

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 11, 1966

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we start our proceedings this afternoon, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 35 Grade 5 students from the Robert H. Smith School under the direction of their teacher, Miss McQuire. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. On behalf of all Members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PETERS: Could we have this stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): In the absence of the member for Selkirk, I wonder if this may be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. MOLGAT: I would ask the same here, Madam Speaker, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, in speaking to the resolution before us and the amendment proposed, my remarks will be rather brief this afternoon. I had a chance to see a map showing the designated area of this province under this legislation and we find that the Metropolitan City of Winnipeg plus the surrounding area is not included. This also means that the City of Portage la Prairie and the communities to the southern portion of this province are also not included in the designated areas, and as a result they are unable to apply for these grants under this legislation and therefore are discriminated against.

While I think that the legislation can create and does create a lot of good, it does create hardship for some communities and as a result I think we find that a number of the industries, the newer industries that have gone up, have located in the Brandon area. I doubt whether this would be the case were it not for this particular piece of legislation, whereby you can get large cash grants towards setting up an industry or towards enlarging an industry and capitalizing on these grants.

I attended a meeting of our own canning industry about a month ago or so and they are very interested in expanding and extending their facilities to include the canning of additional crops, also to go into freezing, but the hardship there too is getting the necessary finances, getting the necessary initial capital to provide for this extension and expansion. Certainly if this legislation applied to my own community, we would see fast development in this area because this legislation, the grants under the legislation provide the necessary capital that you can expand, and on the basis of that you can get further borrowing, so that actually anyone starting a new industry, or expanding, doesn't have to put up any capital of his own. If he gets the grants, he can expand with the help of additional borrowings, so that we find ourselves handicapped in this way. This does not only apply to my home town, it applies to the other centres in my riding and I'm sure it applies to a good number of other centres of other honourable members in the House here.

I think that the amendments that were proposed are in a way a little unfair, because I think the amendment proposed by the government refers to regions and wants it extended to regions. I think we should concentrate more on getting the area that is designated at the present time enlarged. Even if they don't take into consideration or will not include the City of Winnipeg, that at least they would include the surrounding rural areas excluding Winnipeg. This would certainly help a great deal and as a result the other communities such as Portage, Winkler, Altona and Steinbach and other towns could take advantage of this legislation. Since the legislation is already on the books, it would be much simpler to just get an extension from the Federal Government of that type than to ask for them to put this on a regional basis and probably have to include the other provinces such as Saskatchewan and Alberta, often referred to as the prairie regions. I think we are asking too much, the government in the amendment they are proposing. We should limit ourselves to the original resolution.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . .

The second amendment tries to recapture some of the intent of the original resolution, but I think the original resolution is much superior to what is asked for in the amendment and I would ask that the government to consider changing their views and supporting the original motion because we have got so much to gain by having the designated area extended to some other parts of this province.

There are a good number of other industries that would locate in the areas further East of Brandon, in the areas probably such as Portage or in my home area, but because of these grants not being available to them, they have no choice in where to locate. They have to go further west to these centres such as Brandon or Dauphin which are included in the designated area. I feel this is a good piece of legislation since our economy isn't prospering the way we would like to see it. Certainly all of us are interested in getting more industry into Manitoba and we should do our utmost to try to get this extended so as to cover the largest amount possible in this province.

I am told, and I think other members who have spoken previously, this is based on a certain formula, they have used a certain criteria whereby the income of the people in a given area has to exceed a certain amount. This does not include the farm workers or farm people, and as a result I am sure if there was some way of applying by the rural towns and municipalities, if they made surveys of their own particular districts and could prove that they definitely were not above or even to the amount that is prescribed, that they would then qualify.

I am sure that our towns and villages and the municipalities - the officials of these - the administrations would be only too happy to do whatever is possible in order to get such petitions going and also to do the necessary surveys to establish these facts, but I think we need the necessary machinery to come from the government. I think the government should contact the Federal Department in this case and see what could be done, whether they would recognize such a petition, whether such changes could be brought about. Certainly we as members, and I for one would be very much in accord and would do my best possible to bring this about.

We were told by the Honourable Member for Burrows that originally Ontario had six such designated areas and now they were cut down to three. Well if that's the case, we might find ourselves before long with a smaller designated area than we presently have, and I think we should work fast and not be idle any longer but try and hurry the thing along and get a larger portion of this province into the designated area so that we could take advantage of these grants.

This is what I had on my mind. I feel that whatever the decision is, that we should get wholeheartedly behind this matter and do our best possible to bring this about.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, this resolution has been before this House on a few occasions and the government members have used the argument that the appointment of an Auditor-General would be a duplication of the services of a Comptroller-General. At least that's what the members on the government side had to say.

I listened with interest to the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet the other day and he did make a very good speech, but he did say that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre had analyzed this resolution quite clearly and explained to this House last year that there is no need for an appointment of an Auditor-General because the Comptroller-General does this job in here and does a good job. I would just like to point out what he did have to say in Hansard of last year. He says, "Madam Speaker, I submit that we do not need the appointment of an Auditor-General to control waste and provide savings in this province for the taxpayers. Our Comptroller-General is already doing that in this province."

Well I would like to agree with him that the Comptroller-General does do a good job. We are not arguing with him on this point and we are not denying the fact at all, but what we are trying to say is that there is a difference between the Auditor-General and the Comptroller-General. I don't believe that the Comptroller-General would criticize any government Minister for any decision that he has made which costs the province money, while on the other hand I

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) believe the Auditor-General would do just a thing like that.

Madam Speaker, the press reports and the publicity in the papers given to the Auditor-General in Ottawa recently, I believe, has aroused the feeling of many people not only in our province but right across Canada, and I don't feel that anyone should feel that the Auditor-General does not provide or do some good function. I feel by uncovering certain matters where thousands of dollars are returned to the government, this in itself is a very good point to consider. The Comptroller-General is not concerned as to how the money is spent; all he does is to see that it is spent in accordance with the appropriation.

On the other hand, the Auditor-General has full right to look into the files and records in connection with any particular project. He can check how much was appropriated to spend, how much was spent, and whether it was spent in the proper manner. The Auditor-General also reports on any omissions or neglect to collect money. I believe our Comptroller-General has no right to indicate that there was a bad purchase made. All he can say is that the money was spent in accordance with the budget as okayed by any Minister. I feel that they are two completely different positions - two different jobs. On one hand, you might say that the Auditor-General would have to be as impartial as a football referee and as tough as a football coach; while on the other hand, the Comptroller-General I feel provides a different function altogether.

The reason I was interested to say a few words on the Auditor-General is because in the Canadian Business Magazine, the recent one, there is a good article on the story of the Auditor-General himself and his work. As a rule I usually do not quote, but I hope the members will have patience with me at this time because I would like to read just parts of this article in the Canadian Business Magazine.

It is headed: "Auditor-General Himself and his Work. In the summer of 1964, the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons invited the Honourable George Hees to appear before it. At that time Mr. Hees was in retirement from politics but he came willingly enough and for more than an hour answered critical questions about the catering contract at the Montreal International Airport that he had recommended to the Treasury Board. The result had been a substantial loss and indebtedness to the government." According to the reports in here, in 1963 I believe the loss was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 167,000, which has not been recovered to this date. "On the sidelines sat the man who had disclosed it all, Canada's Auditor-General, Mr. A. M. Henderson. His report of 1963 had been quite obviously critical of the transaction.

"Since Mr. Henderson's appointment in March of 1960, he has won respect of many Ministers in two governments and the members of three Parliaments that he had served. He has also earned the confidence of senior civil servants who are anxious to get his help and advice to avoid his criticisms.

"At the top of the list in his 1964 report is a recommendation that Parliament revise second-class postal rates to cover present losses. The Post Office in 1964 recorded an excess of expenditure over revenue of about \$6 million, but as the Auditor-General points out, this excludes 25.8 million supplied by the Department of Public Works for accommodation as well as other costs picked up by other departments.

"Per diem living expenses for judges, generally \$60 a day but sometimes as much as \$100, were questioned originally by the Auditor-General as having an element of remuneration. This is contrary to The Judges' Act and a committee has recommended that, in future, any additional remuneration must be approved by the House.

"Another point that he pointed out is a recommendation in revision of Public Accounts section dealing with the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation to show all surplus material recoveries compared with original cost. A good part of these surplus materials come from the Department of National Defence. Mr. Henderson disclosed that \$28.9 million of defence materials declared surplus in 1962-63 had only realized \$715,000.

"Since 1961, the Auditor-General's report had listed a growing number of non-productive payments spotted in the audit. Individually, most of them are relatively small though any Canadian taxpayer would be grateful if he could get a tax refund equal to the smallest. Collectively, they add up to a staggering sum poured down the drain.

"In 1959, the RCAF threw away \$144,000 by cancellation of an order for magnetrons because tubes manufactured to specifications in the contract failed to work. Another \$29,000 went down the drain because of inaccuracies in drawing specifications.

"Mr. Henderson has no responsibility for the administration of funds." I think this is

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) ... the most important point in this whole article. "Mr. Henderson has no responsibility for the administration of funds. His primary responsibility is to help members of the House of Commons to satisfy themselves that expenditures have been incurred in accordance with parliamentary appropriations and that statutory directives have been observed and accounts faithfully kept. Sound basic decisions, Mr. Henderson preaches, can only be reached on the basis of full disclosure of all pertinent facts. I think, like private business, government managers have a responsibility to report fully to the people on their handling of the resources with which the people have entrusted to them. Public funds are trust funds. To me, this is the very essence of financial accountability to Parliament." And in ending, "With respect to expenditures, the Auditor-General's report is a post-audit. Any audit before payment is the responsibility of the Comptroller of the Treasury."

Madam Speaker, I believe that the article points out quite clearly that there is a great difference between an Auditor-General and a Comptroller-General. I feel that the member for Winnipeg Centre knows this because the members on this side have expressed our opinions, and all seem to have agreed that there is a difference. I would say it's a pretty weak case that the member for Winnipeg South is building and probably very embarrassing to him, because I don't think the facts that he has given are good enough to say that it's the same function - the Auditor-General and the Comptroller-General - it's the same function that they perform.

So the article I have just quoted from clearly indicates, Madam Speaker, that the Auditor-General is concerned with waste of public funds and that Mr. Henderson has not responsibility for administration of money but sees that the expenditures have been incurred in accordance with parliamentary appropriation. So I would say, Madam Speaker, that this resolution is worthy of support in this House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I will only take a few minutes at this time because we have had this resolution before us in previous years and so much has been said that there isn't too much more to add to what has already been said. I am sorry that I cannot speak on the main amendment - on the main motion - this is an amendment so I'll try to stay with the amendment and I hope that Madam Speaker bears with me.

This is another Session and we've got another resolution and another amendment. Last year we had an amendment, as I said, to a similar resolution. This year again, but this year the amendment is so weasly that I think nobody, just nobody but a member from the government side would ever think of introducing it. It is simply a very cheap excuse to delay action. The government cannot decide on itself so it's sloughing its responsibility and asking a doctor to make a decision for this government.

Last year the amendment to a similar resolution at least had a weak alternative, but this year it's different. The government accepted last year's amendment but treated it with contempt, complete disregard of its responsibilities. This time, this amendment simply is a whitewash. What assurance have we got from the government that this year's amendment will not get similar treatment to what last year's amendment got - complete disregard. Sure, the government proposes to have a study made, and when the study is completed, the report is before us, how are we to be assured that action will be taken?

The Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne tried to justify the necessity for this amendment in his speech. First of all he did it by attacking the Federal Government. That is quite usual in this House. When one of the members or the Cabinet Ministers is cornered, he backs into a corner and then he snarls back: "Help, it's not my fault; it's the federal fault." The honourable member is complaining about losing \$800 on account of the federal action, but at the same time he tells us that he can still afford to pay for sunshine in Honolulu. Now to quote, Madam Speaker - and I have the direct quotation here - "I just do not see what this portion has to do with purple gas used in trucks." Neither can I, so I'll refrain from that part. The last few words were my own - "neither can I".

The honourable member in his resolution tries to justify his amendment by weak arguments.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) One of his arguments is that after telling us what he thinks, he seems to be more concerned with certain other businesses, especially the PSV - Public Service Vehicle. He does not think it is fair to the PSV that the farmers be allowed to use tax-free gasoline. In other words, he is more concerned about the welfare of the PSV - at least it seems that way - than he is with the welfare of the farmer.

Now the amendment says that Dr. Gilson is to determine the total amount of gasoline consumed. I wonder why engage a doctor, Dr. Gilson, to do it. The honourable member seems to know the answer because he tells us that the tax portion on this gas is about \$3 million worth. Well it just takes simple arithmetic - divide it by 17 cents and you will know, you will know how much gasoline is consumed. He seems to know the answer. So I wonder why he doesn't tell the Premier if he knows it. Again the amendment asks Dr. Gilson to find out what significance tax-free gas would play in farm production costs. What significance will it play? Why do this? The honourable member has the answer too. And what does he tell us? He says that most farmers are not so concerned with the expense of their operations - not so concerned with the expense of their operations - quite a statement to make.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Read the rest of it. Read the rest of it.

MR. TANCHAK: He is a farmer himself and if he is so sure about it, why doesn't he tell the Premier? Why ask Dr. Gilson to do it? Myself, I wouldn't advise the farmers to disregard expenses. He says they are more concerned with the income, the incoming money than the expenses. I am sure that the honourable member is completely wrong because most of our farmers are practical businessmen and they watch their expenses very very carefully. If they didn't watch their expenses and they didn't have any concern for their expenses, they would indeed be very poor farmers and very poor businessmen. I am sure that they are concerned with their expenses and that's why they are asking, they are requesting that this measure be taken. If they didn't watch their expenses, I don't think that they would be asking the different governments to look into the cost-price squeeze as they are doing now. That's part of their expense. I just can't understand the honourable member when he says they are not as concerned with their expenses as with the amount of money coming in. It doesn't seem to make any sense.

In my opinion, this amendment is completely unacceptable. I'll give you some of the reasons why. According to the member, or the government member, the member does not think that the farmer is entitled to tax-free gasoline while he is hauling his product to the market. It's fine to say that for one farmer, but I completely disagree with him and the government, if the government agrees with him. I would say that marketing grain to many farmers is very very important. It is an important part of the farm operation. I know some farmers who live as far as 30 miles from an elevator, and if they have to haul all their grain in, it's quite a considerable expense - the gasoline that's used in their trucks and in the taxes they have to pay. I agree that the saving to the member from Souris-Lansdowne personally would be very small - naturally very small because he told us himself that he operates from a base of around 200 yards from an elevator so naturally he himself is not too concerned about this extra expense. But I would say that the members should consider other farmers who are less fortunate. I'm sure they'll disagree with him.

According to him, the total farm population represents only about 20 percent of Manitoba population I would say, so in his opinion this assistance if granted would cost the other 80 percent of the Manitoba population some extra money. Maybe that is true, but I would say this isn't a direct subsidization of the farmer. He puts some money into the general revenue of the Province of Manitoba. It would simply mean the narrowing down of the cost-price squeeze, and it's odd to me that I did not hear the honourable member complain about subsidization of other businesses or other projects, never mind what they are. I didn't hear the honourable member express himself as far as the subsidization of the transit system - no. Probably that is fair. You could subsidize one but it's a sin to subsidize the farmer; he doesn't deserve it probably. I'm not saying the honourable member said that, but I can infer that from his speech.

It seems to me that if the honourable member had his way as far as this amendment is concerned and so on, that instead of 20 percent of our total population being on rural farms, if he had his way probably in the very near future we would reduce it to five percent.

The amendment says that special consideration is not commendable. Whether it is commendable, why not special consideration? There are certain people in our province that do get special consideration. We give special consideration in other fields I am sure, such as I mentioned, the transit subsidy. Why not to the farmer if that's what it is? But he says you're

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) trying to take tax money contributed by the people of Manitoba, and handing it over to the farmer of Manitoba is a \$3 million gift - take it from the other people and give it to the farmers as a \$3 million gift. I think even if it was a gift, I think that our farmers have earned that even if it was, but I disagree that it is a gift. The farmer works for his living; he works for every cent that he possesses. The farmer does not want to be a beggar but I know that he feels that if other industries are considered, he should be considered.

This amendment is a complete abrogation of responsibility by the present government. It's just delaying tactics. It indicates so vividly that the government lacks leadership and is not capable even of making a very simple decision on its own.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, may I have this resolution stand please?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Carillon. The Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, this resolution I suppose if replied to in a very narrow sense would not leave very great room for explanation. However, I think because of the nature of it, a little background information is desirable and I trust you, Madam Speaker, will bear with me if I appear to divert from the main core of the argument because I think you will realize that it all becomes pertinent.

The statement has been made by various members of the opposition that this is political gimmickry and that the Premier likes to see the cheques go out with his signature on and all this sort of charge. I think this is completely unreasonable, but of course if people have this attitude then nothing under the sun is likely to convince them otherwise.

I got a great deal of amusement the other afternoon in the House listening to the two parties nearby arguing as to who had originated the statement that property taxes should be only paying the services to property and that services to people should be borne by other methods of taxation. Now I can recall in 1952 making much the same kind of statement in this House and this is, I think all who are fair-minded would admit, not the invention of any particular group but rather the reasonable thinking of people as to what real property taxes should bear. I think both parties, both the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party, while they formed the government, made some real effort, at their particular times, to relieve the burden upon the real property taxpayer, because I think there's a very important reason that one should consider when thinking of real property taxes.

Many years ago I proposed in this House the idea that if one's neighbour for instance came along and placed a permanent mortgage on the property you owned, it would be a pretty hard circumstance, but literally this is in effect what taxation on real property is doing, it is placing a permanent mortgage with many years of interest to be paid. The real unfortunate part about it is that in hard times property can be sold for the lack of payment of taxes and it would be rather a tragedy if many older people who, having raised their family and paid education taxes and services-to-people type of taxes which are imposed on real property, then after they had raised their own families saw the loss of their own homes. So this is why there is always the real intent of governments to relieve the real estate taxpayers.

Now, in the instance since this government has come to office, I think that you would find that the records do show this, and I am certain the same relatively is true as when the Liberal Government were in office, that more and more of the load of the municipalities was taken over by the Provincial Government. But, unfortunately, while this was happening the municipal burden also grew so that relatively - and in a relative sense only probably - there has not been a great deal of change unfortunately.

Now when the municipal people were indirectly approached as to whether, if the further grants were made to municipalities, if they would accept some restraint upon their budgets continually increasing at what would appear to be an almost uncontrolled rate, there was genuine reluctance on their part, and understandably so, because they are elected to do a job. My own reaction to this method of refund of real property taxes was simply this, that personally I could see a great deal of merit in leaving the mill rate to appear on the tax bill to the height to

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd.) which it had climbed, because if the money could be returned direct to the real estate taxpayer this high mill rate would be at least some deterrent to councils to further increase local taxes and give them probably a better ability to withstand many of the many pressures that are imposed upon them by the people of the community. To me, this seemed to me to be a very sensible approach, that the money be returned by the Provincial Treasurer direct to the real property taxpayer.

Now of course this has been met in actual practice with a variety of reactions. As I mentioned earlier, we have heard the opposition claim this is political gimmickry and so on. Locally, we had one of our aldermen argue for several months that this money should have been returned directly to the municipality and they should have been allowed to set up an investment fund to have a reserve - this sort of thing - and I suspect that the local taxpayer might not have accepted this viewpoint with any great elation.

I think we must remember too that this was part of a tax burden exchange, taking it off real estate property and putting it on other materials and supply. This wasn't all the story. I rather suspect that many of the municipalities did get a considerable amount of direct aid to the municipality. I know in the instance of Brandon, Brandon received an increase in excess of three mills due to the raising of the grants paid in lieu of taxes on provincial buildings. I was never able to pin down just exactly what it amounted to in assistance in roads and streets but I imagine that this could have been a considerable item.

Now as to the attitude the opposition takes, I can only remind them that this is being done in one way or another in neighbouring provinces. I understand Saskatchewan is using almost the same method as we have been using in this province with the exception that it goes to the homeowner, I believe, only.

Now much has been made of the delay. I think one speaker even argued that for people who were hard up this was a terrible burden if they had to go borrow the money. Well, if you borrowed that amount of money, something less than \$50.00 - fifty was the maximum - for two or three months, I don't suppose the interest calculated at normal bank rates would have exceeded 25 to 35 cents probably, and I'm guessing close to that. So I can't see that this is any real argument.

There were some technical difficulties encountered and complaints about the time that it took to process these cheques were quite legitimate. I believe one thing which was rather unexpected, or had escaped notice, in that when the applications for the refund arrived in the department, naturally they came from all over Manitoba and they were not labelled in batches and groups as to the municipality they came from. They all had to be hand-sorted and this made a bottleneck.

Then there are normally I understand something like 20,000 changes to assessments occur annually and many of the assessment records did not record the registered owner, so you can see that this would be another source of delay. I am sure that many of these technical difficulties have been cleared up and that it is estimated that next year there should not be more than five or six days' delay on the issuance of a cheque, so I rather imagine that this complaint would be rather nonexistent next year, but I think members would agree that regardless of how the relief to the real estate taxpayer is granted it is good sense and should be welcomed by all. The manner in which the person receives the relief taxation I suggest is not too important, and certainly the method taken would, I think, in itself be a deterrent toward increasing real estate property taxes at least to the extent that it affords the councillors and reeves and mayors at least some support in resisting the many pressures which are put upon municipal governments these days for varying services.

I recall speaking to one councillor years ago during the 50's, and at that time he said that educational costs and the various services people were increasing at such a rate that his municipality were actually curtailing services which they should have been providing to real estate property, such as ploughing roads at certain times and a certain amount of grading.

So, Madam Speaker, the plain truth of the matter I think all would agree, is that this is a definite and positive relief to the real estate property owner and I am certain that he will be appreciative no matter which method is used, and the method being used in my opinion certainly does carry some merit.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I have spoken on this matter but I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question. Madam Speaker, the honourable member said that when the municipalities were asked about making the tax rebate, they

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd.) showed a reluctance, and he said they were reluctant because they thought the true picture of taxation should show. I'd like to ask the honourable member, were the municipal councils afraid that the school boards were inclined to run away with their budgets, and were the municipal councils actually asked to make the rebate?

MR. LISSAMAN: I may have left some misunderstanding with the honourable member. I think what I said, or intended to say, was that the municipal people consulted were reluctant to give any undertaking that taxes would not increase beyond a certain prescribed rate.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, if my honourable friend would permit another question - we just received an Order for Return now and I suppose he has it in his hands, but the Order for Return shows that 197,200 cheques were issued for tax rebates in 1965, and at least a further 15,300 are to be issued or have been issued since January 1, and the number of applications made was in excess of well roughly 400,000, a little in excess of that. What would the cost be roughly \$1.00 per application for processing them? Would he not agree that if we are talking about economy, that there might conceivably be a saving of a half a million dollars if the rebate was made at the municipal office.

MR. LISSAMAN: I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that the honourable member can conjecture as easily as I can as to what the internal costs of the department might run on issuing these cheques. I would suggest there's going to be costs no matter what are the methods you use.

. continued on next page

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this subject.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: I thank the Honourable Member from Brandon for his contribution, but in my opinion I don't think he was speaking to the resolution. Perhaps to refresh his memory, if we take a look at the resolution, that "the present method of returning a part of the school tax to the property owner by a direct cheque from the government has proved to be slow and cumbersome; and whereas it would be faster, more economical and more efficient to allow the municipal corporations to give the rebate directly at the time the property owner pays the taxes; and whereas the municipal corporations have indicated their willingness to have the rebate handled in this way;" I don't think the Member from Brandon spoke to that at all. He gave all sorts of reasons about other things but not about the resolution.

How can the Honourable Member for Brandon - and he poses a question to the municipal people that they should give a commitment to hold the tax line - how can he suggest this to them when you don't know what their problems are from year to year, what they have to face? We know educational costs are rising. So, how can he ask them to give this commitment and the government that he represents give no such commitment whatsoever to the people of Manitoba, and if we look at their record of increased taxation we can certainly understand why they wouldn't like to ever give that commitment.

The fact that a direct rebate is made at the municipality cannot be confused with whether or not taxes will rise or not. It's a separate subject altogether, I submit. My honourable friend from Gladstone, when he posed his question about costs, surely this is something that should be considered. If there are 400,000 cheques to be processed, to be verified, to be checked, the applications to be checked, there's a cost factor here and I would doubt very much whether it could be done for a dollar per cheque. I doubt it very much. I would be interested if some member of the government would get up and tell us what this cost is. I wonder if any member is prepared to accept the question if we put it in as an order for return or during this debate. Would they get us this cost?

Now, I have some copies of some letters and correspondence here that we have received in the city of Portage la Prairie over the past year with respect to tax rebates, and I have a copy of a letter here, I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs must have sent them out by the hundred thousand because I've seen three copies of it and they're all the same. They're all a standard reply to a complaint: when are we going to receive our tax rebate? This is addressed to Mr. H. K. Stevens; it's dated September 9th; and I'll just read the letter because there is some background to be had for some of the answers; "Dear Mr. Stevens, this will acknowledge receipt of your letter of September 7th making enquiry concerning your school tax rebate application. As soon as the letter was received I made enquiries concerning this delay" (referring of course to the delay in receiving back his cheque,) "I made enquiries concerning this delay and I am now informed that your city has not forwarded to us a copy of their tax roll showing the school taxes charged for each individual piece of property. The Comptroller-General will not allow the issue of cheques until he is able to make a check of the rebate application against the actual tax roll of the city. Until your letter was received I had no knowledge that the city" (meaning Portage) "had neglected to let us have this information. I will take steps immediately to bring this matter to the attention of the mayor and council of the City of Portage la Prairie, and I trust they will let us have the necessary roll so that we may process your application and others received from your city immediately."

Now, Madam Speaker, in this letter there are, in my opinion, two misstatements. The first one is, it is being inferred here that the city of Portage had neglected to send in some information. Well, Madam Speaker, for the information of the members of this House, the city of Portage was never asked to send in any information, up until this time, and this is September 9th. They were never asked whatsoever at all. But what happened, I suppose applications were coming into the Department of Municipal Affairs and just piling up and piling up, and finally they started to receive letters of complaint. So he looked into it and assumed somehow that Portage should have taken this action that he suggests. But the Portage council, or the Portage administration were never asked for this action, so I think this is throwing some blame unfairly on people who were not to blame at all, and I think that is a rather shabby way of evading a responsibility by placing the blame on someone else.

Until your letter was received I had no knowledge that the city had "neglected" to let us have this information. I fail to see where the city of Portage la Prairie was neglectful when they had not been asked for the information. Finally, later on, after this came to light that

(MR JOHNSTON cont'd)... no one in Portage had received a tax rebate at this late date, it was discovered by the Municipal Affairs Department that we had our own assessor, and we had our own tax roll in the office, and we were asked to send in our tax roll. Now I ask anyone here in this House who has had municipal experience, how many municipalities or city administrations will allow their tax rolls to go out of their office? It's the same thing as asking the banker to give up the stocks and bonds in his vault so they can be copied. It's the same thing. Nobody allows their tax rolls out of their office. So eventually it came about that copies were to be made, but Portage was asked to send in their tax rolls - rather an odd request, I would say, to give up their tax rolls with no record left. If anything were ever to happen to them they'd be chastised, and rightly so, by the people and by the Department of Municipal Affairs. So I'd like to point that out, that there was no neglect by Portage council or by the Portage administration.

Now, that's rather odd that on September 10th, the next day, this letter comes out to the Portage council. Incidentally the last letter was signed "R. G. Smellie." It was from the Minister to the taxpayer in Portage. Now I have here a copy of a letter that is signed by R. G. Smellie and it is addressed to the administration, but it's rather odd it's not addressed to anyone; it's just two paragraphs but it's not addressed to anyone in particular. Usually it's the procedure to address correspondence to the secretary-treasurer, or failing that to the mayor and council, but this is not addressed. It is dated September 10th, the next day after the other one, so it looked like the Minister felt he should be doing a little fence-mending along the line. I'll read the letter.

"September 10th, 1965. I recognize that the granting of portions of school taxes paid by your ratepayers has imposed additional responsibilities upon you. The willing acceptance of this challenge by municipal officials throughout the province has been greatly appreciated by this department. I sincerely hope that the difficulties experienced in the first year may be lessened as time goes by and the public become accustomed to the method of procedure. Now that you have had some experience with the handling of the applications, you may have some constructive criticism to offer or some proposals as to how the procedure might be amended in order to increase its efficiency and eliminate some of the problems you found in the first year of operation. We would be most happy to hear from you if you have any such ideas."

So that's the letter, Madam Speaker, signed R. G. Smellie. He certainly, in my opinion, takes quite a bit on himself when he says, "The willing acceptance of this challenge by the municipal officials throughout the province has been greatly appreciated." The ones I talked to didn't willingly take this challenge. It was pushed on them. And the municipal officials had to answer to the irate taxpayer who wanted to know why the delay and why he had to send his receipt into Winnipeg and 1001 other questions, and I know in our office there was no willing acceptance of this work. It was done with reluctance. It was done to the best of the ability but it was certainly not a willing acceptance.

I have here a copy of a letter that I'll just quote out of. It's a letter to the editor in the Daily Graphic of September 24, 1965, and it's quite a lengthy letter; I'll only read part of it. This is "To the Editor: Dear Sir: Please allow some space for the following letter. On August 28 last there was a report in the Free Press of an interview with the Honourable Municipal Minister Robert Smellie, and here is a small extract of what he said: 'The taxpayer is given a tax rebate claimed for him by the municipal office when he pays his taxes, and this is sent to the Provincial Government where the application is checked over and a rebate cheque mailed out.' Mr. Smellie said cheques for all claims received up to July 1st had now been mailed out. I did send my claim on June 17th and that made me wonder why my claim was not taken care of. But here's the answer I received from the Hon. Mr. Smellie," and the answer is the same as the standard answer that must have been mailed out by the hundred thousand I would think. It's no use reading that again, but it's the same answer, and he doesn't correct the statement that he had made in the report in the Free Press. This person is asking for the rebate that they had applied for on the 17th, but on July 1st Mr. Smellie said "everybody who had been paid up to that date," and the letter to the editor is in a paper dated September 24th, so members can draw their own conclusions as to how organized and how efficient this method was proceeding down in Municipal Affairs office. Just a bit of mental arithmetic shows that this person writing this letter had not received his tax school rebate for 97 days at that time, and I know he didn't receive it for some time after, so it's fair to say that it was well over 100 days, and I think it's fair to say that a great many people were in the same boat, well over 100 days.

Now, Madam Speaker, I just read a letter where the Minister of Municipal Affairs was

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)... asking for ideas as to ways to streamline the transaction, ways to do things a little more quickly, although he didn't say economically, but I'm sure he would not turn up his nose at saving a few hundred thousand dollars. On September 20th, Portage City Council expressed their ideas in the form of a resolution, and I'll just read the resolution: "Whereas the present method of returning a part of the school tax to the property owner has proved to be cumbersome; And Whereas municipal mayors, councilmen and Secretary-Treasurers have been subject to much criticism by taxpayers over this cumbersome method of returning money to the taxpayer; And Whereas the present method is proving to be expensive and time-consuming for the provincial administration to handle; Therefore Be It Resolved that the Province of Manitoba give consideration to a plan whereby the Municipal Corporations give an immediate rebate at the time of paying the real property taxes at a municipal office, and that a copy be forwarded to the Manitoba Urban Association." This resolution was carried September 20, 1965, and certified a true copy of Resolution No. 600."

Now, for the information of other members here who do not know it, this resolution was passed by the Urban Association, so now we have at least one City Council - I know there were others. We have the Urban Association urging this same method of handling the tax rebate on the province, and I understand, although I do not have any documents to substantiate it, but I understand that some of the school boards through their Association asked that it be handled in a method similar to the resolution on the Order Paper. So I think when the Member for Brandon stands up and talks all around the point and tries to make out that everything's fine with the municipal people, I don't think this is true at all. The municipal people I've talked to at conventions feel that it's a great deal of extra work for them, the way it's being handled now. They have a repetitious request; people lose their receipts and they come back again to the municipal office; and surely the political credit will be gained the way it is being gained now. In B. C. this is the way they handle it. I don't know about the other provinces but in B. C. I understand it is handled at the municipal level and it works out quite well there, and the administration there seems to get the credit, so I don't see why this administration takes the stand they do that in order to extract maximum political credit they must add some hundreds of thousands of dollars to the cost of doing this to the taxpayers. And surely a resolution like this, unless there are better arguments or better answers forthcoming, I fail to see why this government will not accept it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR WRIGHT: In anticipation of a government statement on this matter, may I have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Arthur. I've had this amendment under consideration, and I find that it is in order. Any member wishing to speak may do so. Are you ready for the question?

MR. BARKMAN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member of Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Springfield. In giving consideration to this amendment I find that it is in order, and any member wishing to proceed may do so. Are you ready for the question?

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PETERS: In the absence of my leader, may we have this stand, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member, may we have this stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks: Be It Resolved that the minimum wage in Manitoba be established at the figure of \$1.50 per hour, and that such minimum wage apply equally regardless of geographical location or sex.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I purposely made my resolution very short, didn't add any "whereases" in the front of it for fear that it would have been emasculated like the rest of them have been that have been brought in by this side of the House.

Madam Speaker, I had a speech prepared with stacks of documents and statistics and everything else, I had in former years, and I found out that every time you bring in statistics somebody from the other side brings in their statistics and then somebody else on this side brings in other statistics, and we go back and forth and nobody seems to get anywhere, so I've checked the statistics out the window and I'm just going to use a different approach, Madam Speaker.

The minimum wage - I remember the first time I brought in the resolution; they told me it was meant to cover people that were training or just learning new skills; and I thought that was a reasonable explanation. But since that time, Madam Speaker -- it's eight years since -- I've found out that the minimum becomes the maximum, and I'm sure that if the Minister of Labor were here he could bear me out because many of the places that have people working for them and they hire them and tell them that "this is the minimum wage and this is what we're going to pay you now, and when you have learned your job we will pay you more" -- they never get any more. As a matter of fact they even refuse to pay them the time and a half for overtime rights, and there have been quite a few of these investigated. As a matter of fact there are a few that I have turned over to the Minister where they have investigated and recovered money from companies that have been violating and pleaded ignorance, saying that they didn't know that they had to pay time and a half after 44 hours. So, Madam Speaker, this business of having a minimum wage and using the excuse that it's only used to train people doesn't hold water.

Now, Madam Speaker, the Premier of this province when he was speaking the other night at a convention, mentioned that he would like to see Manitoba a place of high wages and a low cost-of-living area. So that, in a sense, he bears out what I am saying, that right now Manitoba is one of, if not the highest, one of the highest cost-of-living areas in Canada, and one of the lowest wage rates in Canada, Madam Speaker. When I brought in resolutions in past years, Madam Speaker, they always said that we would drive industry away because our wages would reach too high -- the figure would be too high. What has happened? The very opposite has happened. People have left this province; they've gone to different parts of the country, even to Saskatchewan, where as a matter of fact, people living on the border of Saskatchewan - living in Manitoba, but on the border of Saskatchewan - are travelling and working in Saskatchewan at the new potash industry and the new industries that have been developed there. --(Interjection) -- Well, they spent it in Manitoba, that's fine and dandy, but what are you doing about the potash? What are you going to do when this new industry opens up in the north? Are you going to pay them 90 cents an hour or \$1.00 an hour for clearing bush? Well let's be reasonable - let's be reasonable. If you want to get reasonable, let's get reasonable.

As I said before, Madam Speaker, and I'll say it now that the Minister of Labour is in the House, he knows very well how many people he's had complaints from in the last three months of the people who were violating the labour laws of this province, not paying the rates that they should have been paying, not paying over-time rates, and I would like the Minister to give this House the figures. Let him get them for me and let him tell the House how much money he's collected for these people.

MR. BAIZLEY: I think if you look in the annual report this information is available to you.

MR. PETERS: No, it's not. And because of our low minimum wages in this province, Madam Speaker, we have too many families where the husband and wife are both forced to go

(MR. PETERS cont'd)... and work because the husband can not make enough money to keep a family going. The Minister of Labour knows this is true; and on the other hand, it is the others that make high rates and go and work because there is a shortage of skilled labourers and people that are holding down two jobs, and the Minister knows this too.

Madam Speaker, the Minister might say to me that there are two labour people on the Minimum Wage Board. We all know this, but when I talked to these members they tell me that they are told by the members on the board representing management, if you guys are going to insist on going up this high, we're not going to go up even a nickel, and so they have to settle for something. I have told them that they would be much better off to resign off the board and let the chairman and the people representing management come in and make a report. As far as I'm concerned, Madam Speaker, the government should get rid of the Minimum Wage Board, face up to its responsibilities instead of pushing it off onto a minimum wage board.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks,

WHEREAS many mothers in low-income families must work in order to supplement their husbands' income; and

WHEREAS many mothers are forced to work to support their families because their families lack another provider; and

WHEREAS many women trained in professions now suffering shortages of personnel, such as teaching and nursing, would once again make their services available to society, could their children be properly cared for at a cost within their means; and

WHEREAS it is anticipated that increasing numbers of mothers will find full and part time employment outside the home and it is to the benefit of all society that proper care for their children is available;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government consider the advisability of establishing public day nurseries in communities where the demand for the service warrants such action.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HARRIS: Madam Speaker, I hear an explanation -- or somebody said "explain." Well I will say this, that to me this thing is like the flood. Like the flood of the 50's. It was among our midst and the water's come in and nobody seemed to know where that water's come from. This thing is the same way now. This thing has crept on us. The WHEREAS clauses of my resolution should make it pretty plain to anybody why we need day nurseries in this province. But a lot of things that seem pretty plain to me seem to be beyond the understanding of the Government. In this case, the Government doesn't even seem to be aware that a problem exists, and it does, right here. In this case, the Labour Gazette, September 1965 issue, contains a report on a United States National Conference On Day Care. The report says that of 1,100 delegates present, only 8 were from Canada. The eight in attendance were listed, and none was from Manitoba. Hubert H. Humphrey, the Vice-President of the United States, spoke to the conference and said, "Day care is not a limited concept. It is just not for low-income families alone and working mothers, it is for the child who needs it, when and where he needs it, and for the length of time he needs it." The Vice-President said there was not only a need for day care service for the children of working mothers, but also the need of day care for physically, mentally or emotionally handicapped children, and particularly for culturally deprived children from impoverished homes. He said that of working mothers, 86 percent in the United States are working because their families need the money.

A survey of child care arrangements of working mothers set out the following facts: About one million children under 14, including 38,000 under 6, whose mothers worked during 1964, were expected to care for themselves; 46 percent were cared for in their own homes by their father, relative or other persons, 15 percent of the guardians being under 16 years of age; 13 percent were looked after by their mother while at work; 2 percent were in a group such as day centres or after-school centres.

Mothers of 15% of the children worked only while the children were in school. Income

(MR. HARRIS cont'd)... of the childrens' families varied widely, almost equally divided between families with income of \$3,000 and families with over \$10,000 a year.

Similar facts for Canada are not available, as usual. I think we may agree that the situation in the United States is not too different from the situation in Canada and Manitoba. When I first prepared this resolution I was mostly concerned about the care of children of working mothers. There are those who are working because the father of the family doesn't earn enough to support them; mothers who must work because there is nobody else to help in supporting the family.

I was also worried about the loss to the community of talents such as teaching and nursing, because the community doesn't provide arrangements for the care of children of those mothers who are trained in such professions. My readings have shown me there are more reasons for establishing day nurseries, and reasons which are perhaps even more important. A speaker at the American Conference I mentioned a moment ago said, "Family break-up, change in family structures, unwed mothers, physical handicaps, mental retardation, emotional problems and mental illness, job mobility, cultural deprivation, call for a variety of services in day care, in order to provide a social and emotional enrichment that many children need. In short, the conference showed that working mothers actually only increase the demand for a service which would be necessary even if no women with children were working. This added demand is bound to increase in the future. It is predicted there will be a 17 percent increase in the employment of women in the United States by 1971, and that many of these will be mothers. There is every reason to expect that the same thing will happen in Canada and Manitoba.

Now some of you will say, well, if there is such a need, why not let people who want to baby-sit, or people who would like to make a little money by running a day nursery, provide for the demand? I have rather a long quotation taken from Canadian Welfare, the May-June, 1964 issue, which answers the question. Just listen to this: "What does service in this area of child welfare imply? Briefly, it implies the right home in the right place at the right time. For the pre-school child, family day care means living in two different homes each day. It is vitally important therefore to be alert to the hazards in this situation for the very young child. For instance, the day care home should be near the child's own home rather than the parents' place of employment, if both want to avoid the wear and tear of time spent in travel, usually by crowded public transportation. If the child is to benefit in his two homes, he must have care that is as constant as possible. This calls for sympathetic collaboration between the mother and the day care foster mother in those daily concerns related to food, sleep and play. Particular attention needs to be given to such vital matters as toilet routines, eating habits, methods of discipline, and vocabulary used in speaking to the child about them. In addition, day nurseries caring for children with special problems will need people with special training. In the case of both the normal child and the child with problems it is necessary that some supervision of standards take place."

Now you may ask, what services of this nature are now available in Winnipeg, and upon what conditions? That is exactly what I have been trying to find out over the past few days. I have found out there are four day nurseries run by the United Way, God bless them. Each of these nurseries is designed to care for children from 2 to 5 years of age. Each is open 5 days a week from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 or 6:00 o'clock p.m. The fee charged by each of these nurseries is related to the family income and to the number of children. Each of them serves one hot meal. Some serve additional snacks. The yellow pages of the phone book list one other day nursery operated privately. The fee there is \$10.00 per week per child. It is designed to handle children from 2 to 5 years of age. It is open from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. A hot lunch and a snack are served.

In addition, there are 8 baby-sitting agencies listed in the yellow pages of the phone book. Of these, one has no service for working mothers; the others charge anywhere from \$4.30 a day to 50 cents an hour. In addition, most require the payment of bus fares for sitters. The cost of getting a sitter from one of these agencies, then, would be roughly \$80.00 to \$90.00 a month for a woman working full-time.

There is another service available to working mothers in Winnipeg, and that is people willing to look after children if they are brought to their own home. I have discovered that rates charged by such people vary from between \$40.00 to \$80.00 a month. Some supply meals, others require that the food be provided by the parents. I don't know what the average salary for working mothers is in Winnipeg, but I would expect that the normal minimum salary for stenographers, which is about \$165.00 a month, would come pretty close to the average.

(MR. HARRIS cont'd)... Take \$40 or \$80 away from \$165 and a person isn't left with much money to pay the rent, buy food and clothing and other necessities.

This, then, means that many mothers are totally dependent upon the United Way-operated institutions for proper supervised care for their children, since only the United Way institutions take into account the family income when assessing fees. I have discovered the combined capacity of the United Way institutions is about 220 children. This small number of places does not begin to meet the need of the community. I think the matter of day nursery care is of great importance and needs to be acted upon very quickly.

I want to finish by quoting another statement made by the American Conference on Day-Care: "When children have unmet needs, time wasted in fulfilling them can never be made up." How true, Madam Chairman, how true. This is the younger generation coming up, and what are we doing for them? Our people have to go out to work, like my colleague here from Elmwood said, because of the low wages. So therefore they have to supplement what is needed home, and to go out that woman is paying more than half her wages away. That is the way it is. We ask for something to be done, but is it going to be done? I hope the government will give that statement some thought before they decide to amend this resolution out of existence, which they have been doing all through this Session. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the debate be adjourned.

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

..... continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we proceed to the next item, I would like to ask the co-operation of all members of the House that if you find it necessary to speak, please lower your voices. We should give the courtesies to the person speaking so that they may be heard by one and all.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, may I have the leave of the House to have this resolution stand. I would have no objection if there's anyone else wishing to speak on it at this time.

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if I might ask the Minister a question. Is it his intention to let this resolution die on the Order Paper or are we going to have this come to a vote?

MR. McLEAN: I have no intention of letting it die.

MADAM SPEAKER: Anyone wishing to speak? Agreed to stand. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that

Whereas the young people of the country constitute a most important human resource; and

Whereas young people at age 18 are considered fit for military services in times of war; and

Whereas young people between the ages of 18 and 21 are considered mature enough to participate in the economic, social and athletic life of our country; and

Whereas it is in the interest of good government that young people between the ages of 18 and 21 participate in the political life of our country;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Province of Manitoba grant its citizens, 18 years of age and over, the right to vote in provincial elections.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, it must be a coincidence that this resolution came up on today's Order Paper because in this morning's paper we read where the University of Manitoba students have suggested and recommended to the Premier that the Legislature lower the voting age for the next election in Manitoba. I know this resolution has been before this House before, and members in the government side have not supported it, which to me seems that they are not keeping in uniformity with what their party is doing in Ottawa. I feel if our democratic system is to survive it will require not only participation of informed and competent people to hold office, but also an informed electorate at large. Apathy is something we must not encourage. If we can encourage our young people to participate in, identify themselves with political ideas and political knowledge at an early age, I think it's something, a goal worthy of support.

I think there are many facts why the voting age should be lowered to 18. A measure to lower the federal voting age was approved unanimously in 1964 by the Privileges and Elections Committee in the House of Commons. I know the Winnipeg City Council as well has asked the Provincial Government to reduce the voting age to 18 in the Winnipeg Civic Elections. Presently there are five provinces in Canada that have lowered their voting age from 21. The 1911 census showed that the average 18-year-old had a Grade 7 education. The 1961 census indicates that the level now is of Grade 11. This would indicate that the present 18-year-old has attained much more education and knowledge than he did years ago, and this in itself is a good indication why an 18-year-old should be allowed the franchise. Half of our population in Canada today is under 25 years of age and 67 percent is under 40 years of age. This indicates that many of our young people in Canada today are holding very important responsible jobs and assuming very important responsibilities. At the present time there is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 32 countries in which persons 18 years old can vote. These include some of the states in the United States, Brazil, Argentina, Israel, and many others.

I recall in 1964 there was a commission or a committee that asked a series of questions in a voting booth -- asked questions of 18 year olds and asked questions of adults, and there were no significant differences in the answers that this committee had received in the voting booth from the 18-year-olds as compared to the adult people. So this is also an indication that the present 18-year-olds are quite well informed on the government's fiscal policies, and other candidates as well.

A commission in the United States which was appointed by the late President Kennedy has also studied this problem and had recommended that the franchise be extended to the 18-year-olds,

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) and I think this would have given a vote to some 9 million people in the last election in the United States.

Madam Speaker, I feel by the time an individual has reached the age of 18 he has acquired essentially sound basic knowledge. It is at this age that he begins to assume full responsibilities as he contemplates marriage and gets a job, so I feel if one is as well employed he also has an obligation to pay tax, and I feel that taxpayers should have some rights in the fiscal policies of the government. The essence of a democratic system is individual participation. We cannot discourage citizens from evaluating government policies.

I feel we effectively promote conditions to disinterest when we exclude the 18-years to vote. In the three years from 18 to 21, young men and women are ready to assume duties as citizens but are denied their most important right. I think at 18 a person is beginning to undertake his rightful role in the business community and is given some measure of responsibility, and education has prepared him for this responsibility. If a citizen's interest in government is allowed to fade by refusing to participation, I feel there is much less likelihood that he will exercise his franchise when he is 21.

Madam Speaker, if a voter is to exercise his franchise judiciously, I feel he must be able to gain experience. To postpone this right until 21 is to delay essential experience in democracy. Democracy thrives on honest disagreements. If we are to keep abreast with needed changes and progress, we must allow for effective expression of views. You must remember that the choice of 21 as the legal voting age is purely arbitrary and there's no basis for it. The fact that the legal age for signing a contract is 21 I don't think should have -- there's no basis on it as well. Let us be fully aware of the greater potential of our young people which is realized with the aid of our improved education at the present time, and I think we should acknowledge the right to vote of people fulfilling obligations by paying taxes. If our citizens are old enough to fly jets and fight for their country, they should be old enough to vote. We have people under 21 who are teaching schools, assuming responsibilities. We have people under 21 signing contracts to play professional sports in hockey, football or baseball, and some of the contracts are pretty attractive ones. They have to be pretty good business to manage that type of investment. I know just recently some of them were pretty high, so I feel, Madam Speaker, the vote should be given to people when one might reasonably conclude that they've had the kind of experience, the kind of training which enables them to understand the meaning of a vote and to vote in an intelligent way, sometimes perhaps in a more intelligent way than we adults do.

An 18-year-old is able to count down space missiles, have babies, make pills, get married, fly jets, and still we deny him the judgment to make a choice among political candidates. The idea of 21 years of age as the magic age of adulthood dates back to medieval times, Madam Speaker, when people were allowed to own and farm their own land. I believe it is time that we have up-dated this custom that we perpetuate and bring them up to the 20th Century.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to let this order stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CAMPBELL: The same request, Madam Speaker, please.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I would like to consult the wishes of the House. Presumably with the unanimous consent, we could return to the Committee on Supply for an hour or for an hour and a quarter if that's the wish of the House. It must be done by leave, and I would like to ask for expressions of opinion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I'm sure that we would be more than willing to see that done.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, under ordinary circumstances I would be prepared to meet the wishes of the Leader of the House, but as you know we have two of our members away sick now, I am under the weather with the flu coming on, and I'd like to get home and get to bed. Therefore, Madam Speaker, we're not going to grant leave.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Monday afternoon.