

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 14, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK: The Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources beg leave to present the following as their third report.

Mr. J. F. Mills, Chairman and General Manager of the Manitoba Telephone System, appeared before the Committee and gave a resume of the operation of the System for the Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1966 and subsequent months.

Your Committee has examined the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1966, as published.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member of the Committee from the officials of the Manitoba Telephone System and their staffs with respect to matters pertaining to the Report of the business of the Manitoba Telephone System. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired; all of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before we proceed I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my right, where we have 60 students of Grade 5 standing, from the Polson School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Anderson and Miss Perras. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. On behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, if I may, before the Orders of the Day, direct a question or two to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. I have reference to Regulation 21/67 in reference to the Public Works Act, said regulation which was posted in the Manitoba Gazette for March 11th, 1967. My questions are to the effect: (1) Is the Minister aware of the contents of the regulation? That would be question one. Question 2., If he is, could he explain the reasons contained within the regulation for restrictions placed on the members of this Assembly between the hours of midnight and 7 o'clock each morning, restrictions placed upon anyone who may be a guest at the Government House that they have to leave Government House in accordance with the regulations before that enchanting hour of midnight lest their glass slippers change to other materials. . . .

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Pumpkins.

MR. PAULLEY: Well this apparently to me is a sort of a pumpkin type of a regulation and I would like to ask these questions, preliminary questions, of my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is yes; the answer to the second question is that the prohibition with respect to the hours of 12 midnight until 7:00 o'clock in the morning do not apply in certain instances which are detailed in the regulations themselves, and it will be noted that they do not apply to members and officers of the Assembly during any period when the Assembly or any committee thereof is meeting, the Lieutenant-Governor or his family or his personal staff, judges or magistrates, an employee of the government required to remain during the times mentioned in the building and on the premises, an employee of a person having a contract with the government to perform certain work, inmate being held in custody or members of the jury, and I would say, perhaps, extending my answer that we would be more than happy to consider making an exception in the case of members of the Legislature at any time. If it is their wish to be free to enter the building between 12 midnight and 7:00 in the morning, that could certainly be altered accordingly.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplemental question, though I am happy to know that the Honourable Minister is prepared to make amends of the regulation that he approved and is fully aware of.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . . However, I realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the time for debate but my honourable friend talks about entering; "no person shall remain on the grounds" - this includes members of this Assembly - "at any time after midnight." Now I have burned the midnight oil here on a number of occasions when we are not in session, Mr. Speaker, and -- I beg your pardon?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Can you park in the dark or . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: And also, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Honourable friend who is so well aware of the regulations that he has approved, saying now that maybe he would consider the change as far as we members, those of us who are members of the Assembly. My question is, he made no reference at all to the guests who may be the guests of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. What is his reaction to that?

MR. McLEAN: I am under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that they are covered by the exemption. If they are not, I am sure that we can make the necessary correction.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary, or the Minister of Public Works rather. Has he yet had occasion to evict any person from the grounds or the building, or seize any property that is on the building which he may require to be removed?

MR. McLEAN: The answer is no.

MR. CHERNIACK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister if he is prepared to undertake to this House that he will not evict someone or seize property until we have had an occasion to discuss this question of these regulations and the extent to which they go beyond the powers of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Is he prepared to undertake not to exercise these powers until we have had an opportunity to discuss it in this House?

MR. McLEAN: My undertaking, Mr. Speaker, would always be to obey the law and carry out my duties and responsibilities, and I would anticipate that there might be an early occasion for our discussion.

MR. CHERNIACK: A final supplementary question, and I think I am entitled to one more, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister aware of the fact that the principles to be followed by the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders includes a statement that regulations should not contain substantive legislation that should be enacted by the Legislature but should be confined to administrative matters? Does he consider that the powers which he has seized unto himself under the regulations are not substantive but administrative when he has taken unto himself the power to order property to be removed or to have a person evicted at any time from this building without having to give any accounting therefor?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, the regulations were prepared on the advice and with the assistance of the Law Officers of the Crown.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Would the Honourable Minister permit another question? Were these regulations in force when Joe Borowski was camping on the front steps?

MR. McLEAN: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe this subject has been sufficiently aired and I think that honourable members will agree there will be another opportunity to discuss it in further depth as and when the Minister brings forward his estimates.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I intended to ask a question on the same regulation but not of the same subject matter that was asked by previous members, and I would request your permission to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: You have the floor.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am not so concerned with guests of the Lieutenant-Governor or even with members of this House, but is the Minister aware that this regulation, as I read it, would prevent two young people from sitting in Memorial Park on a summer's evening after 12:00 o'clock at night?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking me a legal question and I am unable to answer it right at this moment.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, then may I ask would the Minister in enforcing the law, as is his right under these regulations, require two young people sitting on a bench in Memorial Park after 12:00 o'clock on a summer's evening, to leave?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe there is sufficient time when the snow clears, and I'm sure that will all be cleared up. Shall the House proceed?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would just like to reply to a question put to me the other day by the

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . . Honourable Member from Lakeside which had to do with the report on the Vegetable Marketing Commission. My Deputy Minister had informed me just the day previous to the question that Mr. Baron, that is the Commissioner, had indeed been in his office with a very preliminary draft of this report. He was there to gather some further information which he deemed necessary to his investigations. I can tell you very honestly that I have not seen the report. It is my understanding that he is now writing his final report and that this should be down soon.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Does the government have plans, or would the government give authority to holding referendums in the fall if this is requested by divisions which intend to have a vote on single district divisions?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, under Bill 16, I would draw the provisions of that bill to the attention of the honourable member: A referendum can be held on the Minister's volition. It can be held if 20 percent of the electors of a division petition, or it can be held if -- when 50 percent of the districts within a division surrender their autonomy to the divisional board, a referendum shall be held under the legislation.

MR. DOERN: . . . . . a supplementary question. Does the government intend to actively promote or encourage some of these 19 districts in the sense of advertising and speakers, etc?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe that matter was thoroughly discussed yesterday and there will be another opportunity. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Is the Province of Manitoba considering the transfer of land to the Federal Government free of encumbrances for the purpose of establishing a second national park in Manitoba?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Tourism and Recreation) (Fort Garry): That question was dealt with during the course of estimates, the discussion on the Department of Tourism and Recreation. I believe the short answer is that we are in negotiation with the Federal Government with respect to a second national park in Manitoba. One of the problems associated with those negotiations would be the question that my honourable friend referred to.

MR. USKIW: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it reasonable to expect, then, that the site would be in the northeastern part of the province or is there any indication -- could we have an indication?

MR. LYON: Again, by reference to Hansard my honourable friend will see that there are two sites under discussion at the present time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Education. Is the Minister aware that the new and expensive swimming pool at the University of Manitoba, and built with public funds, beside being open to the students and the staff is open only to the members of the alumni; and if so, if this is the case, does he feel that this should be done and that the alumni should enjoy any special privileges?

MR. JOHNSON: This is a matter that I would have to direct to the Board of Governors of the University and I'll be pleased to ask them concerning this.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding I wish to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House, No. 42 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Has the agreement with the Federal Government involving the ARDA and the Interlake area been finalized, and if so, is it available for perusal?

MR. ROBLIN: The agreement has not yet been completed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the privilege of the House to make a short statement in reference to proceedings which have happened in this House. It deals actually, Mr. Speaker, with a personal matter. The other day during the debate on Bill 56 and the amendment thereto, I made the statement that the previous Liberal administration under the Premiership of my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside had not referred to Law Amendments Committee, or to any other committee, the question of increases in taxation. Subsequently my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside took part in the debate and made the statement that I was in error and that his government did in fact refer these matters of taxation to respective committees. Following the statement of my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, Mr. Speaker, I undertook to pursue and to study the journals of the proceedings

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . of the House during the time that my honourable friend was Premier of Manitoba. I find that he was perfectly correct, Mr. Speaker, that I was in error, and I wish to apologize to my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside for my incorrect statement in respect of this matter.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I think I would be less than gracious if I didn't acknowledge with appreciation what the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party has just said. I can say to you quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time in all the years that I have been in this House that anyone has ever apologized to me, and I might have harboured some notion sometimes that maybe someone should have, but this is the first time that anyone has ever done so. I might also record that I have never asked for an apology. Quite frankly I think that if anybody feels that it's necessary - and I appreciate the sentiments by which my honourable friend is actuated - I think if anybody feels it incumbent upon them to apologize at any time that the apology should be to the House for having given incorrect information rather than directed to the individual concerned. However, I accept the statement of the honourable gentleman in the spirit that it's given, and the only way that I would be inclined to moralize upon it, Mr. Speaker, would be to say that all of us, even I, can at times be in error. Perhaps we should all be a little more cautious and careful about what we say and if we do at times fall into error then maybe a suggestion of apologizing to the House for giving incorrect information would be better than this method, because it would keep the apology from being a personal matter as it is now. But inasmuch as the honourable gentleman is directed to me, I must say thank you and it's been a pleasure to point out the mistake.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, then if I may, following my honourable friend, also ask for the apologies of the House as well as to my honourable friend.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I share with the House the second report of the Flood Forecasting Committee.

The Committee advises that the situation on the Red River has improved since its initial meeting held February 23, 1967, as snowfall over the Basin since that time has been much below normal. The Committee reports that a stage at Winnipeg between 18 and 21 feet City Datum is indicated. Flows are expected to be contained within the banks of the Red River north of the International Boundary. However, the Committee again emphasizes the fact that weather conditions from now on are highly significant and could give rise to either substantially lower or higher river stages depending on whether subsequent meteorological conditions prove to be favourable or adverse.

A large portion of the major dikes in the Greater Winnipeg area are constructed to a top elevation which corresponds to a stage of 26.5 feet, City Datum. The remainder of the major dikes are some four feet higher.

On the Assiniboine River spring peaks slightly above normal are indicated on the assumption that weather conditions from now until the end of the break-up period will be average. There is no evidence that flood stages will be reached although ice jams could cause local flooding between Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg.

In addition to information obtained from the usual sources in Canada, the Committee had available to it the latest snowfall and other pertinent data provided by co-operating agencies in the United States.

The Committee advises that a subsequent meeting will be held later in March to again review the situation as regards flood prospects in light of conditions existing at that time.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I wish to table the report of the Public Utilities Board, the annual report for the year ending December 31, 1966, and copies of the report will be available to all the members. May I also table an answer, a reply to an Order for Return No. 1 on the Order of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains of December 14, 1966; a reply to an Order for Return No. 2 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone-Nee-pawa December 12, 1966; a reply to an Order for Return No. 8 on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party December 12, 1966; a reply to an Order for Return No. 9 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Hamiota, December 12, 1966; a reply to an Order for Return -- this is not numbered but it was on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Hamiota December 14, 1966; and a reply to an Order for Return No. 35 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface dated February 6, 1967.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 29 on the motion of the Honourable Member for

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . Portage la Prairie.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, and I'm referring to -- I'm speaking to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and I'm not getting his attention, Mr. Speaker. To my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, I'm referring to a story in the Tribune March 10th headed "Cattle Cancer Details Asked." And it reports that the President of the Farmers Union asked my honourable friend to state in what areas of the province cancer was found in cattle because it was affecting cattle sales in the province. Subsequently I received a phone call from the President of the Farmers Union asking if I could get the information for him. My question, of course, is: why does not the Minister provide the information if it is affecting the markets, as the president has stated?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the request may be at the Animals Branch of the department; it hasn't come across my desk. I take this question as notice and will check into it. I don't believe the incidence of cancer in our cattle is new. We have had it from time to time and certainly anything, any news that I have of it is not of the nature that it's of a serious nature. It's more serious to the owner that suffers any loss in this way, but not of any widespread nature.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question on the same matter. Can the Honourable the Minister tell me if cancer in cattle is a reportable disease under the Federal Health of Animals Act?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, no, it is not.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Does he know whether the contractor who has the contract, or who is about to receive the contract, to build the Seagrams Distillery is a Manitoba contractor or not?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, the House of Seagrams have a general contractor who supervises all their contracts as a general contractor. The initial sub-contracts will be offered in Manitoba. That is, I'm led to believe they will be offered in Manitoba.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Leader of the House. In view of the fact that we've had a number of Orders for Returns tabled today, will we be getting the Orders that carried over at the end of the last session? My list indicates that I have six in which my group were interested, which were moved in various stages during the last session starting on the 28th of February and which were not returned. We also had three Address for Papers which were passed by the House and which were not returned. Will we be getting these or are we to place these once again on the Order Paper?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the question of Orders for Return and their carrying over has been one that has had some discussion, as my honourable friend is aware. I think the best I can tell him in that regard as to a continuing rule of the House would be that the Rules Committee is going to be re-established this session to look into some rule changes that I think honourable members will be aware are required, and the subject I think can be looked into in more detail then. Whether or not as between one Legislature and another they carry over I think is a very moot question.

MR. MOLGAT: What are we to expect then, Mr. Speaker, insofar as those that were not returned last year? Do we have them typed up again and move each one once again, or is the government going to submit them to . . . . .

MR. LYON: I think that would be the desirable procedure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Then, Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly, in view of the fact that the government had all the time from the 28th of February until prorogation the 26th of April, most of the answers will be ready, I presume. In any case there will be an instantaneous reply. Can we depend on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders are called I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Welfare. Has Manitoba signed the agreement with Canada regarding the Canada Assistance Plan, and if they have not could the Minister tell us why?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw to the attention of the Provincial Secretary something that I think is very important. If one looks at the front of this Hansard, you will notice that there is something missing, and I believe that on the flagpole there are no flags. We have a new national flag. We also have a provincial flag. I wondered if the Provincial Treasurer would take this as notice and — or Provincial Secretary I should say, and have something done about it. It should come from the north.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, it's to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce I think I should direct a question. I heard briefly this morning a news report on the radio and I wasn't able to catch quite all of what was being said, but it had to do with tax concessions to the distillery that is being proposed at Gimli, and I wondered whether the Honourable the Minister could inform the House as to what these tax concessions are and from where they come. Who is making the concessions? Is it the government, is it municipal, or otherwise?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have already made a statement in connection with this that can be found in Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, thank you for noticing me. I'd like to direct a question in the absence of the Minister of Health to the House Leader, whoever he is. Bill 68 which appeared on our desks today deals with the question of medical services, and in view of the history, the long period of time it took for us to obtain copies of Bill 56, the Sales Tax bill, in sufficient quantity to be able to study them, I asked our Whip to ascertain how many copies would be available for our group and he brought back five copies. Assuming that there is an insufficient number, could it be made certain that there would be sufficient available of this very important Bill so that we could have the additional copies we would need for the purpose I've already outlined?

MR. LYON: We can pass that request along, Mr. Speaker, to the appropriate authorities.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Has any information been withheld from the press on the voting results at the various polls and divisions on this last referendum? Certainly in other elections this information is provided to the news media and the press, but it seems to be absent to date. Secondly, will we, as members, be furnished with this information?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little bit at a loss to know what information we would withhold from the press or anybody else with respect to this vote. If my honourable friend thinks that some information has been withheld or should be made available that isn't, if he'll let me know what it is I will try and investigate it for him, but to the best of my knowledge all the information is available and I am sure that the results will be published in the Manitoba Gazette in due course.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. When he brought down his budget I believe he told us that the change in the law with respect to purple gas would go into effect May 1st. If that's correct, would he verify that? My second question would be: when will the regulations be made available to us with respect to this new change?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, at the moment I don't recall what was contained in the budget address with respect to that item. My honourable friend has a copy of the budget address and can look it up. The regulations will be made public after they are passed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Last year on the eighth of March the then Minister of Industry and Commerce made a statement regarding the integrated forest industry development in northern Manitoba, and he read at that time from a letter which had been addressed to Mr. Roblin and signed by Monoca AG, and it listed the stages in which the proposed program was to proceed. Stage 1 would be the establishment of woodlands debarking and loading facilities for 50,000 cords of debarked wood to be in operation by March 31, 1968. Stage 2 would be the establishment and construction of a modern sawmill at The Pas for the production of 30 million board feet of lumber per year to be in operation not later than December 30, 1968. Stage 3 was to be the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . newsprint and magazine paper mill. Could the Minister indicate whether there has been any change in this proposed schedule or any changes in any of the phases.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I've already told the House that I proposed to make a statement with respect to the Churchill Forest Industries on my estimates.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the number of reported accidents in Manitoba for the years 1964, 1965 and 1966 involving power toboggans, broken down to show: (a) the number of fatalities; (b) the number of persons injured; (c) damage to property in dollars; (d) the number of convictions of power toboggan owners and operators; and (e) the classification of the above convictions.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, while not objecting to this Order for Return, I have taken the precaution of discussing the request with members of the Department and am informed that we do not have the information for the questions (a) and (b) for the years 1964 and 1965, but that we do have it for 1966 and will be pleased to provide it; and that we do not have the information requested in (c), (d) and (e) and I would have to accept this subject to the fact that that information is not available.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker -- you're only going to answer one?

MR. McLEAN: (a) and (b) for the year 1966.

MR. SHOEMAKER: You are going to give me information for (a) and (b) for the year 1966 only, and not to (c) or (d). Well surely there was -- I'm allowed to speak on this, am I not? On the order?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Honourable Member for Gladstone heard the Minister rightly. He said '64 and '65 that they didn't have the records of a certain portion of the questions asked.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I am allowed to speak on the order; yes, okay. Now, Mr. Speaker, I fully recall that there were two persons killed, I believe, last year up in the vicinity of Sandy Lake or north of there, by power toboggans and I thought that that was in the year 1965. It may have been 1966. This whole Order for Return results from questions that I have been asking my honourable friend continually since December, since we met in December, and that is that there does not appear to be any provision at all for the use of snow toboggans and skidoos and so on on our highways in this province. And there isn't a week goes by when I'm travelling back and forth to Neepawa but that you see power toboggans on the roads, and I know that the owners and operators of the power toboggans are greatly concerned. Millions of dollars worth of them have been sold and are being used, and they're operating outside of the law, many of them, and it has reached the point that we have had one or more fatalities now and I don't know how many thousands of dollars of property damage that has resulted, and there must have been a number of convictions and there's going to be a lot more convictions unless something is done to make it possible for the owners to operate the power toboggans, because they're being advertised through all media and they're being sold in great numbers and certainly something has to be done.

Now, did I understand my honourable friend to say that he could not supply the answers to (d), that is, the number of convictions of power toboggan owners and operators? Surely there have been some convictions in all the last three or four years, and surely the information is available. And then (e), the classifications of the above convictions. Convicted for what? That's what I'm asking for. What were they convicted of and what was the conviction, and the amount of fines in dollars and so on? I think this is pretty important information that I'm asking for and I hope that my honourable friend will endeavour to get me all of the information that is available from all sources to supply as much as is humanly possible for the answers to the questions that I'm asking here.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (a) What is the monthly salary of nurses aides at the Manitoba Home for Retardates. (b) What is the monthly salaries for male

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . attendants. (c) Are the qualifications and duties of nurses aides and male attendants identical? (d) If not, how do they differ?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I see nothing that attracts my notice in this question with respect to matters that might be not answerable and therefore we accept the motion, but I'd just like to issue, to utter just a little bit of a hedge in case the Minister of Health should have a reservation on this that I'm not aware of, but as far as I know it's all right.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing for the academic years 1965-66 and 1966-67 the following information:

The number of students registered in each course at the University of Manitoba and each of the affiliated colleges except Brandon College, showing the following breakdown:

- (a) The number from Greater Winnipeg.
- (b) The number from the remainder of Manitoba.
- (c) The number from other provinces in Canada.
- (d) The number from outside Canada.
2. The same information as in (1) for the Manitoba Institute of Technology.
3. The number of students registered in each course at Brandon College showing the

following:

- (a) The number from Brandon City.
- (b) The number from the remainder of Manitoba.
- (c) The number from other provinces in Canada.
- (d) The number from outside Canada.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the honourable member -- the number of students registered in each course such as English, Maths. I think we can get this information from the institutions concerned on a faculty basis if that would be satisfactory, but on a course basis it would be pretty impossible. Otherwise I think we can accept the question. My information is that the University has these figures on a gross basis but -- and again by faculty in school and not by course. We'll do our best to I think otherwise get these answers.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. All traffic counts taken on Provincial Road No. 462 from the intersection of No. 261 North to the Village of Glencairn.
2. All traffic counts taken on Provincial Road No. 480 from the intersection of No. 5 Highway North.
3. All traffic counts taken on Provincial Road No. 276 from No. 5 Highway North to the intersection with Provincial Road No. 364.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to accept this on the same terms as we accepted the other Orders of this nature, but the answer will have to be on average daily volumes as they fall within certain ranges.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I note the reservation that the Minister makes. I agree it is the same one that he has made in previous requests of the same nature. I would hope that this statement that "its average daily counts as they fall between certain volumes" is going to nevertheless give enough information that we can assess intelligently the amount of traffic that is in fact generated on these various roads. I am sure that the Minister is aware that there are problems on some of these roads about snow plowing and so on, and a number of local concerns as to whether or not a road should be included within the program for extended services or whether it shouldn't, and I think we would resolve a lot of the local difficulties if we could, in fact, give them reasonably accurate figures, not vague averages. I think that we would be doing a service to the department itself where it may be criticized unfairly because in the minds of the public they are not proceeding in the right way on certain roads. If the information were available and given to the public, it would simplify the situation very substantially; there would be an answer given to them and the arguments would cease. Now, if the Minister says that he's prepared to give it on those averages I'm prepared to wait and see exactly what he produces. I hope that it will be satisfactory to give us the explanations that we want. If not,



(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . then I think we may have a further debate. I wonder if the Minister could indicate when we might expect to have the answers. Can we expect them soon and would "soon" in these terms mean in time for discussion on his estimates, for example?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, the answer is: as soon as they are ready.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . ask the Minister a question. The information has been calculated by the Department, has it not? They are taking counts on a regular basis on the various roads?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in favour please say Aye. I hear no response whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER after a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills: No. 23, an Act to Amend an Act to incorporate Les Reverends Peres Oblats in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bills Nos. 23, 28, 50 and 57.

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee proceed. Bills Nos. 23, 28 and 50 were read section by section and passed. Bill No. 57, (1)--passed; (2)... The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, this clause (1). Does that mean that if this is passed that they can pay varying rates of interest on capital, that it doesn't have to be one particular rate?

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, the rate at the present time is limited, as you can see, and it is the wish of the Co-operative Credit Society to have it so that they can fluctuate according from year to year as the dividend is accumulated.

MR. FROESE: But they cannot differentiate; in other words, pay two different rates for different kinds of capital.

MR. MCKENZIE: I don't think so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The balance of Bill 57 was read and passed.) Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered and passed Bills Nos. 23, 28, 50 and 57.

#### IN SESSION

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution . . . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we have to now call the Third Readings of the Bills that were reported out of Committee.

BILLS Nos. 23, 28, 50 and 57 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Russell, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member of Brokenhead in amendment thereto. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): In the absence of our leader, may we have the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I adjourned debate, Mr. Speaker, for the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I only intend to comment briefly on this resolution. It seems as if we've had a sort of a bouncing ball here. It began with a proposal by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface who argued that the voting age should be lowered to 18, and then there were

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . further amendments to this which were made by the Honourable Member for Burrows which suggested that the school program should be geared up to take this into account, this should be done provincially and recommended to the Federal Government, and also should be done municipally. And then the Premier got up and everyone was anxious to hear what he said, and he proposed that a study on the status of youth be made, and I think that no one here would argue otherwise that this was a worthwhile objective, but it seemed to delay or to, in a sense, undercut the issue, so I am happy that the Honourable Member for Selkirk made his amendment which said that, in the meantime, while the study was made and as evidence of sincerity and good faith, the Government of Manitoba take immediate steps to lower the voting age within the aforesaid limits for the election of members to this Assembly, and I wish to urge members very strongly to support this.

I don't know whether we have to have another study made of this question. We, I think, have debated this in this House, or the House has debated it for years - at least some ten years; we've heard the arguments proposed in this debate; and I see no necessity for us to wait for a study. I think that most of the members of this House have in their own minds an opinion as to whether or not the voting age should be lowered, and I don't think that a study examining the habits or the intelligence quotients of students or their moral background or their knowledge of political affairs is going to very much alter our opinions. It's simply a case of either you believe that eighteen-year-olds in Manitoba are capable or trainable to make a political judgment or you do not, and I think that I, for one, believe that eighteen-year-old people in our province can cast intelligent votes. I think they require a bit of assistance in the sense of information on political parties, etc., but if the question is boldly stated or baldly put: "Do you or do you not think that eighteen-year-olds should vote?" then I must answer 'yes'. I have some additions to make but I must answer 'yes'. So I don't see the necessity of this study and I think we can even evade that question itself. The question very simply is: "Do we believe that younger people, younger than twenty-one and in this case eighteen, are capable of voting intelligently?" And if we do believe that, then what are we waiting for? So I urge the members of this House to support this amendment that the voting age in the Province of Manitoba be lowered here and now, and I think that we can decide this issue on its merits. We have no need to look elsewhere or to make in-depth studies.

MR. SPEAKER put the question, on the amendment to the amendment on the main motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 26; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. Are you ready for the question on the amendment to the main motion?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might say a few words before we proceed with the amendment as proposed. When the Minister, the Leader of the House, who is now leading the House, first suggested, when the original motion was before us, that he was going to do something there was a great coverage all over the place. Media of various sorts had headlines saying, "Roblin Government moves towards or accepts principle, must vote at age eighteen." My honourable friend left the impression at that time that after having supported the idea of "vote at age eighteen" as long as he was in the Opposition, after having gone against it once he became the Leader of the House, was now going to support it once again. But lo and behold, we find that it was actually a sham, Mr. Speaker. He had no intention whatever of doing anything; just proceeding with another study. This is what we're faced with now. Instead of action, more study. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . to interrupt the Honourable Leader of the Opposition but it's been brought to my attention that he has already spoken on this amendment. I wonder . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that my name did appear at the bottom of the resolution one day; I did not speak as such. I had adjourned it on behalf of my colleague, the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . Member for Selkirk, which is what I stated when I rose on the subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I . . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: However, if you rule that that is speaking then I . . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please. If that is the case I apologize for interrupting the honourable gentleman and would he please proceed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think on the point of order there is a technical point involved. We would be all delighted, I'm sure, to hear my honourable friend again and again but I think there is a technicality involved here in that if the Order does once stand in the name of an honourable member - and here I'm going sheerly on recollection - and that if he then stands and speaks on it even if it only be to say, "I adjourn this for my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk," even though these few words are spoken I think the rules have held, and I'm certainly subject to correction on this, but I think the rules have held that that constitutes speaking. Now I'm merely asking, Sir, to perhaps take that under consideration. We're not trying to -- nobody's trying to suggest the honourable member shouldn't speak but I think the rules are the rules. We have to see what they are in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition if he persists that he should speak at this time on this subject.

MR. MOLGAT: Do I insist?

MR. SPEAKER: Do you persist? Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I'm prepared to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Well then now if I might . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: But I'm not going to be the cause of the affair -- if you suggest that I'm out of order then I will find some other occasion, I'm sure, when I can speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I propose to do so by this quotation from Beauchesne: "If a member who moves an Order of the Day should rise and say only a word or two - for instance, that he moves the order - he is precluded from again addressing the House except if the Order of the Day is a substantive motion, the second reading of a bill, in which case he will be allowed to reply."

MR. MOLGAT: What citation is that, if I may, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: That citation is 166 sub-paragraph (4).

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, we have had an opportunity to review the entire question of the vote being given to young people of eighteen years of age and over, and the Honourable Member for Selkirk reviewed the history of all the debates that have gone on in the past, and of course if we keep on debating it then we will eventually reach those people who are now eighteen years of age because three years from now they will be entitled to vote. But, Mr. Speaker, we have made it clear that we feel that this subject has been traversed enough times for all of us to recognize, as did, I believe, all of us, or the vast majority of us, that people who are eighteen, nineteen years of age are perfectly capable of making a decision and should be given that responsibility, and I don't speak of it only as a right to vote but rather an acceptance of the responsibility to vote.

Now, when this amendment was moved by the Honourable the First Minister of the House, my Leader quickly jumped up and pointed out that the purport of the amendment is clearly to postpone and delay and to just slough off the responsibility by passing it on to another level of government and to set up a further commission. Now we've had proposals already that we're going to have a commission dealing with the question of the status of youth. We've had a proposal that we're going to have a commission dealing with the status of women. We already have a motion dealing with the status of consumers and the problems of consumers. Before we know it we will put off all the responsibilities which we have into commissions which will be studying all the various aspects of all the people, because certainly no one will deny that the question of the status, the responsibilities and the burdens carried by the older people is deserving of a study, and it won't be long before the Honourable the First Minister will suggest that we have a commission appointed in this province to study the status and responsibilities and opportunities for the elderly citizens of this province. That will leave out the middle-aged which no doubt we'll get around to dealing with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the time has come for us to indicate to the Premier that we think that it's time his government acted on this issue, because I'm afraid, following the tenor set by this government, that the next step other than the appointment of commissions will

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . be that of referenda. Before we know it we will be adjourning the House again in order to go out into the country to try and sell, which reminds me that the Honourable the Attorney-General said that politics is selling; we sell ourselves. Well to me politics is not selling but politics is responsibility, and I think that the responsibility of politics and of politicians is to represent the people that elect them and give them that responsibility and that we should not slough it off again and again.

I am under the impression that of the ten provinces substantial progress has been made in the recognition of the need to recognize the change in our society and to reduce the voting age, and if other levels of government are not ready to do so I don't see that that is any reason for us to delay. I believe Quebec and Saskatchewan have recognized 18 as being a voting age. I believe British Columbia and Alberta have recognized 19 as a voting age. And I have just learned, I've just been told that the Speech from the Throne in Prince Edward Island has been made today, this afternoon - although they're a couple of hours ahead of us - and that included in that Speech from the Throne is a statement that the government is going to seek a lowering of the voting age in this session. How long do we have to - in this province - drag behind the lead of the others? And in view of what has been said and in view of what we have learned of statements made by the First Minister when he was in opposition, the statements made by the parties, the various parties in the House, in favour of the principle of reduction of age, I think that it ill behoves this government at this stage to push off the problem by suggesting a commission and by suggesting further discussions with the Government of Canada.

In the eight years or nine years that this government has been in power it has had every opportunity to discuss this problem with the government at Ottawa be it Conservative, be it Liberal, and I think that by supporting this amendment we would be participating with the government in this delaying tactic. I think that it is a very important thing that we do study the problems of the status of youth. I think it's an important thing that the Youth and Manpower Agency has been established, and if as and when the First Minister or any other member of the government proposes a resolution establishing a study that would be made on the question of the status of youth with particular reference to legal responsibilities and rights, I am sure that it will find favour amongst all parties in this House. And I would urge that this separate resolution should be brought by the government, and the First Minister should present it, and I would guess that it would be endorsed wholeheartedly; but to tack it on to this I think is wrong, and for that reason it is our proposal to vote against it. If we persuade sufficient members of the House that we are right then we will deal again with the principal issue and that is the one that was proposed originally. If we do succeed in that way then, as I say, I would urge the First Minister to bring his amendment in the form of a resolution so that we can support it. Naturally, if we fail to persuade the majority of the members of this House to vote against this motion and if it becomes a resolution as amended, then we could not but accept and vote for such a resolution as amended, but I do urge members of this House not to wait, not to become the sixth or seventh province that recognizes this, but to accept what has been said over all these years - vote down this amendment by the First Minister and deal with the resolution in its pure form.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the position that the Honourable the Member for St. John's has just taken, and in supporting it I would like to refer briefly to something of the history of this particular issue in this House. As has been mentioned by other speakers, Mr. Speaker, it's been before us for a long time, and it's perhaps characteristic of my honourable friend the First Minister of the province and characteristic of me that during the years we have changed our respective positions. I was in the position at one time of somewhat supporting the argument that he now advances, and he was on the other side of the question. But I, being a progressive individual, have moved along and have come to modernize, as is my custom, and move with the times, whereas my honourable friend the First Minister of the province has become a reactionary, and now tries to do those things, exactly the same thing that that unenlightened government of years ago used to do, that government that got us into all the trouble in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for the stand that I took at that time. I said then and I would repeat now that I would go from any age, from 20 down to 18, that we could get the Federal Government to agree with because as you know, Mr. Speaker, I'm a great believer in uniformity; and I took the position that we should try to persuade the Federal Government to see our point of view; took the position to the extent that I had the privilege of urging that point of view both at one of the federal-provincial fiscal conferences and at one of the federal-provincial

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . constitutional conferences. On both occasions I brought this question up and recommended strongly to the Federal Government that they should consider this proposal because of the western provinces having already moved and that we were inclined to move. That's the reason that I was so reactionary in those days as to want to wait for a study, but do you think my honourable friend the present First Minister would have anything of that? Goodness, no! He certainly wouldn't. And I just took the trouble to look up what happened in 1954, Mr. Speaker. That was the time when my honourable friend was just engaged in a campaign to assume the leadership of the Conservative Party in this province, just as he is now - if some of the press reports are right - engaged in a campaign to move into higher and wider fields, and I see that that causes a lot of interest on the part of my honourable friend the Attorney-General. Personal interest, I gather, from what the same press reports say . . .

MR. LYON: Humorous interest.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, well it is a rather humorous suggestion, I must admit, that my honourable friend should ever achieve to lead a government in this province. This - - certainly it would be humorous if it wouldn't be so tragic. But at that time when my honourable friend the present First Minister of the House was progressive and forward-looking, he took the position when we suggested that a study should be made that that was a terrible thing, and I must read something of what happened at that time.

This motion had been moved at that time by a member of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Swailes, in 1954, "that the government give consideration to the advisability of lowering the age of eligibility for voting in Manitoba provincial elections;" the proposed motion of Mr. Clement in amendment thereto, "that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'that' in the first line thereof, and substituting the following: in the opinion of this House the Federal Government and the government in Manitoba should jointly consider the advisability of lowering the age qualifications of persons voting in the federal and provincial elections."

And as I have mentioned, Mr. Speaker, I took the opportunity at two federal-provincial conferences to urge a procedure of that kind but - and I'm reading from Page 79, the 26th of February in the 1954 journal - "and the debate continuing, Mr. Willis moved an amendment to the amendment" -- Mr. Willis was at that time, of course, the Leader of the Party, but certainly the Honourable the present First Minister was high in the councils of the Party and undoubtedly he was assisting Mr. Willis in proposing the amendment. "Mr. Willis moved an amendment to the amendment that the proposed motion of Mr. Clement in amendment be further amended by striking out the words 'the Federal Government' in the first line thereof, by striking out the word 'jointly' in the second line thereof, and by striking out the word 'federal' in the fourth line thereof, and adding the following words at the end of the said amendment; 'in order to recognize responsibilities now assumed by persons under 21 years of age'." And you will realize, Mr. Speaker, that that was putting it right back to where it was advocating the lower voting age, and I took the trouble because I was interested in the change that had taken place in my honourable friend the First Minister.

I think a man now aspiring to do greater things should show some evidence of consistency too, and so I just wondered what position he had taken there, but I looked up first the transcript of the remarks that had been made by the Leader of the party at that time, which, as I am sure, the honourable the First Minister - who is now the First Minister - certainly concurred at that time. I have no objection whatever, Mr. Speaker, to reading all of this speech that was made by the then Leader of the Conservative Party on February 26, 1954 and I guarantee that what I read is not taking it out of context but if anyone wants to hear more I would be glad to read it to them. I am now reading from what the Leader of the Conservative Party said at that time.

"Now the Member for St. Andrews dreamed up, as I said, several reasons why at 21 it is early enough for them to vote, whereas it has been said here before, at an age lesser than 21 we allow them to fight for us in battle. We are happy to take the advantage of their youth to have them fight for us. We allow them to drive automobiles and have a great killer under their control, namely, an automobile, which does great damage; and too we are allowing them to do other things which are of tremendous importance, such as get married and take on responsibilities of bringing up a family. All these things we do, but we still say that we will not allow them to vote even though they be 20 years of age.

"Now the words 'the Federal portion of this' have been introduced, that we sit down together with the Federal Government and consider the possibility of lowering that age. That, in my opinion, is merely an excuse so that when no action is taken, as no action would be taken,

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . they would be able to blame the Federal Government for it and it would be said that they did not co-operate. We operate on our own in this province and our own jurisdiction, and under the British North America Act we have as much authority as the Dominion Government has in regard to those subjects which have been assigned to us. It is not necessary, therefore, and it is nothing of our business in this House as to the age of voting for those who vote in Federal elections. Therefore I think, as far as the amendment is concerned, it is merely brought forward to give this government an excuse for doing nothing."

Well now, does that apply pretty well to the present situation? "Consequently, in order that the motion may be brought back to where it belongs, without keeping the House further, I propose to make an amendment," and the amendment was the one that I read. And the matter was carried to a vote, Mr. Speaker, and my honourable friend the present First Minister of the province voted for the amendment to the amendment which said, or at least the sponsor of it had said that it was just a delaying tactic and an excuse. Well is that what it is today, Mr. Speaker?

I simply ask this question of my honourable friends. The motion, the amendment to the amendment that would have put it beyond peradventure of doubt has been voted down, and I now join with the others who have spoken in suggesting to my honourable friends that if they really want to do something about this, isn't it the fact that for 13 years now it has been up to the Federal Government to make their move in this direction, that we should decide that the time has arrived to do something about it ourselves.

I don't apologize for what was done in those years. I think there were some good arguments for believing that there was advantage in getting the two to act, but after this length of time I must say that I'm inclined to give up hope in that direction of having a great deal of influence on the Federal Government of that day or the one that has intervened in the meantime or the present one, and the only thing that I can see, the reasonable position for this House to take, is not to postpone the matter any longer but to deal with our own situation in our own province.

So, like the Honourable Member for St. John's, I do not propose to support a motion that, to use the phrases of the former Leader of the Conservative Party, is evidently intended to be a delaying action or an excuse. I do not suggest, as does the Honourable the First Minister, that we should turn back the clock and start advocating now what 13 years ago that party thought was the wrong procedure. Whether they were right then or not in the strictures that they laid upon us and the ideas that they had about our plan of procedure, surely 13 years is sufficient to have convinced us that there is little opportunity of the Federal Government being swayed by our position in this matter. Therefore, isn't it sensible and right that we should proceed to deal with the jurisdiction where we have authority? I intend consequently, Mr. Speaker, to vote against this amendment and I hope that others who, like myself, have progressed a little bit in their thinking in this period, unlike the Honourable the First Minister have not become hardened reactionaries, will take the forward view and will support the enlightened position that is represented by the original motion.

MR. LYON: Perhaps a word would be in order at this stage because I was most interested to hear the comments of the Member for St. John's and then following upon his heels the comments of the Member for Lakeside, relative to their being unable to vote for this amendment, and as I re-read the amendment after recalling the address that had been given by the First Minister when he introduced it, I found these words coming rather strange to my ears because there is a great deal involved in this amendment and there is a great deal involved in the approach that is suggested by the First Minister.

I think we would do well to take a look at the amendment again and see what it is in it that we disagree with, because I think that there are within it the seeds of understanding and the seeds of progress that all of us want to take. I don't want to say that these were the words I heard, because certainly they weren't, but it almost seemed as though someone on the back playground was saying in effect, "if you won't play the game according to my rules we won't play the game at all," but I'm merely suggesting that there is much in this amendment that should be given attention to before honourable members too quickly vote against it.

What does the amendment say? It says that the status of youth in modern society is a matter of concern to this House. I can't imagine anybody on the opposite side or on this side of the House disagreeing with that statement.

It says that the legal voting age at the federal, the provincial and local levels should be reviewed before the next provincial election. Now we never know with any degree of absolute

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . . certainty as to when provincial elections take place, but in all likelihood this review can take place before another provincial election takes place. What are we after? My honourable friends opposite are apparently seeking a voting age of 18. The amendment says let the review take place before another provincial election, so that the ultimate effect is, if the review finds in favour of this, that you could conceivably have a voting age of 18 before the next provincial election.

"Whereas a common electoral franchise is desirable." Who in their right mind would oppose that? Of course it is desirable if you can have a common electoral franchise in this province, or indeed in all parts of the country, so that you don't have this misunderstanding that arises, as I have been told, in other provinces where they have reduced the voting age to 18 or to 19, the chap who can vote provincially but can't vote municipally and can't vote federally, and sometimes you create more problems than there were had you left the voting age at least common. There is something to be said for a common voting age. I think we would all agree that if you can have a common electoral voting age it is a very desirable thing.

"And Whereas an improvement in education for democracy should be sought." How could we fight against that? How can anybody say that this is not good? I believe these were some of the remarks of the Member for Elmwood or the Member for Burrows when they were taking part in this debate.

"Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking the agreement of the Government of Canada to reduce the legal voting age to 18 years, or such other age under 21 as may be deemed appropriate." Now I suggest that when this statement is made in 1967 it has perhaps much more meaning than the statement that was made apparently by my honourable friends opposite when they were considering the common federal-provincial electoral franchise some 13 or 14 years ago. I have to admit I have not gone into that kind of research in depth as to what was said 14 years ago by anyone in this Legislative Chamber because I don't think it really has too much bearing on what we are trying to do today in 1967.

My honourable friend the Member for Lakeside and others may say that it's a shame that the Leader of the House is not consistent. Well, I know that sometimes consistency is a good thing other times you know -- and the saying is recalled to my mind that "consistency is the solace of the commonplace mind." Well if that be the case then I see no particular value in consistency, and if we were dependent upon consistency I am sure that many of the people in the United States of America would be quite interested, as I was, on an earlier occasion, reading the voting record of the President of the United States with respect to civil rights, and yet the greatest movement toward the granting of civil rights in the United States takes place under whom? The same man who 13 or 14 years before, spoke against it. So I don't think that consistency is necessarily the great prerequisite that one should always seek in the political mind, but be that as it may, the speeches were made, fine and dandy, and the positions were taken, and some of the same things that were said then are being said now, and shouldn't that encourage us to take a much broader view of this whole problem than perhaps we have in the past, because it seems we have been chasing one another's tails around in a circle. -- (Interjection) -- So all I say to my honourable friends is that thus far have we come across anything here that anyone can honestly say they disagree with? And let me say this, that when the statement was made to my honourable friend from Lakeside when he was the First Minister of this House, that -- or at least the amendment introduced, as I judge it was, by someone on his side saying that he should seek consultations with the Federal Government, it is much more meaningful today because the Federal Government, the Liberal Government at Ottawa, as one of their election platforms and planks has said that it is going to reduce the voting age in Canada to 18. Now that's on the record.

Now surely my honourable friends opposite are not trying to say to us today, "Well you can't believe that bunch of rascals. Just because they said it doesn't mean they are going to do it." I believe that that is their intention and I think that if that takes place, and if the consultations that the Honourable the First Minister has already had with the Prime Minister of Canada come to fruition, that there can emerge out of this a much wider change in the laws affecting youth of Canada and in the general franchise and the manner of making up our voting list and so on, that things that were beyond their comprehension only a year or two or three years ago.

So here we are in a position where if you say today that the Federal Government has indicated that they are going to reduce the voting age, as they have, to the age of 18 years, that certainly we can't be anticipating that they are going to delay it too much.

(MR. LYON cont'd.)

And "Be It Further Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking such improvements in education for democracy through the public school system as will better prepare youth for the franchise." Who can object to that?

"Be It Further Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of instructing the Youth and Manpower Agency to undertake a wide-ranging study of the status of youth in Manitoba, with particular reference to legal responsibilities and rights." Heaven knows how much that is needed, and one need only consider some of the anomalies that can arise if you don't have a thoroughgoing study that relates not just to the voting age but relates to the total question of age at which people can do certain things. You can't make a will in this province, a legal will, under the age of 21 unless you are a member of the Armed Forces. You can't go into a drinking establishment in Manitoba unless you are 21 years of age, but you can vote, my honourable friends are saying. These are inconsistencies. There are a hundred and one things. You can't make a legal contract for the purchase of anything but necessities unless you are 21 years of age or over, one of the great foundation rocks of the whole commercial field of law in our province and indeed in our country. Are we just to slough that aside and say, "Well fine. A person can't go out and buy himself a car but he can vote when he's eighteen." My honourable friend says, "Yes, but the other provinces are doing it." I would suggest that the other provinces would do well to look at this matter in depth as is being proposed in this amendment because it's not just the question of voting. There is a whole sphere of responsibilities that accrue to the age of twenty-one and as to whether or not that age should be reduced, and voting is one of them, a very important one, but voting is only one of them. Voting is only one of them. And I suggest that the whole range of responsibilities of youth should be looked at as is put forward in this amendment and I suggest that if we get on with it, and if we support it, that we can perhaps have this look in depth by the Youth and Manpower Agency of Manitoba and in the end -- and in the end we will be doing exactly what my honourable friends want. Not in the particular way that they want it done, no. I'm sure that perhaps some of them on the other side are only wishing that they had thought of this first. Because it is an excellent approach, to look at all of these matters in context, to look at these matters in context and see where they fit. I'm wondering as I listen to the Honourable Member from St. John's, to the Honourable Member from Lakeside, if they can really in their heart and in their conscience vote against this matter. I have read it all over to them. I'm sure there's nothing there that they oppose. I'm sure there's nothing there that they oppose . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Nothing except a stall, Red.

MR. LYON: And I hope that they will vote for it. My honourable friend from St. Boniface says something about a stall. No question of a stall. My honourable friend should realize that there is much more involved in this than perhaps he has even contemplated. -- (Interjection) -- Play the game according to the Liberal rules or the NDP rules, at all cost but don't play it according to a reasonable suggestion because we didn't suggest it. You know that is a bit like a corner playground attitude and I don't suggest that it's one that honourable members are going to follow. So I merely appeal to their sense of reason, -- (Interjection) -- to their goodwill and suggest that they shouldn't cut off their noses to spite their faces by voting against this amendment, because the study, I suggest, is going to be a meaningful study for the youth in this province and I am sure that most of the honourable members on the other side would like to feel in years to follow that they were a part -- that they were a part or played a part in having the study undertaken which will be of some considerable benefit to the future of our youth of this province.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I ask a question of the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker? In the event that this amendment is defeated, what would prevent the Government of Manitoba to consider the advisability of instructing the youth and manpower agency to undertake a wide ranging study of the status of youth in Manitoba with particular reference to legal responsibilities and rights. Would it not be done in any event?

MR. LYON: Of course, that's hypothetical. I'm not presuming that the amendment is going to be defeated.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, oh pardon me, I believe the Member for Elmwood has a question to ask. I yield to him.

MR. DOERN: May I ask a question of the Minister? Are you undecided in your own mind on the single question of whether the vote should be lowered to eighteen? In other words could you not make a decision on that single item now or would you have to wait for the study?



MR. LYON: I've just finished saying that I think it's much preferable to look at the whole field. This is only one factor. This is only one factor of a number, where the rights of youth, including the right to vote, but the rights of youth are affected by the age of twenty-one. The question of the common electoral age or the common franchise age I think is extremely important. As my honourable friend will know from, I think he has said on at least one occasion that he's a former high school teacher, my honourable friend will know from discussing this with high school students, as I have done, that they aren't too sure themselves as to whether they want it reduced to eighteen willy-nilly without looking at some of the other matters. I get more youngsters between eighteen and twenty-one, and I'm not suggesting that there are a legion of them, but in casual conversations with them, much more concerned about the drinking age than they are about the voting age. So these are matters that have to be looked at seriously.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, after yesterday's very dramatic debates I found the remarks and the speech by the Honourable Attorney very entertaining and he's brought a somewhat lighter atmosphere into the House. All that was missing I think was some background music. He started off by suggesting that we're being difficult. He says, "You play our way or you don't play at all." He feels that we are adopting this very difficult attitude. What a lot of nonsense. This is so typical of what the government has done on other occasions. This is what they did to the bill dealing -- or resolution rather -- dealing with the introduction of day nurseries. They proceeded to amend it -- the First Minister as a matter of fact proceeded to amend it in such a way that it was almost unrecognizable. Well this time it is recognizable. To that extent I must admit they're not quite as difficult. They amend it nonetheless so that it has no basis in fact as far as the next two, three years are concerned. Maybe, and this is not part of the 'be it therefore' or 'therefore resolved' but rather under the 'Whereas' section, that perhaps it could be done before the next provincial election. But this is only a maybe. There's nothing to impose this; it doesn't suggest that they must. I feel very strongly that what we are witnessing here is what the other members who have spoken have said, it's simply an attempt to slough it off. Now why the government adopts this attitude I'm not sure. Maybe it bothers them to see constructive legislation brought in from this side of the House -- and frankly with the performance of this government in the last few weeks, they have a lot to be worried about because the public I think is getting fed up with the kind of not only not constructive legislation, but wishy-washy attitude of this government -- and this is a perfect example of it. They blow hot and they blow cold. They are for the voting age of eighteen but they're not for it enough to vote for it. So they introduce red herrings. And this is a typical one.

I suggest if they're sincere -- and I'm not kidding myself, I don't believe for a moment that they are. They are sincerely trying to refute the principles of this resolution. To that extent I go along with their sincerity. On the other hand I say this to them: that if they want to do something constructive then let them bring in a resolution dealing with youth and manpower agency. As the Honourable Member for St. John's said he will support it. I think if they ask him he may even second it.

But with regard to the amendments themselves brought in by the First Minister, I would suggest that if you look at them closely they are repeating what are in the original resolution. In one case the First Minister said, "Be it resolved the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking agreement of the Government of Canada." Now this is exactly what the first original resolution said: "that the Government of Canada be requested to consider the enactment of legislation." Same thing. The other portion of the 'be it resolved', "That the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking such improvements in education, etc." We go back to the original resolution. It says: "This government institute a more intensive program of instruction dealing with the structure, function and operation of all levels of government in Canada." So that there really is no clash except in wording between the major parts of the resolution and the major parts of the amendment. The only difference is in this last one dealing with the advisability of instructing the youth and manpower agency, and I suggest that this can be done without in any way interfering with a reasonable vote on this subject of voting at age eighteen.

The government has not brought up any reason why they feel the vote at eighteen should not be made available. They have not questioned whether this is or is not a good idea. Instead they resort to the tactic of trying to delay it and to frustrate the whole concept which has been discussed in this House. I think that we would be foolhardy on our part to buy this sort of approach; I'm convinced that by doing so we'd simply be delaying something that, as announced today by the Honourable Member for St. John's, the rest of Canada seems to be accepting and if the Government of Canada is not quite ready to move in this direction, there's no question in my mind that if Manitoba adds her voice to that of all the other provinces that have now taken this step, then the Government of Canada will certainly heed these voices and will act accordingly. So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution -- this amendment rather, be rejected and we vote on the original resolution and at that time pass it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Attorney-General drew me to my feet by an observation that he continued to make that there is nothing within the wording of the resolution as put by the First Minister that anybody in this House could disagree with. And then he started to read, Mr. Speaker, the 'whereas', "and whereas the legal voting age at the federal, provincial and local levels should be reviewed before the next provincial election." He says nobody disagrees with that. And he continued in that vein reading every 'whereas' and saying,

(MR. GREEN cont'd)...."Nobody disagrees with that." And he challenged - he challenged the members on this side to show anything in this resolution that we disagree with. Well we disagree with the part that the Honourable Minister didn't read and that part is this: these are the only words -- the only words that the Honourable the Attorney-General didn't read, and I'll read them now, and these are the words that we disagree with. "In the preamble delete all the words after the first 'whereas'." That's what we disagree with. But my honourable friend didn't read those words. In other words, he says we agree with everything that follows that, but we don't agree but he doesn't suggest that these words form part of the resolution and my honourable friend can't do that. If he's going to suggest that we agree with the resolution then let him read the whole resolution, and the whole resolution includes words which everybody on this side of the House has indicated to the honourable member that we do disagree with. And I do read them those words, and I accept his challenge. We disagree with the words, "In the preamble delete all the words after the first 'whereas'." And then -- and then -- and then if my honourable friend or the Minister or anybody in the House on either side brings in a resolution which contains the words that my honourable friend read, I am sure that he will find acceptance of those words. But he won't find acceptance of the words "delete all the words after the first 'whereas'."

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the honourable member a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: Does the honourable member realize that the government has already voted for what they are now deleting?

MR. GREEN: I was going to refer to the fact and I thank my honourable friend for helping me. I was going to refer to the fact that not only do the members on this side of the House agree with the words proposed by the Honourable the First Minister with the exception of five words at the beginning, not only do we agree with those, but the members on that side of the House have agreed and voted for every word that contains the original motion, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, how -- and I was somewhat astonished by this procedure -- if we have voted to adopt a specific wording why do we then introduce a resolution saying delete the specific wording that we have already voted for and approve of? Because this is what the members on that side of the House have done. They have voted for the wording contained in the initial resolution - and we suggest that the wording contained in the amendment reverses that wording - and I'm suggesting to you that it can't do anything else when it says "Delete all the words after the first 'whereas'," which is all the words of the resolution except one word, "whereas"; and that having deleted all those words which they have voted for they introduce words which they say everybody else agrees to.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the government has put themselves into an impossible position because if they agree with the original resolution and if everybody on this side agrees with the Premier's resolution then we should pass them both and the Premier's resolution should not delete the words that have been approved by everybody on that side of the House. There wasn't a dissenting vote in this Chamber but they now wish to delete those words.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Honourable the Attorney-General it reminded me of a statement that I heard made by Professor Frank Underhill who is now apparently a consultant of the Liberal Party in Ottawa or is very closely associated with them. He was one of the founders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. In describing the philosophies of the Liberal Government under Mackenzie King he said, and I'm trying to quote him, that Mackenzie King's objective was to make the Liberal Party the party of the "extreme centre". It was a new concept to me that there could be such a thing as an extreme centre but nevertheless Professor Underhill brought that out. He said of the Conservative Party, of the Progressive Conservative Party, that their philosophy would never do anything first, and I think that this is the approach that is being pursued by the Honourable the Attorney-General in this House - never do anything first. Try to see whether somebody else will do this and then latch on. And to do them credit they do sometimes catch up with what has happened in other places.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I want to reject the notion that the best way of getting action from the federal government is to urge it at a federal-provincial conference. I think that in Canada, history has shown, at least recent history, that action comes as a result of the - and I don't like the analogy of the tail wagging the dog rather than the other way around - action on national hospitalization came not by waiting for Ottawa but the other way around, came by the enactment in provinces later carried through by Ottawa. Action on National Health came not by

(MR. GREEN cont'd).....waiting for Ottawa but the other way around. And I submit that action on the voting age will come not by waiting for Ottawa but that when 6, 7 or 8, and I hope that we are one of them, enact laws which suggest that people of the age of 18 and over have the right to vote, then Ottawa having recognized a fait accompli will follow suit. It's not the case that this province should wait "if" and we adopt the confirmation of the members opposite - they agree that "be it resolved that the Province of Manitoba grant its citizens 18 years and over the right to vote in elections over which the provincial legislature has control" - and they agreed with that.

My honourable friend the Attorney-General also referred to certain things that 18 year olds can't do and he's right. By law they can't enter into certain contracts - most contracts; and by law they're prevented from entering drinking establishments and consuming alcohol - I'm not sure that they don't do this but they're at least prevented by law from doing it. Well, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of things that 18 year olds can do. For one, most 18 year olds - everybody except 15 percent of the people who commence elementary school, only 15 percent of those people carry on through University, therefore I must assume that 85 percent of our population after they leave high school, which is around the age of 18 years, they have to assume the responsibility of maturity. They have to assume the responsibility of earning a living and many of them do assume this responsibility. They can get married and they have pretty soon the responsibility of a family. And, Mr. Speaker, they can own property; they can't dispose of real property but they can own real property and they have to assume the responsibility of paying real property taxation and they have to assume the responsibility of paying income tax and unless this side of the House can convince this government to the contrary on June 1st they're going to have to assume the responsibility of paying a sales tax. We think that the right to vote should coincide with the assumption of responsibility in our society and the assumption of responsibility includes many many things other than the right to enter into a contract other than the purchase of necessaries. And I think that on the balance 18 year olds have much greater responsibilities than they are denied responsibilities by virtue of our laws and for that reason we recognize - and apparently the government has recognized - that they should have the right to vote, that the only thing they won't do is pass the amendment which they voted for and I don't know whether there is a precedent for this. I don't know if the Member for Lakeside who has a very good memory or the Leader of this party who also has a very good memory can point to an example of where all the parties have voted for a resolution and then one party comes back and says delete the wording of it, and change it into another resolution. However, I guess that this is one case where the progressive conservative party is going to do something first. That is not to pass a resolution which they have agreed to - not to pass the resolution which not only they have agreed to but which they've registered an affirmative vote for. Perhaps this is a first I don't know. I confess that I haven't been around long enough to know.

But let's just look at the difference in wording between what they have passed by their affirmative vote and what they now propose. They passed by their affirmative vote the following: "be it resolved that the Province of Manitoba grant its citizens 18 years and over the right to vote in elections over which the provincial legislature has control." Mr. Speaker, even a lawyer couldn't confuse the meaning of that, but they've passed that by their affirmative vote. Here's what they now propose: "therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking the agreement of the Government of Canada to reduce the legal voting age to 18 years or such other age under 21 as they deemed appropriate." And my honourable friend says they're the same thing. Well, let an independent reader judge whether these are the same thing. I suggest that they are in no way the same; that one is a negation of the other.

Mr. Speaker, I must go along and associate myself with my colleagues who have already spoken on this matter - there is no reason in the world why both these resolutions can't pass with the affirmative vote I believe of almost every member in this House. No reason except that the government benches are going to, or seem to be prepared to adopt a procedure which will effectively negate a resolution on which they gave affirmative and unanimous consent.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this time I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, a number of points have been raised in opposition to the amendment to this resolution, some of these arguments were the same which were applied in both instances in opposition to the original resolution and to the amendment; one of them is that organized labour takes care of this problem, takes care of the matter of wages, that this matter affects only very few and there was a fear expressed of the effect that an increase in the minimum wages may have on prices, on industry in general and so forth.

However, Mr. Speaker, this matter does not affect just a few employees, it's more than just a handful or a few hundred employees even in the Province of Manitoba. The 1964 Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports show that in Manitoba there were 11,300 employees in the service industries. This is a 1964 figure and I use this as an example because the vast majority of the employees in the service industries are not organized, a large number of them are not organized. And I also refer to this particular group of employees for another reason. If the Honourable Minister of Labour will look at the August, 1966 Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports he would find that their average hourly earnings, their average hourly earnings are \$1.30 an hour, which is far below what we're asking for as a minimum wage which is just slightly above - very slightly above what the resolution asks for. And this Mr. Speaker, is the average not the minimum - in other words that obviously there must be many employees, probably about 50 percent of the employees, earning less than \$1.30 an hour.

And secondly, the average weekly hours worked in some of those industries is rather short, the average work week for all occupations in Manitoba at the present time is in excess of 40 hours. I haven't the figures for it but I do have the figures for the average number of hours worked per week in the service industries, laundries, cleaners, pressers, hotels, restaurants and so forth. In laundries it works out to 38.7 hours per week, in the hotels it's 35.7 hours per week, so if you multiply either of those two figures by \$1.30 an hour it can readily be seen, Mr. Speaker, that the wage earned by those people is less - far less than adequate. And as I mentioned at the outset these people do not have the assistance of a labour union to assist them in their wage negotiations. It may be argued by some, well if they do not have that assistance let them get that assistance - why do they not organize. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that you would appreciate that in some of these areas of employment it's difficult for the employees to organize because they're employed casually, the shops are small, the place of employment, they employ no more than one or two people, the corner grocers, the corner coffee shops, restaurants, drugstores and that sort of thing, which many of these people work on a part time basis, which makes it difficult very difficult for these people to resort to any type of professional assistance in their wage and salary negotiations. So this, Mr. Speaker, is a situation with respect to the people that we're talking about when we're dealing with this resolution.

There is a fear expressed by some in this House as to what effect an increase in the minimum wage would have on the overall economy of this province and the effect that it may eventually have on the Dominion of Canada. Two years ago a report was put out by the Department of Labour of Canada titled "Wage Determination in Canada" - in April 1965. There is some interesting observations made in there, one of them reads as follows and I quote from this report: "That recent studies by the Canadian Departments of Trade and Commerce and Labour indicate a very weak relation between wages and costs" - a very weak relation between wages and costs. Then that report also goes on to say that frequently increases in prices of commodities have been laid at the door of labour but there is little evidence to support this view.

There are similar findings, similar findings resulting from studies dealing with the same matter in the United States, one of a few years ago done by the United States Department of Labour at a time when they increased their minimum wages from 75 cents to \$1.00 an hour; was done by their department, in March 1957, and here are some of their observations that they have made based on their study made across the United States of America.

One was that the increase in the minimum wage had not resulted in any substantial changes in the economic situation of the nation as a whole; had not resulted in an increase in hourly earnings of high paid employees proportionate to the increase in earnings of the lower paid employees. In other words, there is a fear that if we increase the minimum wage, what's going to happen at the upper end of the scale? The salaries, the wages at that end will simply skyrocket.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd).....That Mr. Speaker, did not happen. This American report goes on to say that there was no indication of an overall loss of jobs as a result of increase in the minimum wage. There was a reduction of employment in some plants but it was increased in others, but at the same time, improvements in plant efficiency resulted, the employers became more selective in hiring new workers.

And a bit more recently than that - as recently as last year a man by the name of Leon Caserling Mr. Speaker, in his study on this same matter, in a book titled "The Role of Wages in a Great Society" published last year, among the various observations that he makes, makes these two which do apply to this particular resolution and the amendment to it, which are worthy of consideration by this House. (1) That about 20% of the poverty and of all the ills that it brings with it, could be attributable to low wages. Secondly, he points out that an increase in minimum wages does not produce the drastic effects on the increase in costs that some would seem to think that it would, and he gives this example, speaking of the minimum wage situation in the United States: That a 40 cent increase in the minimum wage in the United States over a five year period won't result in an increase in the cost of production attributed to the increase in wages of only 1.5% a year -- and when he speaks of a 40 cent increase in wages he's talking of bringing the minimum wage up to close to \$2.00 in the United States. In other words, the increase in the costs of production would be far less than the increase in the minimum wage would seem to indicate because of the fact that when you are increasing the wage you also are increasing the purchasing power of the worker, of the recipient of the income.

However, what really did concern me, Mr. Speaker, wasn't so much what these various reports have to say, because I think this is common knowledge to us, but what really concerned me is the attitude displayed by this government towards the question of minimum wages. A month ago, on February 14th, the Honourable Minister of Labour says, "There are (on page 1070) "There are certain economic facts that in a free society have to be coped with." That's a fair enough statement. And in this case he was referring to the people working at a minimum wage, to the people working at a wage below a subsistence level. And he goes on to say: "We just happen to believe on this side of the House that this is the kind of economy we want to have." We just happen to believe that this is the kind of economy that we want to have. In other words, in our economy we want to have the haves and we want to have the have-nots, and this, the Honourable Minister of Labour says is a desirable thing, that this is something that we should work towards and this is something that we should in no way curtail or prevent or curb, we should just allow this to continue. This is a free society that we pride ourselves in; this is a free society within which we have the freedom to starve; we have the freedom to be unemployed; we have the freedom to be underpaid. That's the free society that the Honourable Minister of Labour speaks of. And then he goes on to say, "I think it's rather ridiculous" -- in the same speech, "I think it's rather ridiculous that we, the members of this House, feel that the government is responsible for wages."

Well Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this government do give some consideration to setting up another department and one titled Department of Responsibility because this is something that we had heard time and time again from different departments. Questions have been asked and the usual answer is "this is not my responsibility; this is another departments's responsibility." I can recall answers of that type during the debate on the estimates this year from three or four departments. I am not conversant with that field; this is a little bit beyond my depth. I came on the scene too late and I'm sorry I can't help - I can't be of assistance to the extent I would like to be, but nobody lets me know what the real problems with real issues are and then the Honourable Minister of Labour says that it's ridiculous to think that the government is responsible for wages.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Honourable Minister just what is his department responsible for? In the same paragraph, in the same speech he assumes some responsibility for what he calls a "planned economy". He doesn't go to define it. I don't know what he means by planned economy, but he does state that his government believes in a planned economy and then he goes on to say that wages are not his responsibility, that wages are not the government's responsibility. Well surely, Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of the government to see that each and every individual living in this Province of Manitoba is assured, is guaranteed earning at least a minimum subsistence income. And nobody can argue that one could become a millionaire on \$1.50 per hour. But the Honourable Minister says that that's not his responsibility.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd).....

Then a word or two about the second portion of the amendment which we are proposing that wages be under constant review rather than be reviewed every two years as the original resolution suggests. Mr. Speaker, in some parts of Canada -- perhaps this is foreign to Manitoba because this did not happen in Manitoba -- but in some parts of Canada wages do increase at a more rapid rate than they do here. Just to give you an example of that, Mr. Speaker, from 1946 to 1965 in British Columbia wages increased from an average of 89¢ an hour to a present rate of \$2.65 an hour. In Saskatchewan and Alberta the average wage was approximately equal to that in Manitoba in 1946, Saskatchewan was 74 cents an hour, Alberta 75 cents and Manitoba 73, but at the present time the average wage in Saskatchewan is \$2.16 an hour, in Alberta \$2.17 an hour and in Manitoba it is \$1.88 an hour. So this is why I say that perhaps the government in the Province of Manitoba isn't aware of the fact that wages in other areas do increase more rapidly than they do in Manitoba, that the cost of living increases fairly rapidly, that two years, Mr. Speaker, will put the employee, will put the worker in the position where he is always 10, 15 or 20 or more percent behind the times. The cost of living will be at least 20 or 25 percent ahead of him at all times, year after year, or every two year period he will be engaged in the process of attempting to catch up, of attempting to catch up to the cost of living, because the cost of living is away ahead of him. This is the reason why, Mr. Speaker, we suggest in our amendment that wages be under constant review and not just every two years as the original resolution suggests.

It was also suggested by some in this House that some employers can't afford to pay their employees more than the present minimum wage. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if that is the case, they would do a greater service to the community and to society at large if they would close their businesses down. I do not believe that any business that contributes to the perpetuation of a poverty situation is making any worthwhile contribution to our economy.

Just one final word about the importance of having -- a continual review of wages brings to mind a little bit - I don't know who the author of it is but I think that it illustrates very well the situation that you would have in a case where minimum wages would come up for review only once every two years. This is the way the author of this expressed it: "There was a dachshund once so long he hadn't any notion how long it took to notify his tail of his emotion, and so it was that though his eyes were filled with tears and sadness, his little tail went wagging on because of previous gladness." And there, Mr. Speaker, we have the minimum wage earners on one end of the dachshund, their eyes filled with tears and sadness, in the meantime the minimum wage board completely out of touch with what's going on in the community around them, their little tail still wagging on because of previous gladness, because two years ago, because two years ago he had heard that there was some increase in the wage picture, some improvement in the wage structure in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A standing vote was taken the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 11; Nays, 44.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. We are now dealing with the main motion. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly on this resolution. The temptation to vote for \$1.50 from a political standpoint may be very appealing but I think from a practical standpoint, Mr. Speaker, which is what we have to deal with here, that the resolution proposed by my colleague, the Member for Assiniboia, is the one that should commend itself to the House. Certainly all of us would like to see higher wages. I think that insofar as the Province of Manitoba we should be moving towards a higher wage economy; I don't think there is a future for a low wage economy, but I think as well, we have to be realistic in the demands that we make

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . . . and that as we proceed the changes should be made in line with the competitive position of the province and the circumstances as they exist in Manitoba.

I believe that the time has come to move to \$1.25 now from the \$1.00 figure which recently has been accepted and I can see no reason why that change which would not be a drastic one shouldn't be made. Now this is tied in very directly with the second part of the resolution which calls for a review at least every two years. And I emphasize at least every two years. Certain honourable members might prefer the wording that was in the sub-amendment, that is that it be under constant review. I point out that at least every two years doesn't mean that it can't be more frequently; it means that it must be reviewed without fail every two years but that quite obviously in between times there can be any reassessment by the Department as required. And so I think that this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a realistic one in the present context, but to ask for \$1.50, while sounding very appealing and making itself probably very interesting probably from the standpoint of speeches and to someone who is receiving only \$1.00 sounding a most attractive figure and one that I would like to see them get, is one that I suspect the government would not be prepared to accept at this time, and so it is unrealistic in my mind to expect that move at the moment. But I cannot see why the government could not move at this time on the \$1.25 figure and as one of my colleagues has pointed out, one of the members of the Party to my left who last year was speaking on this resolution, admitted that they had no expectation of getting \$1.50 but they had used that figure in the hope that if they asked for a high figure they might get something in between.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I prefer to be less political and more realistic and so I ask for the support of this resolution at this time. I think it is a reasonable request to move on now; that it does not require any further delay by the government; that it will not, being a minimum increase really, change the competitive position in the province; that it can be accepted by employers as well without any major readjustment in their own schedules and therefore could be proceeded with. I emphasize again insofar as the government is concerned that their own actions insofar as salary increases surely does not put them in a position where they can refuse to support this resolution at this time and proceed with a continual review of the amount of the minimum wage.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make two very brief comments in connection with the resolution. I did speak on the amendment and at that time I pointed out why I could not support the amendment because I felt it was too high and that certain industries that employed seasonal help and so on where young students or older people who are partially disabled are able to get work and I'm sure that with the minimum wage being increased to this extent this would cut them out and bar them from getting employment and for that reason I will oppose the resolution increasing the minimum wage. This does not mean that I'm not for higher wages. This does not mean that the minimum wage is a fair wage or so on but I feel that people should be free in this matter to increase wages when they can afford it and if they so desire but why do we have to legislate it? I personally will not support the motion. I think as we've just increased the minimum wage in Manitoba, people just have made adjustments, I think this is moving too fast at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was rather shocked by the suggestion made by the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition that somehow there is some popularity mileage to be made out of the suggestion that people should live at the poverty level. I thought I made it sufficiently plain when I got up to address myself to this subject firstly, and I think that all of my colleagues have done likewise, that we don't see ourselves as heroes in suggesting that people should earn \$60.00 a week, roughly \$3,000 a year, which is the poverty level which has been established by all of the economic studies which have gone into the question of a person's necessities. So we can't claim any plaudits for adopting this position and indeed, Mr. Speaker, I find it embarrassing to get up and speak on a resolution which suggests that people earn \$1.50 an hour. I can't conceive of anybody cheering for me for doing this. I think that when I first spoke on it I suggested that anybody who goes out and advocates this type of living, that is \$1.50 an hour, rather than be cheered perhaps should be drawn and quartered. I can't see how the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition suggests that this is a vote-seeking position and of course the Honourable Member for Carillon questions the sincerity of myself of making this particular appeal. I assure the Honourable Member from Carillon that if he thought I was sincerely suggesting that people earn \$1.50 an hour, I assure him that I wasn't; that I feel that there has to be a floor, that floor has to be legislated and I, as a legislator, have a responsibility



(MR. GREEN cont'd).....to set the floor, and as reluctant as I am to do so I suggest that that floor be set at the poverty level. I don't claim that this is one of the issues upon which I can seek the support of my electorate.

Now the Honourable Member from Rhineland says that people should be able to set a free wage - and I think that this in effect is the substance of the government position, that really \$1.00 an hour or thereabouts is the free wage. That's about as little as anybody would be prepared to work for and that having been established as the wage which is the least for which anybody would come out and offer themselves to work, the Minister of Labour says, "That's the minimum wage and we'll legislate that." In fact they haven't done anything. They've merely recognized what is probably the free wage, the wage that would be established by the free interplay of economic forces and the resultant of supply and demand. That's what my honourable friend, the Member for Rhineland, supports and I submit that that's the position of the government in this regard.

Well we say, Mr. Speaker, that there can't be in this area a free wage, especially, especially because the laws of this province have prevented the adequate organization of workers into trade unions which would make sure that they wouldn't have to work for the free wage, that somebody has to set that minimum, and we have to bargain collectively on behalf of the unorganized. And we're not very good bargainers if all we can get them is \$1.50 an hour. It doesn't affect competitive wages. It doesn't affect, as my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland says, people who are disabled or young people from getting jobs, because if they can get jobs now and if the rate is \$1.50 for everybody, not for some people but for everybody, the same people who need the services of these people will have to pay \$1.50 and they will be enabled by the free interplay of economic forces to pass that on to the community. What we are really saying, Mr. Speaker, is not that the government subsidize the minimum wage and not that business subsidize a minimum wage but that the collective peoples of Manitoba say in their conscience that they are willing to pay a little more for their services so that nobody works for less than the poverty level. It's not business that's going to have to pay minimum wages. It's not the government that's going to have to pay minimum wages. It's every citizen in the Province of Manitoba saying that they are willing to forego some of their wages so that nobody will have to work for less than \$1.50 an hour; and we say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba have a social conscience and they would not object to seeing to it that nobody works for less than that minimum wage.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (St. Vital): Would the honourable member permit a question? In your statement did you say that there weren't any agreements below \$1.50?

MR. GREEN: As a matter of fact some agreements -- in the vaunted garment industry the agreement very often recognizes the minimum wage. What I was saying is that this province hasn't permitted sufficient play to organize labour so that everybody was organized and nobody would be able to compete against organized labour so as to reduce the wages which have to be bargained for. But their organized labour generally works for higher than the minimum wage.

MR. CRAIK: What I took from your statement was that, at the present minimum wage that we were protecting the unorganized. Was this not what you said?

MR. GREEN: .....but I didn't say that no agreements contained wages at the minimum, and I will .....

MR. CRAIK: .....acknowledge any agreements at \$1.25 then?

MR. GREEN: There are some agreements at the minimum. Some agreements - my honourable friend he'll proudly demonstrate them to you. The garment industry - I think they're all - many of them work for the minimum.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us requests that an Auditor-General be appointed in the Province of Manitoba. Now I gather that this resolution has been before this House on more than one occasion, and in looking back on some past debates as to the position taken by the government, after having read the arguments I'm still not convinced or I

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . don't quite understand why this resolution has to be brought before us every year. From what I can understand of it the position taken by the government has been that the areas of responsibility of the Comptroller-General in Manitoba is a very compact one because this is a comparatively small province, and the area therefore is not as widespread nor is the job as prodigious as the counterpart of the Comptroller-General in Ottawa, and that since the duties are confined to Manitoba then the Comptroller-General is able to include in his duties the same function as would an Auditor-General.

Now I believe that the Act under which the Comptroller-General operates or works is the Treasury Act which was revised in 1933. This is a number of years ago and one of the speakers in former debates said that in all these years there were no major discrepancies and therefore the system worked well. This was the argument. But I'm wondering, is it valid to maintain that because something was done in 1933 that it still applies today? Looking back on some of the estimates over the years and looking at the expansion of government business in the province, I find that in 1937 the estimates called for \$14 million in total. Now this didn't include capital cost, it's true, but this is what they were dealing with in those days. In 1942 it had grown to \$17 million. In 1952 - 10 years later - \$42 million. It wasn't until 1962 that we hit \$103 million. Today we're dealing with a budget or estimate of \$354 million. What an expansion. And so it makes no sense to say that because something was valid or was done 20 or 30 years ago and apparently it worked then, therefore we should continue on that system.

I'm not saying that we're going to -- I'm not criticizing the Comptroller-General I think he's doing an excellent job. I think the job he does is an important one and a big one, but I think the time has come when we have to look at other than just an internal audit, because in the last number of years, as I said, the government has grown so big and become so involved and become so complex, and has become so departmentalized, that really a close scrutiny must be made and it's a scrutiny not just of auditing whether the appropriations did indeed cover this particular item, or whether the voucher was signed for by the Minister or his Deputy. This is like the internal audits in a municipality. I don't doubt that this is done and done properly by our Comptroller-General and I'm sure that before he passes or approves of anything he makes very very sure that it's done properly or he reports it to the Minister very quickly. I'm saying that because of the complexity of government today and because of the vast programs which this government undertakes, that it's inevitable that there must be - or there's a possibility that there may be inefficiencies creep into a system, because this province is involved more than ever before in cost-sharing programs, for example, with the Federal Government, programs that were never envisaged back in the Thirties or the Forties or even the Fifties.

I remember the night that the Commissioner for Northern Affairs was reporting to the House on his estimates, and he brought out that although his budget is a very small one and the extent of his participation in northern affairs is really quite small, and pointed out that the biggest parts of activity were by the Department of Industry and Commerce, and Department of Welfare, and Department of Labour, and Department of Education. All of these were involved in one form or another in the development of northern affairs. The Department of Welfare has its own program in Manitoba but also acts and administers -- rather acts dealing with the federal program, the Department of Welfare Act, the Social Allowances Act, Child Welfare Act. All these are cost-sharing Acts. In many cases there's a very fine line distinguishing where one starts and the other stops.

The Fitness and Amateur Sports Act is another Act which again is tied in with the federal program. The whole program of technical and vocational education both for capital costs, operating costs, these are all programs tied in with the federal program, the provincial programs which require municipal participation at the other end, where municipalities must share in the costs in order to benefit from provincial grants. So that it's appeared to me that what existed 20 years ago certainly doesn't exist today, and the Comptroller-General I don't think can -- I don't think it's possible for one man to do all the jobs that might be required of him because at the present time he's doing the pre-audit which is to see whether the money was indeed appropriated, and then an internal audit. That is, after the fact - after the money is spent, and simply to certify that the money spent was properly authorized by the Minister or, as I say, by the Deputy Minister. And this of course is an important function and I gather that if he finds a discrepancy or he finds that he's not satisfied with the method used or the procedures used, he can and does report to the Minister responsible and if the Minister does not heed his questioning or his objection, he can then bring the matter to the House.

(MR. MILLER cont'd).....

Now I'm sure this has never happened. Some of the members who have been here longer than I have would correct me if that was so. I don't imagine this has ever happened because I can't see any Minister permitting the matter to go so far that it has to be brought to this House. But really this is an internal audit and I don't think it's the type of audit that this resolution calls for, because what we, I think, really should be concerned with is an audit that goes beyond an internal audit, an audit whereby - and only the Auditor-General can do this - where he investigates what went on behind the purchase itself; whether the money was wisely expended; whether there was proper management. This is not a part of management itself.

MR. SPEAKER: There's just a minute to go. I wondered if the honourable member could finish his remarks or should we call it 5:30?

MR. MILLER: I'll just be a very -- just another minute perhaps. Now I'm wondering whether -- as I say, the Auditor-General looks behind just the surface functions and to see whether we have indeed achieved the lowest prices, and because of the very many agencies which are involved today, far more than ever before, I think that we should give some consideration to having an Auditor-General of Manitoba who will be answerable to the Legislature, who will make an annual report, and who can bring to the attention of this House the sort of information which is brought to the federal House of Commons. I think that if we have that, then I feel that the needs of the province will be properly safeguarded, that the public will then have an opportunity to hear what is said through the Members of this House, and I'm not at this time casting any shadow of doubt on the Comptroller-General. I don't believe this is any criticism of him. I think he's doing an excellent job. I'm suggesting that the job now has to be expanded and it can only be done through the creation of an Auditor-General's office.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 p.m. this evening.