrupt now to the extent as has been debated, but nobody has debated the fact that we are going to disrupt several major communities within our rural parts of the province. When you recall the length, the repetitiveness of the debate when a similar - not a similar because I for one have never used that argument because I do believe there's quite a distinct, quite a difference, and I'm referring to the South Indian Lake and Grandville Lake communities and they are different, completely different - but nonetheless, nonetheless in terms of mathematics or arithmetic or numbers, it's understandable that people have used that argument, and when you consider the length at which that particular subject was debated in this Chamber by members of the opposition, the hours will surpass the debate taken place on Bill 56.

MR. SCHREYER: By whom?

MR. ENNS: That is correct. Check your Hansard. Check your Hansard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to suggest is that all of this is of no avail because we have pushed ourselves into this dogmatic position and we're not going to really listen with any sense of reason or responsibility to what is being offered. And I'm not so sure, Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite, that is outside the members of the G and G caucus, that the members opposite are really aware of how much harm they are doing it, not by the introduction of Bill 56 but by their approach to it - by their approach to it. I'm not so sure, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister is aware of how very serious and fundamental harm he is doing to himself and to the cause that he has espoused on assuming office as bringing a government, a responsible government; hopes to be more keenly in tune to the sensitive human development areas; the people of Manitoba; Social Democrats; social problems of this province; shift the emphasis; but, Mr. Speaker, not in any of those speeches, and I haven't got them before me, never did he suggest that there was a wilful intent on the part of the government to run, you know, the dogs of capitalism out of this province, or to simply insist on Crown corporations versus private enterprise, government operations versus our business society as we have it today, simply because of a doctrinaire approach that he holds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've never accused the First Minister of holding that approach; I don't believe he does - I don't believe he does. I can understand, Mr. Speaker, the fact that he is tied to the program, the program that he - I shouldn't suggest, I shouldn't even impute the word "tied", because this program, he's spoken on it often and there's some feeling that he sincerely believes the issue of government auto insurance is one that's fundamental in terms of providing new . . . service to the motoring public in Manitoba. You see, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SCHREYER: . . . because it offers the biggest stake.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the fact though remains that by choosing not to listen, by choosing not to negotiate, by choosing not to make an attempt - you've already made that position of yours aware to many more people than I think the members opposite, and particularly the First Minister, is currently aware of. Perhaps he is aware of it, I don't know. But I want to suggest to you one thing, Mr. Speaker, that the concept or the thoughts that the members opposite might have had about going into an election on an issue such as this, even a week ago when all you had was an opposition posture, or a position of barking against proposed government action with no constructive programs of their own to offer, and the position you find yourself in today, Sir, and will find yourself in as the months progress or weeks progress, whatever time we have, Mr. Speaker, will be entirely different.

I could - you know, I couldn't have heard nicer words when the Minister of Finance got up the other evening after the rather lengthy speech on the part of our Leader - and let me say, Mr. Speaker, I found it personally, completely uncalled for and completely unfair, that my Leader should be chastised for on occasion taking time to speak somewhat longer in this House. Mr. Speaker, if anything, he's been chastised for not speaking enough and often enough and long enough on too many occasions. So it's rather ironic that on the one occasion that my Leader chooses to speak at some length, and even if he indulged in some of the releases that all of us have the privilege of indulging in when we get up in this Chamber and speak, to be chastised by the Minister of Finance for that reason was utter nonsense.

And let me say one thing else while I'm on that particular subject, that it was with a tremendous degree of personal satisfaction and pride, and I know I speak for all the members on this side, not only this side, but a lot of people in the Province of Manitoba who have some hope of maintaining a competitive, private, but sound auto insurance plan in this province,

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) when we realize the kind of hard work and effort that my Leader put to this plan. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I defy you to dig up any correspondence or any great deal of help or information that put forward that material in his speech from any outside sources.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Who drafted the scheme? Who drafted the scheme?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that some of the major concepts of that plan that's been proposed are the original thoughts and material of my Leader, and while we haven't yet come to that position where we pass formal resolutions patting each other on the shoulder or on the back as it seems that the members opposite have, but certainly I'm pleased and happy to pay tribute to the hard work. I know personally the weeks of effort that my Leader put into putting together that speech.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know, when I look at these fellows opposite and we've listened to the bill that they've introduced on Bill 43 - you know, sometimes it breaks my heart, Mr. Speaker, when I recognize all those nicely renovated offices that we left over for the ministers to move into to run a program, and you know, I have a sneaky feeling they'd like to stay there for a while. I have a sneaky feeling they'd like to stay there for a while. After all, they are moving a little step further, this introduction of Bill 43, they'd like to look after a few more of their people just to keep peace in the family -- (Interjection) -- oh, there's only two left. Well then, there must be somebody else that's worthy of help.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that they have a lot of second thoughts about the possibility of going to the polls, despite the brave announcements that are being made from time to time by various views as government. -- (Interjection) -- Oh I know that, and I'm always ready for a fight. After all, that's why I got this haircut, because it's worth 800 votes in my constituency. Mr. Speaker, but we needn't have one because you know, Mr. Speaker, I don't particularly think, if we could get off this kick that we're on on Bill 56 -- (Interjection) -- we're not filibustering. The Honourable Minister of Transportation thinks we're filibustering. I thought we had made that pretty clear a little while ago. But the Minister and the government opposite have an opportunity, they have an opportunity, a golden opportunity provided by us, to accept the PC Plan, to accept the PC Plan and try it, Mr. Speaker, and try it.

MR. GREEN: Try ours.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a reaction that I expected because what I'm trying to suggest to the First Minister is becoming evident to a significant number of the people of Manitoba that this free - you know, the very same thing that we accused some of the present factors in the auto insurance industry, the assumption of guilt prior to being guilty, you know, in the case of the young driver in some areas and things like this - the assumption on the part of the government that any effort to attempt to regulate, to come together with private enterprise to work out a reasonable solution, one would think that they would choose that rather than jeopardize their position, that this will jeopardize them -- (Interjection) -- Yes, certainly.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Why doesn't the member persuade the Government of Ontario, the Progressive Conservative Government of Ontario to introduce the PC Plan so we could have competition between the two provinces and see which one works best.

MR. ENNS: Well, I think it's notable that within the very few short days it's quite evident that notice, national notice has been attracted to the PC Plan in B.C. and perhaps also in Ontario, and what we might well see a development of no-fault insurance taking on many of the major elements that you're proposing in your proposal, except the major elements that we are proposing in our proposal, and work for the people of Manitoba, bring about the best plan in Manitoba, but on a position that leaves room for comparisons, leaves room for yardsticks, leaves room for people to breathe and live.

MR. GREEN: . . . permit me a question? Is he aware that what he calls the PC Plan, even if it were a good one which I don't admit, could be provided under the bill presented by my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs and 15 percent cheaper at least?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can recall the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources when I had some difficulty with him on another matter and when I in fact, because of the reports or the information that I had was of an interdepartmental nature and I refuse to divulge them in the House just as he has refused to divulge interdepartmental information in this House when he is sitting in that House, I can recall him saying to me, what's wrong with your position is you're asking me to trust you, trust you, trust you.

MR. GREEN: That's right.

MR. ENNS: And you see, what are you doing to me right now? You've told us nothing. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs has been silent, deadly silent; in fact it's got to the point where we've started to worry about his health. He's had all kinds of other people here though saying trust us, trust us, trust us. They haven't told us anything; no premiums, no idea of the differential of urban and rural - in fact I suppose there will not be or should not be. Well, members that have read or referred to the Wootton Report have pulled out that particular recommendation and said that there's - you know, according to Wootton, there was little justification for differential in urban and rural rates. But, Mr. Speaker, that's here nor there, we've been faced with what my Leader called a kangaroo court and it's been absolutely correct - absolutely correct.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would you answer a question?

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well the question I wanted to know if you would answer is the one asked you by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. ENNS: I'm sorry, I didn't get the question.

MR. GREEN: Is he not aware that even if the PC Plan, as he calls it, were a good plan, that it could be provided in the bill now before the Legislature and it could be provided at a savings of administrative cost of 50 percent. Now of administrative costs we could cut them in half, we could cut the premium in the aggregate by about 50 percent.

MR. ENNS: If the Minister of Finance would have actually allowed - I was actually answering the question. I was answering the question because we now have on the authority of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources a guarantee, ironclad, that it'll save us 15 or 20 percent. Let's firm it up right now whatever it will be. I'm prepared you know, if you say so - you know, I look at you and look a little further and I see Moses and I'm ready to believe both of you. But the fact is, all I'm trying to suggest, Mr. Speaker, how changed the position is, how changed the position is. He tells us so and it's got to be so.

Well, Mr. Speaker, fine, if that's the case I suppose I should sit down and say it's going to be that way. -- (Interjection) -- Well no, Mr. Speaker, I will not vote for it because, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe, I do not believe -- (Interjection) -- I believe a lot of things. I believe for every drop of rain that falls and a few other things like that, but I do not believe that we have not the ability, the capacity in this Chamber to legislate, to regulate any sector in our community to serve the best interests of our people, and I believe that very simply and very sincerely. -- (Interjection) -- No, you don't have to accept it. All I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, though, what I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, you don't have to believe it at all, and of course this is where we get off into a tangent and this is where we get far adrift. You know, we've heard in the discourse, in the length of this debate, we've heard a lot of left field, out-field batting going on on both sides, and we've had a considerable demeaning debate to some extent with respect to all what's wrong with our system, or all that's wrong with the American system that seems to be coming into the debate every time. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being corny . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member he has five minutes remaining.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll not abuse that privilege. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of sounding a little over-sentimental, I am prepared at any time to talk at great length and use another 40 minutes about all the things that are right in our system . . .

MR. GREEN: I could spend 50.

MR. ENNS: . . . the fact that there is less of violence today than probably at any time in the history of mankind; the fact that there is less and more concern -- (Interjection) -- yes, individually and personally; and the fact that we are doing more in terms of our responsibilities for our fellow man than at any time in the world before. Oh yes, and that's not a debate. I'm prepared, Mr. Speaker, to look much more positively than has been looked at from time to time in the course of this debate about the positive things within our society. I'm prepared to believe very strongly in many of those things. And being a Conservative, there's nothing wrong - and of course you'd expect me to take that position - of not necessarily thinking that any institution or any system or any organization is bad merely because of its age or of its tradition. It's bad if it isn't functioning and it should be changed, but, Mr. Speaker, by the same yardstick, if I had to choose and measure personal freedom, personal happiness, health and opportunity available to any of God's children in this earth, I wouldn't change it for any other system than we have in this world.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member submit to a question? Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Member for Lakeside agree that the proposed PC Plan involves a review and a control and a reduction of commissions payable to agents for the sale of the compulsory features?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's that simplistic. I think the involvement of the \$300 ceiling on the no-fault enters into it in the sense that a tremendous amount of the administrative, legal and other costs are involved in that particular area, but certainly attached to it, I would have to agree with the Minister that a review, the controls and regulations of fees is an essential part of the proposed plan.

MR. CHERNIACK: Just to get clarification, did the honourable member agree that this would mean a reduction in commissions paid to auto insurance agents?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker, that's not a correct assumption at all - not a correct assumption at all.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): During the course of the honourable member's address, I heard him to indicate . . .

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): . . . question or not? I would like to ask a question if you're going to speak.

MR. PAWLEY: Pardon?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Are you speaking?

MR. PAWLEY: No, I'm asking a question. During the course of the honourable member's address, I understand him to have indicated that the plan outlined by his Leader was a novel one with respect to the savings that it could obtain. Is he aware that the Insurance Bureau of Canada on November 16th, 1969 presented a brief to the Manitoba Automobile Insurance Committee whereby it also recommended that savings could be obtained by reducing or even eliminating damages payable under the property damage section?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of that, in fact I was a member of the administration to whom that report was submitted. — (Interjection) — I would have liked to have been, eh? Well, small difference. Well I have not for one moment attempted to suggest that the whole import of the proposed scheme was developed within our own group, but I did suggest some very major features of it, particularly the ones with respect to the incentives in terms of the young drivers, the safe drivers, were programs that my Leader had given particular attention to.

MR. PAWLEY: Is the honourable member - a supplementary question - aware that the Insurance Bureau had indicated that any savings that might be obtained by this method would be substantially offset by increased costs on the collision side of the insurance contract?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to answer that question. I don't know of all the details myself except that I certainly subscribe to the position taken by my Leader in the sense that it's not an isolated -- if you take parts of the program out of context from the rest then the full benefits that we attend to accrue to it no doubt will not happen. If you accept the whole, we suggest that these benefits are available and not only to those that are there, but the promotion of the incentive to produce more safe drivers and at the same time harsher restrictions on those who aren't safe drivers, particularly in our younger groups who have - you know, it's hard to put figures on, but it stands to reason that they'll have very significant effects on policy holders within the other age group.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the member a question. Did your party consult with the insurance industry before you brought this scheme into the Legislature?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, unlike the party that is charged with the responsibility of bringing in a major auto insurance scheme, certainly we consulted with the industry. I'm sure that -- I would think that if the Minister of Education was bringing in some major change in education he'd probably consult with the educational society, the teachers and the trustees; or I'm sure if the Minister of Labour was bringing in major labour legislation that he would probably want to consult with some of the major labour organizations in the Province of Manitoba. But if there's any - and I will not disturb the decorum of the House, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting that in that question there was any implicit or any inclination on the part of the Minister of Transportation to impute motives of some dark and sinister nature to us in that

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) question, because I assure you nobody really wants his job because the roads in Manitoba are dusty, despite what he says about the rain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the member that I certainly didn't try to suggest anything, not with him. I simply wanted him to say yes or no. I don't want him to justify - they have every right to consult - I simply wanted to know, have you consulted? Not to justify it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the Member for Lakeside permit a question? Earlier in his speech he dealt rather harshly with the former Opposition - and I don't fault him for that, we made our mistakes - but is he aware that during this session that myself and his Leader reached an unofficial agreement to allow a certain length of time for discussion on every department within the 80 hours, and is he also aware that he and certain other members of his caucus ignored the admonitions of his Leader to avoid repetition, thereby using up all of the 80 hours without some of the departments being covered?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am an unfettered soul and whether bonds are put on me by the - well there are some restrictions and restraint when they are put on by my leader, but certainly none when they're put on by the Leader of the Liberal Party in the House here.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words to say on this very important matter. The reason I'm rising is that I had thought that the Premier of our province would at least make one speech on automobile insurance. - (Interjection) - Well, I'm glad to hear that. We've heard him make many statements around the province about automobile insurance, that if the Bill is defeated there'll be an election, and tonight he also confirmed the statement with the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

We're now dealing with the amendment to the main motion on second reading.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . the honourable member doesn't like interruptions but I'd like to ask him one question. Why is he so surprised if I should suggest that defeat on this Bill would involve an election? Why is he surprised when he knows as well as I that this is standard parliamentary procedure, defeat on a major policy bill is usually followed by an election.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mostly it's a defeat of the government, mostly on money bills in my experience in here. An exception could I guess be made, although there's never been an opportunity of any government to be defeated on a Bill that's put forward by the government of the day, but any money Bill that's defeated, it's naturally the call of election. I remember so well in 1959 that we were defeated at that time, in March. An election was called at that time. -- (Interjection) - '59. Surely no government wants an election if they can avoid it within four years and I agree with that. - (Interjection) - No, '59, 11 years ago.

The more I hear from the members opposite, I think the more they're wanting an election, and I would forecast right now that it'll be the last week of October, fairly close to the last week of October. Regardless of the outcome of this Bill, regardless of the outcome of this Bill there's going to be an election in October. I don't think I'm very far out either. Not very far out. - (Interjection) - Oh, I had a few thoughts in-my mind, and listening to the honourable member, my seat mate here, from Lakeside, he kind of got myself off.

But I do want to explain to the members here what I think is happening here in our Province of Manitoba. We have here a Socialist Government who is dedicated to their party, and one of their philosophies over the years - and I will agree with that, and they don't change, that's one thing about the Socialist Parties and the NDP Parties, they don't change - one of their platforms has always been government automobile insurance, a takeover of this great industry from the companies, and last June they had the pleasure of forming the government and one of the things that they set out to do was to bring this about.

Last October, I remember so well, on appointment of this committee, the committee that was supposed to look into the automobile insurance, the Chairman was the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his two appointees, a man from Brandon and a man brought in from Ontario, the secretary brought in from British Columbia, and they in turn decided what was going to be good for the Province of Manitoba.

Now I understand that the Minister of Municipal Affairs did take out an insurance licence

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) at one time but I also understand he never wrote a policy, never filled out an application. I don't know if that's right or not but this is what I was told. He has become an authority on insurance; he's become an authority and I can easily understand how easy it is to become an authority on insurance when you're a lawyer, because they know all the ins and outs practically on every liability case. They know how to deal with companies where there's a collision damage or accidents and they know how to make things linger a little longer as their bill runs up, and I must say that while I think lawyers only enter into about five percent of the actual accidents that ever happen in the province - five percent, that's about all lawyers ever get involved in - they do take a considerable sum of money out of the pockets of the policy holders. Well, I shouldn't say taking all out, it isn't maybe that large an amount, but they have taken out considerable because of their excessive charges.

This is the one thing that we've heard so violently, if we could only do away with the agents we'd save the people of Manitoba 15 percent. If we could only do away with the lawyers of Manitoba - and I understand there are too many according to the President of the Bar Association - we could save the people of Manitoba a lot of money too. But I'm not one of those who believe that we should do away with lawyers and I'm not one of those who believes we should do away with the insurance agents of Manitoba, because they are serving as useful a purpose as the lawyers of Manitoba in their own field, and this is where I see the whole situation differently from the government of the day over there. I know the rates that you'll pay to your several agents that you establish in the Province of Manitoba. I know it's about 15 or 20 cents a policy. This is what you'll pay and this is how you'll save your 15 percent. But what does that man do? What does he do for his work for 15 or 20 cents? I'll tell you what he does . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Where did you get your information?

MR. McKELLAR: Well, I know what they pay in Saskatchewan so you'll pay about the same. You can't save 15 percent unless you do cut out that agent's commission. I know. So what happens? That agent is no good to the people who have cars insured because he's not a specialist, he doesn't know what to do and furthermore he isn't available for people in trouble. Furthermore, if you have accidents on weekends, you're going to have to wait quite awhile to get even information through to the head office.

Now they talk about they're going to save all this money. Well, I can tell you one thing, likely as not they'll use coloured gas in the cars they're going to use for their government cars - I know this is just about there right now - and they'll save half the cost of gasoline. Being as the Queen's Printer is down here in the basement, they'll use the Queen's Printer down in the basement for doing all their printing and they'll save some more money there. They'll likely not pay any sales tax on physical damage costs and I know that'll likely be true. They're not going to pay any medical costs, not a dollar out of their insurance premiums for the medical costs; they'll all be insured under the Medical Corporation. There'll not be \$1.00 paid out in hospitalization costs because it will be all absorbed in the hospitalization field.

MR. GREEN: You're wrong; you're wrong.

MR. McKELLAR: I'm saying this right now and I'll bet it's true. You can't deny it because you haven't got a policy to come up with on the table right now and show me different.

MR. GREEN: And you haven't heard it because it's not true.

MR. McKELLAR: But I'll bet I'm awful close. I bet I'm awful close.

MR. GREEN: Let's bet then.

MR. McKELLAR: I bet I'm awful close because I know the Socialists well enough that they're not going to take a nickel out of that premium dollar of insurance and distribute, and that's one of the ways why you are going to save 15 percent.

MR. GREEN: That is not a saving.

MR. McKELLAR: I know from experience, and I must say I was on the government side for 11 years and nobody needs to tell me the efficiency of government. I don't care who's operating the government. I want to tell you, the more you get involved in government the more inefficient you're going to be. I know who you're going to hire. There'll be about half a dozen from my constituency, a half a dozen from the Member from Portage la Prairie and half a dozen more from Rhineland, and you'll have all your friends looked after and all your relatives.

MR. GREEN: Is that what you did, Earl?

MR. McKELLAR: Yes, and will they be efficient? You won't hire them for efficiency's sake. You won't hire them for efficiency's sake. You'll have an army that you can turn loose

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) at election time and — (Interjection) — and I'll fight you on even ground in my area. — (Interjection) — Yes, that's one thing I forgot too. You're going to have the Department of Public Works buy the building. I understand it's already been bought, the Auditorium, to put the five or six hundred, seven hundred people in. They'll provide the building free, it'll come out of the Consolidated Revenue. These are the things that happened in Saskatchewan. These are nothing new; it happened 25 years ago in Saskatchewan. This is why they could never get a financial statement. It is impossible to get it. The Consolidated Revenue is paying a good majority of the costs of the insurance plan.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Remember the deal here in 1960?

MR. McKELLAR: If this is what you want and if this is what the people of Manitoba want, this is what they'll get, but this is what I'll tell them, they'd better look out.

We heard tonight the question asked — the Minister of Municipal Affairs asked the Member for Lakeside a question about IBC, that they could transfer all the property damage costs and third party liability and put them on collision. What happens if it's a train the car hits? Have you ever thought of that? What happens if it's a train? Many, many accidents that have taken place over the years have not been involved with two automobiles. You just can't work it that way and they likely knew that. I don't know why they mentioned that, but you can run into a train and that accident will cost at least a half a million dollars.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member would appreciate this point of privilege. The word in the IBC Brief, as I indicated in my question to the honourable member, was "substantial", not "all".

MR. McKELLAR: Well I guess — well I'll tell you, I could tell you a lot but you wouldn't understand it if I did tell you because insurance is so involved, and technical, it wouldn't be possible to tell the Father what it's all about.

Now we've heard a lot about the young driver and I know the young drivers have been involved in accidents. They've been involved to the point where one in three have an accident every year, and the average cost of an accident runs around \$800.00. Many of these young drivers are not all principal operators. This is what the members should realize, they're not all principal operators. A lot of them are occasional drivers. An occasional driver gets his insurance for at least one-third of what a principal operator does, and this is the case in many families in the Province of Manitoba. In fact I have at least three young drivers out of four that are insured as occasional drivers in their family, reducing the cost a great deal. The statement made by my Leader, trying to encourage the young driver to be a better driver by incentive plan, has a lot of merit because I think this is where the fault lies. I had one young driver insured, he was 16 years old, that had two charges this past summer for having open liquor in the car. He then took his father's car out and rolled it over. Lucky enough he was insured as principal operator or he wouldn't be covered, but there are a number of them that need to have some incentive and the penalties will be there to look after them if they do not drive in the proper manner. I think many of them have to be told in such a way that I think through the pocketbook is not only the right way; I think it has to be done through suspension.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we heard some time ago about race discrimination. We've heard a lot of things happen in this debate. We've heard from — and I often wonder about some of these speeches that have been made out on the public platform, I have never sat in on any of them — but I think it's quite easy to make a statement on the public platform when there's nobody there to correct you and I'm kind of sorry the Minister of Agriculture hadn't given a second thought before he made that statement because I think many of the people in Manitoba thought this was an actual fact right today and it isn't an actual fact. They do ask a lot of questions but they are more or less how many accidents they had and whether their character is satisfactory, their drinking habits or something like that and if they're born in Canada and a few more questions like that. But there's no question in any application I've ever seen in my 25 years in the business did it ever mention racial discrimination and I hope the public have realized this by now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're coming to the latter part of the debate. We've heard from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources twice; we've heard from the Minister of Finance twice and I think one or two others; but I would hope even on the main motion or on the amendment that our First Minister will get up and state the position of the government, what the proposed policy will be, because this is one of the things we have never heard yet. We've heard the report over and over again and we in the Opposition and the people of Manitoba have

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) yet to hear of what the proposed policy of the government will be. It's easy enough to get up in here and say that the plan says this and Saskatchewan's got this, but I think it's high time, it's high time that the First Minister got up on his feet and told us what their plan will be and I would hope that he will do this. Wouldn't it be a tragic thing for the people of Manitoba if we were to go through the Public Utilities Committee and come back into the House and go through the Committee of the Whole and Third Reading and never at any time would we hear what the proposed plan of the government will be.

If ever there was a warning to the government of the day, they should bring this plan out. If they appreciate democracy, I would suggest to them that they lay that plan on the table. They can leave the details for the Regulations and I think this is what they should do and I hope that the First Minister will do it. I've known the First Minister ever since we first both came into the House at the same time in 1958 and I have confidence in him that he will lay this plan on, not in detail, but the general outline of their plan so that people of Manitoba can come in and speak for or against it when we go into Public Utilities Committee.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): It's already been done.

MR. McKELLAR: The Minister of Agriculture makes the statement, "It's already been done." I'd like to see a piece of paper with that plan laid on it, and he can't . . .

MR. USKIW: Read Hansard. It's all there.

MR. McKELLAR: Well, I've been in here a long while and the Minister of Agriculture need not try to fool me or anybody else. He's only fooling himself. It shows that he lacks consideration for the people of Manitoba, and I think the farmers are getting about the same treatment right now, and I suggest that he should pay a little more attention to the farmers too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have about completed all my few remarks that I was going to make. Once again I want to quote — (Interjection) — after I've finished. With your making this statement about 15 percent cheaper, are you guaranteeing every policy holder in the Province of Manitoba that you're going to be 15 percent cheaper? — (Interjection) — I know you say "no", but you go around telling everybody in a general outline that you're going to give this insurance 15 percent cheaper, and I'll bet right now that 75 percent of the policy holders will be paying more money. I'll bet you right now; I'll lay odds on that. And with that statement, Mr. Speaker, I'll sit down and let the Premier take over and present his policy to the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to resist the tempting offer of the honourable member, however I do undertake to speak to the matter at the appropriate time. In any case, there have been — I'm rising to ask a question, Sir — there have been a number of interesting things said by the last speaker and so I'd like to ask him this question. He made passing reference to the farmers in his concluding few sentences and I would like to ask him, in a serious way, that whatever one may think about the state of the farm economy, we may even agree that farmers are not getting the kind of treatment under farm policy that they should, but in what specific way is the present government's policies militating against farmers any more than the previous administration. What changes have we made that are more negative in their effect on farmers than the previous administration?

MR. McKELLAR: Well, if you're going to deal with insurance, if you're talking about insurance, I'll tell you right now that every farmer is going to pay more for his insurance and that's increasing his cost. I'll tell you another thing too, never in history, and I mean in history, are we — we're in a more serious position right now than we ever were in the 30's. We're selling grain for a cent a pound at our — (Interjection) — What are we getting out of the Wheat Board? I'm going to debate with you on that. What are we getting on the Wheat Board? In our point, at Nesbitt, we just started our second bushel today. I'd like you to live on one bushel quota for 10 and a half months, and I think the government, had they been wise and treated the farmers fairly, they would have accepted the resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye because this is where it's got to start. It's got to start somewhere. It took the Farm Bureau and the Grain Council, once they started around the Province of Manitoba discussing the Task Force on Agriculture, then the Minister of Agriculture got off his rear end and also was going to call a meeting after the session is over, but the damage is done . . .

MR. USKIW: It was all done by the . . .

MR. McKELLAR: The damage is done because the farmer, the young farmer, and it's the young farmer is who I am pleading for, the ones between 30, 25 and 40 years of age, are

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) being hurt and I mean every word of it, they're getting hurt and they need some help and guidance.

MR. SCHREYER: I agree with you, but that's been the story for the last 20 years.

MR. McKELLAR: What do you mean story?

MR. SCHREYER: For the last 20 years, not just in the last year.

MR. McKELLAR: I'll debate with you another time.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour please -- The Honourable Member for Roblin.

. continued on next page

MR. WALLY J MCKENZIE (ROBLIN): Well, Mr. Speaker, rather than vote on this very serious issue tonight, I will try and talk the clock out seeing as how no others accept, and if the members opposite are really looking for a filibuster, I'll show you what a filibuster is. I think . . .

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

MR. MCKENZIE: . . . if all of us say to you and to the House they've been at great length talking about a filibuster across the way, but I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have been very serious in our debates; we've been very serious in our consideration of this very important matter; and I humbly submit until I got on my feet tonight there has not been a filibuster from the opposition benches. --(Interjection)-- not till I'm finished. --(Interjection)-- Well I'll try and permit the honourable member a question but I haven't said anything yet so what's he going to ask me. --(Interjection) -- No I haven't, I haven't said a thing. I'm talking about the amendment for Bill -- and this is so classic of you, Mr. Speaker, and I humbly submit that some day before this House adjourns that you should take issue with the members opposite for the way they've conducted themselves. I think the day is - and maybe even tonight would be a good night to speak, to give us a chance to get our views across without being interrupted from time to time immemorial. There's no possible way that a man with my limited knowledge and my limited ability, Mr. Speaker, can get his point across. Just about the time you get your thoughts all phrased and you're ready to go, somebody over there stands up and interrupts you. I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, it's unfair. They are the government of the day; the opposition in government, in case you didn't know, Mr. Speaker, you are on our side. In my anticipation, the opposition was created to give the voice of the people against this great big strong government over here and you're supposed to be on our side, Mr. Speaker, defending us. I have no quarrel, I think you've done a wonderful job in this session, Mr. Speaker, and I congratulate you for your initiative and the way you've conducted the matter of the House. But let's get on with Bill 56 which is . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege, a point of parliamentary privilege. I'm hoping that my honourable friend the Member for Roblin was saying that in a bantering manner when he suggested that the Chair was on the side of one side of this House or the other, because I think that that is really a sad reflection on the proper role of the Chair which is to be impartial as between both sides.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, if I in any way infringed on your rights, I apologize. I didn't mean it that way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: If I may speak on the same point of privilege, I think that you have been quite fair but I would think that at times Ministers have used their positions to interject and say too much at times to make your job very difficult, but I appreciate that you've been very fair.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin. I do hope that all honourable members will take heed of comments made by both previous members. The Honourable Member for Roblin may proceed.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it is my duty, Mr. Speaker, to try and get this government to put their Automobile Insurance Plan on the table. It's as simple as that. How long do we have to stand here and ask this government? One simple thing will solve this whole problem, Mr. Speaker, put your plan on the table. Let's have a look at it; let me take it out to my constituency tonight or phone home and say, we've finally got it. How can I vote for a pig in a poke? Do you mean to tell me that I would be that kind of an M. L. A. to stand up and vote for something I haven't seen? I don't know what it's all about. It's an illusion; it's a strawman; it's a shadow. Would you vote for that? If you represent your constituents in that manner, I would submit to the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, he better go and take another look. He wasn't sent here to defend the people of his constituency under those rules, and if he has a quarrel with me under that statement I challenge him to stand up and task me with it.

But I'm a different M. L. A. than the Member for - is it St. Matthews? - I'm a different kind of an M. L. A. I don't vote until I see what I'm voting for. Now he's a different type of politician; he represents an illusion or a philosophy or a dream. He's one of these book-worms. You know, I basically don't know, and I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, that in all faith, and to the integrity and to the history of this province, 100 years, put your plan on the table. I submit to you again, Mr. First Minister, tonight, let's have a look at it. Let's have

MR. J. MCKENZIE cont'd.) a look at it. We've got our plan. There it is - black and white. - it's on the table, but we haven't seen theirs.

And of course, Mr. Speaker, the point that really got me involved in selling insurance, the point that got me most interested was the -- oh, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is not in his chair, but he even submits tonight that we may save 50 percent and I'm for it all the way. That's the kind of saving that I would like. I don't know how he's going to do it, maybe we join the two plans together - and I think that's worth the time and the effort of this House and the members to sit down and put the two plans together - and if we can save 50 percent, Mr. Speaker, I'm all for it, but not on a monopoly with the government operating it because I think we have enough people in this province . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Would you permit a question?

MR. MCKENZIE: . . . skilled, talented, the best brains of the insurance industry are here, and with our help and their help, if there's any way we can save 50 percent, Mr. Speaker, I'm for it and I bet you're for it. I bet you are, Mr. Speaker. I bet you are, and I bet the people of Manitoba are for it, and it would be most unfortunate that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has other duties - and that's fine and no doubt we will have the time to come back and take a look at this at another time - but if there is a possibility of a 50 percent saving, then I'm all for it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? I know you'd rather not, but would you actually?

MR. MCKENZIE: Yes, I'll try.

MR. SCHREYER: Thank you. And I ask this question only because the honourable member has repeatedly used the figure of 50 percent, possible 50 percent saving, and I know that he would want to put the record straight and not cause or compound misimpressions, so my question is, does he realize that when the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources referred to the possibility of a 50 percent saving, he was referring to the possibility of a 50 percent saving on administrative costs alone, or putting it another way, a 15 percent saving in terms of total premium cost.

MR. MCKENZIE: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't understand it that way. If that is what the First Minister says, I got no quarrel with the First Minister on that basis because I basically haven't got any proof to justify. I heard the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources say there is a possibility of a 50 percent saving, and if there is, then I think it's our right and it's our duty to put it on the table and let's have a look at it. That's all we're asking for. I think we owe it to the House, we owe it to the people that we represent, if we can afford them on the insurance of their vehicles in this province 50 percent. But, Mr. Speaker, this may be an illusion; this could be a dream this 50 percent. And this is where I think the Member for St. Matthews is, he's off in a dream world; the Minister of Municipal Affairs he's got some dreaming illusion over there such as a report that he said that he went around and he got all this information that we got in our drawers here.

I was on the Committee that was struck in this Legislature when I first came here in 1966 and we done, I thought, a very thorough study of the industry. We had many hearings and they weren't of the same type that the Honourable Member had; we compiled a lot of information, and finally decided, in agreement with the N. D. P. - in agreement with the N. D. P. - let's wait for the Wootton Report. You know, it's cost a million bucks, let's wait for it; let's wait for the Alberta Report. Why should we challenge or tax the people of this province a million bucks for something we could have got? I think the bill was \$10, 000 wasn't it, Mr. Speaker? He was on the Committee. I think the cost was \$10, 000 for the transcript of the B. C. study. The Alberta study, I don't know what the cost of that was, I haven't got the figure, but nevertheless, we finally got them. We waited a long time, but in the main, Mr. Speaker, we got the N. D. P. playing politics in that committee. They weren't interested in that Wootton Report any more than I'm interested in flying to the moon. They were interested in politics. Remember the history of that Committee where they said we never said nothing? They come into the House and moved that you do this, you do that, because - you know, he said this committee was a farce.

I submit very humbly to you, Mr. Speaker, that we studied it very seriously. We studied it very seriously and we done it a different way than the government of the day. So I humbly submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of the House tonight, that this committee has been badly misinformed - badly misinformed about the industry as it operates in this province; badly misinformed as the industry works in Canada; badly misinformed at the way

MR. WALLY J. MCKENZIE cont'd.) . . . insurance works in Saskatchewan because your friend Blackburn hasn't been there for about seven years, you remember? And maybe eight years. There's a lot of changes in eight years, Mr. Speaker. Isn't it amazing? It's a changing world.

Could you imagine us trying to put a plan through this Legislature tonight, Mr. Speaker, that was good in Saskatchewan 20 years ago? That's what we're trying to do; that's what this government is trying to put across to us. But I humbly submit, in their great wisdom and in their knowledge and in their philosophy, they'll recognize that we have something to help them out with to resolve this difficult political problem in this province today. Well, we've got a stalemate. We're stuck here with a stalemate and we could be here till Christmas trying to resolve this thing. If we would recognize that there are alternatives, and not stand up like the members opposite are standing up here day and after day and saying there are no alternatives; take it or else; take it out before the people. Well, we're ready to go to the people on this issue. Why wouldn't we? That's what we're selected to do, to represent the views of the people that we represent, and if the First Minister wants to call an election on this issue I'm ready to go. No problem.

MR. JOHANNSON: You won't be here next time.

MR. MCKENZIE: History will tell the story of my future in politics and my future in Roblin Constituency, Mr. Speaker, and I don't need the Honourable Member for St. Matthews to give me any wisdom about my constituency. I would never even try to tell him what his political career is going to be in his constituency because I don't think I have any right to. But I resent, Mr. Speaker, him telling me what my future is in my constituency.

Well, let's get on. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the committee and the government are badly misinformed. And let's talk about their popularity. This government today, you know, think they've got all the answers to all the problems of this province. I submit they better go out and take another look. You're not as good as you were. You know, you started pretty high and you know what happened in the old country the other day. --(Interjection)-- Well let's not get on too solid ground over there and build your future on an automobile insurance plan, that that's going to carry you with your political philosophy through the problems of administering this province because it don't wash with me and it doesn't wash with a lot of people in this province, and if you want to go to the people on insurance, I say let's go and let's call it quick, Mr. Speaker, because . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Would the member submit to a question?

MR. MCKENZIE: No, not till I finish because I want to have my full 40 minutes, Mr. Speaker, if you'll permit me the pleasure. And this is what I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, remember my remarks and what I tried to tell you? It's very difficult for a member like me to get on his feet and speak in this House because you're continually interrupted by the government. The government doesn't need to interrupt us, Mr. Speaker, they're the government of the day, and if anybody should be asking the questions it's the Opposition. You're the government. Then why do they continually ask all the questions? I haven't been here -- (Interjection) -- Well, I haven't been here that long, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not the most knowledgeable person politically in this province, but it just scares me to see a government of the day who's continually asking the Opposition questions. My God! Do you mean to tell me that this is going to be the future of Manitoba, with all your great ideology and all your philosophy, that you have to continually ask us what to do?

You know, I was a backbencher with the government - and it was an honour - and maybe they are scared to persevere and make these decisions. I never in my political career ever saw the front bench ask the Opposition questions, Mr. Speaker. Now we can check that out in Hansard, Mr. Speaker, because you were here the same time I was, and maybe in your Chambers some day you and I could leaf through Hansard and check that out. But it's a new philosophy I think, and of course they said this was going to be a new government - the new way, the new stall, the new world, the second century of history in this great province, where the government asks the Opposition questions and no doubt they'll formulate their policy around that. -- (Interjection) -- No they don't. They will I think in time.

But let's move along on Bill 56 and this amendment that we're debating tonight, Mr. Speaker. The first point that I'm trying to get across to the First Minister and his government, Mr. Speaker, is that they've been badly misinformed about the past history of this great Province of Manitoba, badly misinformed where it never before has had the type of government that it's got today. You know, Manitoba today is what it is - and it's a great place to be,

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) it's healthy, it's clean, it's fresh, it's nice and I like it. I'm an ex-Saskatchewanite and I love it, but we've never before got exposed to this type of government. Therefore, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that they better be very careful on which ground they tread or what changes they make because this province has made great strides in the last hundred years and we're to stand here today historically and honour our ancestors and those that came here and persevered and pioneered and put Manitoba where it is today, the best place in the world to live and I like it very much.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, very humbly, that this government and this First Minister better be very very careful before they break down the tradition of this great province and our history by bringing in measures of a socialistic nature or a derogatory fashion such as this Bill 56 where they won't put the Bill on the table; they won't tell us what we're debating; they won't tell us what we're going to do. I have no way, Mr. Speaker, of going back to my constituency tonight and say, well, I was in the House last night. "Bill 56 - what did you do or what did you say?" I said I spoke about three times but I don't know what I'm talking about because I don't know what it's all about. There's no Bill, there's no plan, and this is general, Mr. Speaker, all over this province. People are waiting as we sit here in our chairs tonight, Mr. First Minister, for you to put that plan on the table. . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member has just said - I believe his very words are that he doesn't know what he's talking about. It seems to me, Sir, that there must be a rule in this House about an honourable member, if he rises in his place to speak, must be relevant in what he says and must know what he's talking about, so perhaps the honourable member is out of order, is he?

MR. McKENZIE: Well, that's a lovely question, Mr. Speaker, and I love to answer it because I just ask the First Minister, you come over here and sit in my chair and get in the debate of Bill 56 and what would you say? You'd say exactly the same thing I said. You'd say exactly the same thing that I said, because in my two speeches on Bill 56, Mr. Speaker, I've said it and I say it again, how can you bat at shadows? How can you bat at strawmen? How can you talk about something you haven't seen? -- (Interjection) -- Well, that's what I keep telling my people in Roblin constituency, there's no way that I can make a just decision; there's no way I can debate; there's no way I can talk to the First Minister; there's basically no way I can talk to you, Mr. Speaker, because we don't know what we're talking about. We haven't seen it. The Minister of Municipal Affairs sits forward and he's got his hands on his face and he, you know, drools in his place. We were on the airplane up to Dauphin the other night and we had a great debate on the plane although I wasn't involved in it. The Member for Ste. Rose was -- (Interjection) -- Yes, but nevertheless he still didn't tell us the plan even though we were in the confines of an airplane. I thought maybe I would get some inside information but unfortunately we didn't, Mr. Speaker.

Another point in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and this is the one I think that I should direct to the new members. There's a lot of new members in this House. What did they say the changeover? Fifty percent? So there's a lot of new members who don't know the history of the study and this automobile insurance debate in the province or in this Legislature. Those over there only know that side of the story. We have some over here who possibly only know our side of the story. There could be some, the Liberal boys I think have been here for some time, but here we have a bunch of new MLAs in this Legislature who basically don't know the history of what has been done in this Legislature.

MR. BILL URUSKI (St. George): Nothing.

MR. McKENZIE: He says "nothing", and I submit that that's a fair answer from somebody that's only been here one year, and I think there's a lot more like the Honourable Member for St. George who says nothing has been done because . . .

MR. URUSKI: On automobile insurance.

MR. McKENZIE: That's right. He said it, Mr. Speaker, I didn't say it and I submit that if you look around the benches there's a lot of MLAs just like the Honourable Member from St. George who would say exactly the same thing and I say that's not true. I appeal to the Minister of Labour -- (Interjection) -- Right. -- (Interjection) -- The Minister of Finance, the Minister of Education. There's many MLAs, the Whip of the New Democratic Party. Something has been done. You maybe say nothing, but some things were done before you came on the scene. You know, the Honourable Member for St. George doesn't recognize that, but I humbly submit to him that there were some things done and the matter was seriously discussed

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) and seriously studied . . .

MR. URUSKI: I'm listening.

MR. McKENZIE: I just ask you, Mr. Speaker, how, how can the Member for St. George make a just decision on this Bill 56 when he comes here in that frame of mind. How can any MLA that's only been here 12 months change this whole province upside down, knock out an insurance industry that's the best in western Canada and maybe of all Canada. It's been here for a long time, a lot longer than he's been an MLA, and he stands up in this House, Mr. Speaker, and says nothing has been done. He's only been here 12 months and all of a sudden he's an expert. Oh, it irritates me, Mr. Speaker. On an issue as great as this, I think the Honourable Member for St. George better take another look and he better go and study some of the reports and the studies that have been done in this big Province of Manitoba . . .

MR. URUSKI: Would the member permit a question?

MR. McKENZIE: . . . and don't get himself off on those tangents or those philosophies and . . .

MR. URUSKI: Would the member submit to a question?

MR. McKENZIE: When I'm finished. I would like to go as long as I can. I'll answer your question, the honourable member, as soon as I'm finished. That's another problem in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and that's a serious problem, when you have men, MLAs representing an area that come in here with a warped mind like that. There's no way he's going to change his mind; there's no way. I'm ready to change. We put a plan on the table; we're ready to change. I'm for compulsory insurance; I'm for no-fault. I've shifted my policy. In four years I'm a completely new guy as far as automobile insurance, and I tell the First Minister, because I well recognize the matter has to be seriously studied; I well recognize this is a changing world and nothing that was good 12 months ago is good today. It is a changing world and we can't be like the Member for St. George who came in here with a warped mind and says nothing was done, and as long as you've got men on the backbench, Mr. Speaker, like the Member for St. George, there's no way that we're going to resolve this problem. But I have; I've changed my mind. We put our plan on the table too, Mr. Speaker. Remember the other night? There it is in black and white.

Now, let's move on. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I have a lot of points, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get across tonight. Now if I'm going too fast -- and I know when I speak insurance a lot of the members opposite get lost. They have a problem over there, I agree. I don't want to cloud the issue but I'm trying to clarify something that's been under great debate here. We've been debating this Bill 56 and now the amendment, and it doesn't seem that we're going to get anywhere with it. So what I'm trying to do is try and see if they can't compromise and we can't compromise, and possibly with the wisdom of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources we likely could come up with a 50 percent saving. I'm sure we could. The best political brains of this province are in this House.

MR. PAWLEY: Where?

MR. McKENZIE: Well, I don't know where but they're supposed to be, and I give the government credit for their share and I think we have our share of people in the Opposition that have the ability. . .

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . would never make a claim like that.

MR. McKENZIE: Where did that come from, Sir? Mr. Mackling? Was that over the gesture or the goodwill -- would you turn it back to the First Minister on my behalf please and ask him just what gesture was sent over on that particular item and . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that was not from me, I don't know why the honourable member . . .

MR. McKENZIE: The Attorney-General sent it over.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: . . . it's in order to put the question. I think the Honourable Member for Roblin was asking me to comment, and I believe that's the fact, he still has the floor, at least I believe he wishes to have the floor. I don't know what comment I'm supposed to make and I don't quite understand the nature of the exchange of the card.

MR. SPEAKER: Well if the honourable member still wishes to continue with the debate he may do so. The Chair was of the impression that the debate ended on the amendment.

MR. BILTON: The Honourable Member for Roblin, it would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word on that point of order, seems to be offended with what was sent over by the

(MR. BILTON cont'd.) Honourable the Attorney-General and he resumed his seat.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if any response is expected from me, I must confess I'm unable to respond because I don't understand the nature of this exchange of cards here or something, but even so, I don't know what it's intended to mean.

MR. McKENZIE: I resent that very much. I don't think that this Chamber calls for that type of operation by the Attorney-General of this province who is supposed to set a standard that's high and somebody that we can be credible to, who sent me over here a little message "Know Your Limit". That's one of those messages that was sent out by the Honourable Minister of Transportation. I know what the background or the philosophy of it is, but if he or the Attorney-General wants me to sit down because saying "know my limit", Mr. Speaker, I will sit down, but I regret that type of procedure in this House very much.

MR. SCHREYER: I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I confess that I don't really understand what this card is all about, but what I find even more puzzling is that the Honourable Member for Roblin can find it to be so insulting. I don't mind showing it to anyone. It's a card that cannot be regarded as insulting. It's simply an information card as to the relationship between weight and ability to drive. It has a calendar on it and I find it inoffensive in every respect. It's so inoffensive — (Interjection) — "Know Your Limit Guide." It's available to every person of the motoring public. It's not offensive and I don't see why . . .

MR. BILTON: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think on behalf of my honourable colleague, in reply to what the First Minister has had to say, I think the implication was quite obvious as to what the Attorney-General intended. When the honourable gentleman had the floor, he doesn't have to take notes such as that.

HON. AL MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do recall when I was speaking some time ago when these cards were distributed by the Honourable Minister of Transport to every member, that someone across the way, I don't know who the identity was, sent me one of these cards during the course of my remarks.

-- (Interjection) -- All right, on a different subject matter. I took no offence to it at all, and since the Honourable Member from Roblin was giving us a very jocular presentation, I assumed that he would know that the limit was indicated to the extent of his speaking and certainly not to anything in respect to any other matters.

MR. McKENZIE: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for being hasty and possibly I shouldn't have taken issue with that little pamphlet being sent over, but I think in the interest of my trying to make a presentation, Mr. Speaker, the message could have waited till I was finished and I would have been glad to discuss the matter with the Attorney-General. I apologize if I have in any way infringed on the First Minister and I'll try and carry on with my debate.

Mr. Speaker, on this great issue, Bill 56 and the amendment that we have before us tonight, I still submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the government of the day, that this philosophy and background from which this plan that we are debating was created was outdated and not a plan that has any bearing of the insurance needs of this province. It was brought into Saskatchewan some 25 years ago, and as I said in remarks earlier, Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, that's not Manitoba today. I say that the Weir plan has an incentive, it has a future for the people of this province, it has a future for the agents of this province, it has a future for the insurance industry, and I can't see any way that the government of the day or the members of that government can quarrel with a plan such as we have put before the House.

And of course the whole debate comes down to vote, as to whether or not or how this Bill 56 and the amendment that we have before us tonight, Mr. Speaker, is going to be made law or defeated or whether we go into an election or what its future will be. But someplace along the line, Mr. Speaker, I humbly submit that somebody on our bench or somebody on their bench on the government side is going to have to change his position on this great issue; otherwise it's a stalemate, and that possibly would put the onus on the Speaker to cast the deciding vote. Of course I look immediately to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface who says he's a Liberal Democrat or he's a Social Democrat, I forget the various terminology that he's used. He's a baseball player, he tripped the Honourable Member for Lakeside, he's a nice guy and he's my personal friend and one of the members that I respect in this House, but nevertheless in politics Mr. Speaker, you have to look some way where we can resolve this whole matter which is so serious to you, Mr. Speaker, tonight and so serious to this House.

I humbly submit that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has the whole thing in the palm of his hand, just like that. I don't believe in the G's and G's, I don't think they've got that

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) kind of control in this debate. They may have it in other debates, but I don't think they have because the Honourable Member from St. Boniface said in Hansard, Page 2986, he said, Mr. Speaker, and I quote: "Friends from across cannot understand how anyone could be interested in anything that doesn't serve his own personal vested interest, it would seem." Quite a statement, Mr. Speaker, quite a statement. I wonder how the Honourable Member from St. Boniface wandered from the Liberal benches - he used to sit where I'm sitting, by the way, Mr. Speaker - how the Honourable Member for St. Boniface wandered from that seat over to that seat. Now he made the statement . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Same way you did from that seat to that seat.

MR. McKENZIE: That's a fair statement, Mr. Speaker, but he made this statement after he went over . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I can't hear you, come closer. I can't hear him.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . because he said "friends from across cannot understand how anyone, how anyone could be interested in anything" - now that's a broad statement to make, Mr. Speaker, - "that doesn't serve his own personal vested interest."

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I think that I should be able to clarify this. I was referring then to the remark that had been made by at least four members on this side of the House that brought in a position, to talk about the fact that I was a funeral director and that they thought it was so odd that I shouldn't have my guideline right in front of me, and this is what I said, that when you come in here you don't necessarily try to work for a vested interest. This is all I said, so don't take this out of context, please.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll carry on with the honourable member's speech if you'll permit me, to try and prove to him that he does have some interest in this debate and some interest in this Bill 56 and the amendment, because he went on and said, still on Page 2986, "I feel that for having sat with members of the government that I'm a better man for it" - and there's nothing wrong with that statement, Mr. Speaker, it's quite legitimate and it's quite sensible - "that I've seen what goes on on the other side of the fence also." And that's what I wonder there where he's referring to this other side of the fence. Is he talking about the other side of the insurance fence or where is he leading us on that remark, Mr. Speaker.

Then he went on anyway, and further in the speech he said - he said in the closing paragraph of that clause, he says: "I don't have to agree with it and he knows it, he knows it and I know it too, so he doesn't have to agree with me and I don't have to agree with many of the other members either. So I'm not selling myself and I'm not afraid to speak for what I believe in, Mr. Speaker." I think that's a fair statement by the honourable member and I've no quarrel with that, but what I'm trying to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and tell the House, that that is the difficult situation that we are in in this House on Bill 56 and the amendment that's before you tonight. There is a member who was a Liberal, a well-known Liberal in this province . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I still am.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . but he's sitting on the other side of the House on this great issue. We see his colleagues over here and we know where they stand. They come out loud and clear but he's sitting over there. Now we're talking that he's a Socialist Democrat, is it?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, a Liberal Democrat.

MR. McKENZIE: . . . and that's the difficulty in this debate. The Member for St. George right behind him, the same kind of a problem; or the Member for St. Matthews, the same kind of a problem. How, Mr. Speaker, are we going to resolve this great problem that we're in in this province today. How are we going to solve this Bill 56? I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, that some place along the line we've got to sit down in committee, or a Committee of the Whole and study this. I don't think the time is right for this to go to the people of this province on politics with an insurance plan because it just isn't justified to the taxpayers of this province. With the problems economically we're having in rural Manitoba today, I don't think the time is right for an election and surely us 57 members in this House, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Would my honourable friend permit a question?

MR. McKENZIE: . . . can sit down and resolve this problem for insurance to the best interests of everybody in this province.

MR. DESJARDINS: Would my honourable friend permit a question?

MR. McKENZIE: Let's keep politics out of insurance, Mr. Speaker, and let's sit down and resolve this problem in the best interests of Manitoba in this Centennial year.

MR. DESJARDINS: Would my honourable friend permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member's question was answered.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I didn't even ask it, how could it be answered, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking a question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Your request to ask a question was answered. May the Honourable Member for Roblin proceed.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well in the main, Mr. Speaker, we get back to the original cause of this great debate. You know, we get into rates and stuff. If the Minister of Transportation, you know, would go out and take a look at some of his roads, I submit the rates are going to go up real fast unless he starts fixing some roads in this province. Some of these P.R. roads, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, are dangerous right now. It may cause insurance rates to go up. A simple thing like that, Mr. Speaker, can change this whole debate, can change the whole thing that we're talking about. Where the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is talking about a 15 percent decline, I say to the Minister of Transportation, unless he gets out and looks at the road system of this province, they could go up 30 percent just like that, a simple little thing. You can't take it out of one pocket and put it in the other, Mr. Speaker, there's no way, there's no way in this.

So I say again to you, Mr. Speaker, if the government would lay their plan on the table beside the plan that my Leader put on the table, and let's sit in committee and take the best of two worlds, put the best of what he's got in his plan, maybe the Liberal Party has some suggestions, maybe the Social Credit and the First Minister, and let's lay it down on the table and put the best of all plans - and bring the industry in - and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that we will have the best insurance industry in the whole wide world, because nobody in the whole wide world can touch the insurance industry that we enjoy in rural Manitoba today. And I challenge you, Mr. Speaker, or any member over there, to take issue with the cheapest insurance rates in the whole wide world are enjoyed by the farmers of this province, and I challenge anybody over there to take me on on that statement. You can't do it, so why break that down and why sacrifice that, Mr. Speaker, for something that we don't know what it's all about - no plan, nothing.

So again I submit to the First Minister, let's sit down in committee, leave politics out of this whole issue, put all the information on the table, put all the plans on the table and let's come up with an insurance plan that's not political.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 67. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it was the intention of the members of the House to move into Law Amendments Committee at 10:00 o'clock, so on the understanding that that is now going to take place, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would presume the government has informed the public at large that Bill 75 and other bills, if there are other bills, will be considered tonight.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the committee has been meeting continuously and those members of the public who are present and interested were there when it was announced that the House would meet at 10:00 o'clock tonight.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, could I just ask the government House Leader whether the order of business tomorrow will be in the order of bills on the Order Paper minus Bill 56. Is that correct? Will we be on Bill -- or are we likely to be on Bill 56 again?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is referring to Bill 56 as being one of those that will not be called. My understanding was that the Member for River Heights is the only member in the Conservative Caucus that still remains to speak. If that is correct, then Bill 56 will not be called until Wednesday; if that is not correct, Bill 56 will be called.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Government Leader's understanding with respect to the Conservative caucus is correct, but he'll appreciate that we can't speak for other caucuses in the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 a.m. Tuesday morning.