



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 51 2:30 p.m. Tuesday, April 3, 1962.

5th Session, 26th Legislature

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 3rd, 1962.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

I might inform the House and introduce to them students of St. Eugene School -- 6 pupils, Grade VII and Grade IX under the guidance of their teacher, Miss Gobeil. I'm sure that we are privileged to have the students with us this afternoon and they are also privileged to look down on the members of the Manitoba Legislature and see democracy at work. We hope that they will take home with them favorable opinions of the Legislature of Manitoba and we wish them also success in their scholastic endeavours.

Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Could he give us a further report on the bond sales -- or the savings bond sales? Last year when the sale was on we got almost daily reports from him -- we don't seem to be getting quite as many this year.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to give my honourable friend some information. The savings bond period of sale will be closed on Wednesday, which is tomorrow, and I expect that the total taken in by that time will be in the neighborhood of 15 million dollars.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture for one purpose only. My neighbors, where I live, are still worrying about a flood. Can you comfort them?

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I think that the weather that we've been experiencing can comfort them more than anything that I can say. It has been very much in our favour and if such weather continues -- that of thawing and freezing, a gradual break-up -- I think that we will be averted the hardships of flooding.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, another question if you don't mind, directed to the Provincial Treasurer. What is the hurry? I know -- and I've met a couple of people this morning -- when the manager of a bank asked him whether he would like to subscribe to the savings bonds he said, "I'm waiting because I expect to get some money from somewhere." Now what's the hurry about it?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, there are a good number of people that are waiting in the hope of getting some money from somewhere. All I can say, Sir, is that it's deemed advisable that there should be a definite period during which these bonds are on sale.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question on the one I had asked. The government had indicated that it expected to get between 20 and 25 millions from the sale of these bonds. Why is it cutting off the sale now at 15 million?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I just wonder whether the statement made is as positive as my honourable friend would have us to believe. I don't really think so.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I suppose he will recall that in my Throne Speech I asked him a question about duty that was charged on hay to farmers who bought hay across the line. There are persistent rumours or reports that at this last meeting -- at the meeting that we had last fall in the Norquay Building -- that the Minister of Agriculture promised to use his influence to see that that duty was refunded. I did not hear the Minister personally but these are the reports. I would like to know what the farmers could expect because quite a few farmers along the boundary -- especially in Emerson constituency -- are concerned about it. Is any effort being made to have this duty refunded, which is the proper thing in my opinion, I would say?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to rise on a question of privilege and try and correct a wrong impression which I left with this House on March 29th, 1962, wherein on page 1186 and 1187 of Hansard, speaking in connection with the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan bill I said, "To me it seems absurd that a war disability pensioner gets free hospitalization at Deer Lodge and still has to pay a premium under the MHSP." Now taken in its literal sense that would mean that a war disability pensioner gets free hospitalization in respect of all sicknesses. Now that is not quite true -- he only gets free hospitalization in respect of his war disability or in respect of other matters that can be traced to war service, and I hope by making that statement in the House and not qualifying it, that I have not done injury or harm to any war pensioner in his attempt to obtain from the federal government that to which I think he is rightfully entitled.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to make a correction on Hansard of March 29th, 1962, on page 1229. In the first paragraph, the fourth line -- I shouldn't say this is a correction; I think it's probably my mistake -- I mention the number of 15,000 children as those attending private schools, and I think at the last count it might be 15,000 now but I think it would be closer at 11,000. But then others here, it seems to be less my mistake, although I don't complain -- I know that I'm not fluent enough in English and sometimes it would be fairly difficult to get my words -- but these nevertheless should be corrected. On the 16th line of the second paragraph I know that I said, "that as long as there are people like me you Catholic so and so" -- I was quoting somebody that phoned me -- "that as long as there are people like me, you Catholic so and so will get nothing in Manitoba." They have: "that as long as there are people like me you can't lick so and so." Well, that might be -- I'd know better if I knew who "so and so" was -- but I think that this should be corrected.

Then on the 11th line from the bottom of that same page, same paragraph -- this could change everything here -- I was advocating a direct grant or aid to "qualified" teachers only and it has "a direct grant or aid to qualify teachers." That could give the impression that I'm trying to get a grant to help them get qualified and that wasn't it at all -- it was a grant to those that were already qualified. And to really change the speech around, on the next page, page 1230 in the last full paragraph in line 4, -- I said that in a country I'd hate to call myself a Catholic 'if' that is what I felt -- and they've got "and that's what I felt" and that could change exactly what I meant, so with those corrections -- (Interjection) -- I'm as bad as Wagner, yes.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if you might permit me to remind the members that on the visit to Brandon -- the Manitoba Winter Fair tomorrow -- the train will leave the CN Station at 9:25 am. I wonder also, Mr. Speaker, if you might permit me to tell the Assembly of something, when the Premier opened the Fair last night, something we saw of a great deal of interest I think, and would be of a great deal of interest to the members, at the Exhibition. Four years ago the Winter Fair started a new venture, what they called a "calf scramble," and for ten boys from rural Manitoba who had never exhibited at a Fair before, they gave the opportunity to them to catch a scramble and this has been going on each year -- a new class each year -- and when they catch and halter the calf, then they are presented with \$100.00 which enables them to purchase the calf which they would feed and develop and bring back to next year's Winter Fair -- a pure-bred animal. Now these scrambles were only open to boys who had not previously exhibited. Well, the ultimate happened last night and quite a wonderful thing. This year the objective was achieved when a boy, Raymond McQuarrie of Grandview brought his calf back to the Fair and won the Grand Championship of the Show in competition with the most experienced and efficient cattlemen in the province, and I think members would agree that this is, first of all, a wonderful project started by the Manitoba Winter Exhibition, and then to have a boy who had no previous background in exhibiting or in caring for pure-bred stock to bring back the animal, perfectly groomed, and take the Grand Championship. I think this was a wonderful thing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and on the same point I'd like to point out that Master McQuarrie is a constituent of mine and it just shows the example of the wonderful farmers and the wonderful boys that we're raising in that district. Thank you.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd) . . . to take the opportunity on my own behalf and on behalf of the fairly large number of members of the Legislature who availed themselves of the arrangements the Honourable the Attorney-General made for us to visit and inspect the Vaughan Street Detention facilities. Members may not agree in the implications of everything that they saw but I think they all appreciated the opportunity.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'd like to join with the Honourable Member for St. John's, Mr. Speaker, in extending the thanks and appreciation of our group for the opportunity of visiting the Home, and I would like to make this suggestion to the Attorney-General and that is this -- that all members of this House should at all times, I think, be furnished with passes which would give them the right of entry into any detention homes or gaols coming under the jurisdiction of this province.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister was about to get up and answer my question but I think somebody else interrupted and he sat down again. I would still like an answer.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, this matter of the duty on hay has been taken up with the federal department, I believe on three occasions, but I think that the Honourable Member for Emerson will appreciate that a tariff such as this is of national application and not provincial, and that anything that is done here must also be done in other parts of Canada, and to date there has been no indication that he will receive any rebate or that the people concerned will receive any rebate. I would not like to make any firm statement as to the eventual outcome of it, but I can only say that we have made representation on their behalf but remind the honourable member that this is a question of national magnitude and that we can do no more than make representations on behalf.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to inform members of the House that the department have prepared invitation cards in order to remind members that -- they will all be receiving one of these cards -- that next Tuesday at 10 o'clock we would be very happy if the members of the House would avail themselves of the opportunity to tour the new environmental sanitation laboratories on the 10th floor of the Norquay Building as the guests of the Department of Health.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. I might point out that this is the resolution that I held on the Order Paper and it stands in my name. Are you ready for the question?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I thought that it was held in your name pending a decision from Your Honour as to whether or not the amendment was in order.

MR. SPEAKER: When I put the motion I signify that it's in order. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Your seconder?

MR. GRAY: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. D.M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that neither the amendment nor the resolution will have the results which we desire. I have prepared an amendment which I do not think will be in order under the amended resolution but I would like to bring in that resolution on the main motion. Therefore I will vote against the amendment.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion defeated.

MR. MOLGAT: The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment to the motion submitted by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The amendment reads as follows: That the motion be amended by striking

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd) out the words "1st of September" in the 10th line thereof and substituting the following: "1st Tuesday of September." And further that the words "31st day of August" in the 11th line thereof be struck out and the following substituted: "1st Monday of September".

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Prefontaine, Reid, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stane's, Strickland, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney, Mrs. Forbes, Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 17. Nays, 33.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

The question before the House is the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Honourable Member for St. James is going to move an amendment, and I would prefer to speak on the main motion rather than an amendment, and I do this with some apologies so far as the old-time members of the House are concerned, because they have heard me speak on this resolution on many occasions over a period of years, because it is one of the hardy annuals that has been coming before this House. I suppose it would be a surprise, Mr. Speaker, to the most of the members if I mentioned that I have changed my mind somewhat. I think it was Plato who was given credit for having said that it's only the supremely wise and the deeply ignorant who never change. I don't profess to belong to either of those categories. I certainly don't belong to the first one -- a lot of people might assign me to the second one. But I can change at times -- not in my general opinion, Mr. Speaker, because my general opinion remains just as unconvinced about the merits of daylight saving as such, as it ever was. But my opinion has changed in this regard, that I think it is so firmly established that a great number of people in Manitoba wish to have daylight saving time, for a portion of the year at least, that the ones of us who do not like the principle of daylight saving time should still recognize the fact that a very large percentage of our population is in favour of it, and be prepared to take our stand realistically in the light of that situation. I make it plain, Mr. Speaker, so far as my personal convictions are concerned, I'm just as much opposed to daylight saving as the Honourable Member for Fisher. I see no necessity of tampering with the clock in order to start your day a little bit earlier, but it seems that the most of the advocates of the daylight saving system prefer to do it that way, and I think that they have a right to have daylight saving time if they decide so to do. But I also think that it would certainly be advantageous if we could have, so far as possible, uniform time, and so if you're going to do those two things, if you're going to give the right -- quite properly I think -- to the large number of people who want it and at the same time have the highest possible degree of uniformity, some sort of a compromise, I think, is necessary, and the compromise that's suggested here for the three summer months is a good one. Quite frankly, I think it was improved by the amendment that my honourable friend moved because it took into account the fact that there is a holiday there that should very well fit in with the summer period, so that I acknowledge quite frankly that the amendment that was moved improved the resolution that our group had prepared. And I don't know yet, of course, what is in the mind of the government group but I would have thought that such a sensible compromise would have appealed to them as well.

I say that I have spoken in the House on many occasions here on this matter. I remember you, Mr. Speaker, making quite a major speech on this particular question a few years back. I believe that on one occasion, at least, that the Honourable the Member for Morris was the mover of the resolution. Generally speaking, the resolutions that used to be moved in the old days were either black or white; they were one way or the other. You either endorsed daylight saving time or you endorsed standard time. This, I think, is a fair in-between position to take.

Now there's another situation that I think is quite interesting to people who are engaged in

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) public life, and that is, the reactions of the electors when you meet them in the various constituencies whether at private discussions or public meetings. And I can say without any hesitation whatever, Mr. Speaker, that in the vast number of public meetings that I have attended during my career in public life, that when the time has come for questions -- and I usually followed the procedure of suggesting that there should be questions if anyone wanted to ask them -- when the time has come for questions, I could say quite definitely that no question have I been asked as often in rural Manitoba as this one of "what about daylight saving time?" And if I could properly assess the temper of the audience at that time, I would say that, generally speaking -- by no means always -- but generally speaking, the feeling of the meeting in those rural parts was quite definitely against daylight saving. And yet I have always said to them, knowing that that was the feeling, I've always said to them, "Well now look, on this question of daylight saving time, it's true that our government has not acceded to the many requests that we have had to ban daylight saving time. We've been pressed by many individuals, many groups of individuals and many organizations to ban daylight saving time as was done in the Province of Alberta. We have not done so; and the reason that we have not done so is the reason that I have felt all the time -- I've not been the only one; it's been the general feeling of our party -- our party has taken the position and I have, that even though we may be personally and individually opposed to daylight saving time as I am, yet I think it's important that where you have such a large percentage of the population, grouped it's true in one main area, which wants daylight saving time, we're not prepared to say they can't have it." And I have said further to them: "We have to have in governments so many areas where at least a certain amount of compulsion is necessary, and the most of people don't care too much about compulsion, but we have to have so much of it that I think we should invoke it only on very important matters. And while I do not suggest that this is not an important matter, it is to many people. It is to farmers in their relations with local businesses. It certainly is to families where there are school children and to many other people. It is important, but I think its main disadvantages lie in its inconvenience, and much as I dislike it myself, I do not think that the disadvantages or the inconveniences are important enough that we should say to practically half the population of the Province of Manitoba, 'You can't have something that you want.' "

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that even with the rural audiences where it was evident that they were very much against daylight saving time, that answer always seemed to gain a certain amount of respect. And even when they have gone further, as they frequently have, and asked the subsequent question, "Is it not true that in the referendum that was held on the subject in Greater Winnipeg that it was a very narrow majority?", I have always said, "Yes, the majority was rather narrow, and it's also a fact, if I remember correctly, that two out of five of the municipalities that voted at that time actually gave a small majority against daylight saving time, but it still is a fact that if you take the area that voted, the majority was for it. And that's the only thing that we can go on. And I made exactly that same reply -- as those who were my colleagues in the Cabinet would remember -- to the various farm organizations and others who came to meet with Cabinet Council when they made recommendations on this subject, because we were asked on many occasions, on many occasions, to take action to ban daylight saving time.

Well now, that's the position that our party took and that's the position that our government took, and I think it was right because I still believe that having to have the areas of compulsion that we must have in some respects, that compulsion should be applied only where it's the last alternative and only where the area is of extreme importance. And I certainly do not advocate now that daylight saving time should be made impossible. I don't advocate either that it should be made uniform, because I think that a great many people in the province would object even more strenuously to that. So, as I said at the beginning, I think the resolution that we have before us is a fair one, a fair compromise, and I think on a situation like this you've got to compromise in order to get even a reasonable degree of agreement. And I'm encouraged to know, Mr. Speaker, that with at least one of the farm organizations that the executive has taken the position that they would be in favour of a proposal such as this, because our group took the opportunity to suggest this solution or experiment to the executive of the Manitoba Farmers' Union when they called upon us, and the members of that executive, after taking some little

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) time to give consideration to the matter, expressed themselves as quite impressed by what appealed to them as being a reasonable and fair compromise.

And so I would suggest to the Honourable Member for St. James and to his group that they think carefully before they decide to vote against this resolution, because it's not an easy matter of solution. Those of us who have had to deal with the situation in this House and in public meetings over a long period of time know that it can be quite a controversial issue. But in addition to that, many of us know from personal experience that it can be a serious inconvenience and even an economic consideration to many people of this province, too. And so, if we're going to respect the wishes of what is now practically one-half of the total population of the Province of Manitoba and, at the same time, give reasonable attention to the point of view of those who, I'm sure in the majority, favour another system, and if we're going to give the proper consideration to the school children of this province, I would think that this is a very fair recommendation. Because this will make the daylight saving period of the year into the time that the school children, at least for a considerable part of that time, are not at school. And this question of getting uniformity of time in the whole of the Province of Manitoba is, in my opinion, very important. So I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm disappointed that the amendment has been voted down, because I think it was a sensible amendment and one that showed the right spirit of trying to improve resolutions that are brought before the House, and that now that it has been voted down, let's see if we can't arrive at something that is equally good as a solution.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken on the original motion, can I say a few words now? -- (Interjection) -- I'm asking the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I have named the Honourable Member for St. James has the right to speak now. We'll decide your question afterwards.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to compliment the Honourable Member from St. Boniface for bringing this very important matter before this House again. It is a most important matter. I also appreciate the wise words from the Honourable Member from Lakeside. It is something we have to give a great deal of thought to. There is at the moment considerable inconvenience on both sides of the question on this question of time. There are one or two remarks I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, if I may, and that is that I have spoken to a number of people who live in the rural area and the big majority, as the Honourable Member from Lakeside has mentioned, are against daylight saving time. To those I would like to say this, that the Almighty did make day and night but did not make the clock. The clock is a man-made thing. Man might have easily split up the hours between daylight and darkness into other times. Probably if it were being done today, I imagine we would be in the metric system. This, the clock, the time, is an instrument of convenience to man. This is why I think this problem is particularly significant at this time in view of the inconvenience to so many -- particularly the rural members of our province, in that it is a man-made thing and should be used to the utmost convenience of everyone who lives in this province.

I might also mention the other side of the coin. As many members will appreciate, in the City of Winnipeg over the last few years, the City of Winnipeg Council has, by resolution, decided the times of the change that will take place in Winnipeg. As a member of one of the urban councils, I know there are several people who did not agree, but we realized in Winnipeg there had to be one time, so we went along in all cases with the City of Winnipeg. The influence on the City of Winnipeg has been two-fold. One, those who do business from the City of Winnipeg into the rural parts of Manitoba, and some of those would like to have standard time or have the rule changed to daylight saving time, but at a time convenient to rural areas. Then the other group, of which I am one, who do business with other cities down east and west, and I would like to see the time changed at a time when they change. Now you might say, well you've got the time differences anyway. Yes you have, but these time changes throughout the country are something which are embedded in one's own mind, and when you have a period of two or three weeks change and it varies every year, it does become very inconvenient and difficult. So we have a variety of opinions, all the way from "stay with the eastern cities," to the rural areas who say "let's stay on standard time."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there should be no change from what we're doing at the moment until we're all positive that the majority of people of this province will be better served by

(Mr. Stanes, cont'd) that change. I believe the change should be something which will be a definite improvement in the views of the majority of people of our province whom we are trying to serve -- whom the clock is trying to serve. I'd also like to point out one other difference, especially to the rural members, and I mention to them that those of us who live in the cities are completely controlled by time. Time is no longer man's servant, but man's master. I get up in the morning; I go to bed at night. Everything I do from is done according to the clock. The rural members are very fortunate that still they can consider the time partly a servant. So therefore, I think perhaps Mr. Speaker, in trying to be unbiased, trying to be realistic, I think perhaps the wishes of the city people should be given slightly more consideration seeing that they are completely the servant of this thing, time, which man made.

In glancing through the various resolutions we have, we find again many opinions. We find the Manitoba municipalities, on November 21st, saying "standard time." Manitoba Urban Association, "daylight time, to go from April and end in September." We find the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture saying this thing should be studied and should be studied very thoroughly, "and if you decide on daylight time it shouldn't go for more than four months." We have the Manitoba Farmers' Union in their resolution of January 23rd, that there should be a government decision on this matter of preferably a referendum. So, Mr. Speaker, from the various rural areas we have many opinions. We haven't yet got the city opinions, and I would repeat again, that I think that a decision on this matter, we should all be absolutely certain that the decision which we make will be one which not only will be better but will be in agreement with the majority of the people of our province. Therefore Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after "whereas" in the fourth line thereof, and substituting the following: "the desirability of uniform time throughout the province is self-evident, and Whereas authority to deal with this matter has for some time been exercised by the municipalities which can, by general consent, establish uniform time, Therefore be it resolved that this House request the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association to give consideration to the problem of uniform time at the first convenient opportunity, and Be it further resolved that these two organizations be requested to place their joint recommendations on this matter before the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and if daylight saving time is recommended, the period in which it should be in effect."

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, weaseliest amendment that has ever been brought into this House by any party. I think the only mistake they made, they should have added another paragraph there, another preamble asking this House to resign and allow the members of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Urban Association to take our seats in this House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if my verbiage will be exactly the same as that of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, but certainly my opinion is the same. I cannot, for the life of me, understand how anybody has the audacity to bring in such a type of an amendment to a proposition as this one that we have now before us. A few years ago I had the honour of being on the executive of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and at the same time the old Winnipeg Suburban Association, which was the forerunner to the Manitoba Urban Association, and we had a resolution before the legislature of that day dealing with the question of daylight saving time, and I had to appear before that body in the law amendments committee, first of all as the representative of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and oppose the resolution which then called for daylight saving time. And then about ten minutes later appear before the self-same committee, the self-same person, in my capacity as President of the Winnipeg Suburban Association, and go on in favour of daylight saving time, and I think the situation that we're confronted with today is just as ridiculous as that. I suggest that this amendment is -- I would suggest that it is a dereliction of responsibility of members of this House to ask us to support such a resolution, and I certainly, for one, although as far as my members, my colleagues in this group are concerned, they're free to do what they like in this -- we certainly don't follow apparently what was followed a little earlier today and all have to stand up because Mr. Man stands up -- but I say this, Mr. Speaker, that this may be indicative in some respects of some of the other proposals that we have had from the other side of the House, and I certainly am going to oppose

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) it in the vote.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I was told -- (interjection)--

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, will you recognize one of these two honourable gentlemen?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): If my honourable friend wishes to go ahead, I have no objection.

MR. GRAY: I was told by doctors that when I was born, my mind starts to function immediately -- am I right, doctor? -- and it quits functioning when I have to make a speech. I think this applies to the mover of this amendment, with all due respect, and I hope you won't get sore. This amendment is absolutely ridiculous; it's whitewashing; and I don't know whether he consulted everyone or not. If he did, the other fellow was crazy. The situation is this, Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion. I don't like daylight saving, personally but if people want it, if the public wants it, it's my duty to give it to them. The referendum did carry with a large majority in Winnipeg and I, as a member of Greater Winnipeg representing in this Legislature -- and as I have already stated once, that I'm not representing directly my constituency because the problem of my constituency is the problem of Greater Winnipeg or the problem of the province -- and since then I made, year after year, the same statement, that if the public wants daylight saving let them have it. I'm not in favour, as I said, because we have the railways; there's a large -- I don't know how many, but there's in the thousands employed, and they come home after the children have had already their dinner and they get away when the children go to school. It's ruination, in my opinion, to the many mothers of school children, to have daylight saving. But as their representative, I support it, and I'll support it until there will be another referendum which will tell me otherwise, and although some may think that I haven't got my own mind -- yes I have, I have; but under the circumstances, this is my duty to do. So then, when the resolution of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface says "three months" -- for goodness sake, either one way or the other. What will you do with your three months? Give the horse races a better opportunity in the races? It's ridiculous. I think that it should be one time for all the province -- either one or the other, and I will support either one. I'll probably support standard time, but at the present, I don't think that any other amendments will help. I'm still of the opinion that three months will not do any good to anybody. It will fool the public in the province and in the city instead of six months, probably in three. One honourable member says a half a loaf is better than nothing. I say, "yes, a half a loaf." If I ask for \$5.00 for the old age pensioners, they give them two and a half -- yes, it's an improvement; but it's not an improvement in a case like this. The farmers will still suffer. The farmer is on the farm all day long and if he has to buy a piece of machinery or repairs or what have you, he'll still be confused and he'll ask his wife every day, "Are we on daylight saving? Is Winnipeg on daylight saving?" And most of the time they didn't know. I'm in favour strongly either one or the other for the time being, until such time, if there's going to be another referendum; I'm going to support the will of the people of the City of Greater Winnipeg which they had decided years ago.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have never heard a more forceful speech in favour of the amendment that was just presented to the House than the one just delivered by the Honourable Member for Inkster, because he is saying in effect that what he thinks is good for Greater Winnipeg should obtain in Greater Winnipeg and, on the other hand, he says -- mind you he thinks there might be a time for all of Manitoba but he would still support what is right for Greater Winnipeg. And thereby, I think, we come to the essence of the nub of this problem that everybody

MR. GRAY: say what's good for Winnipeg, I said what Winnipeg instructed me to do.

MR. LYON: Yes. Thereby we come to the essence of the problem, that everybody thinks in their own particular area that what they're doing is probably right. We come to a further base or bedrock point in this problem and that is, namely, that by law and by tradition the establishment of time in Manitoba has always been a matter of local jurisdiction. And I don't think any member on the other side of the House would stand up in his place and say that this matter of jurisdiction should be quickly taken away from local jurisdictions without determining what the local jurisdictions would like to see done. And yet we have the Honourable Member from Selkirk, we have the Honourable Leader of the NDP Party standing up, talking about weasel

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd) amendments, talking about the House not being able to make up its own mind. I think, Mr. Speaker, on reflection, that they will agree that it's probably a very wise course to ask those from whom you intend to take power how they would like the Legislature to re-establish this power on a provincial basis. We'll hear lots of speeches across the way, or we would, if this House were to bring in a resolution saying that certain powers should be taken away from the local school district, or any other power should be taken away from a municipality, and yet when we come to the resolution or when there is a resolution on the Order Paper which says that this matter of tradition should be taken away holus-bolus from the municipality without consulting the municipal organizations, why then we have members opposite standing up and saying we don't know what we're talking about. Well now I would like to see some consistency in this matter, Mr. Speaker, because either they're in favour of local rights or they're against local rights. And if I wanted to be demagogic -- which of course I never am -- I would stand up and brand both of the opposition parties as being opposed to local rights and local interests, because that's in effect what they're saying. But I merely ask them to reflect upon what they have said and I'm sure that after reflection they will agree that the substance of this amendment as presented is the proper thing to do, because we go back and we ask the Urban Association, the Union of Municipalities what you wish -- we all agree. We say to them, "We all agree that there should be some uniform time in Manitoba, daylight and/or standard." And we say, "That being in agreement, what are the periods that you two groups recommend?" And will you try to concert your efforts and tell this House what you would like us to do, because remember, the Legislature of Manitoba is going to be taking away the power that you presently have and before we take it away, not just on the word of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, or the honourable member who moved the first amendment, we want to know what you think about it." And so, Mr. Speaker, I don't see what all of the objection is across the way at all.

But I think we must consider some of the other factors that come into account here. What about the position of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources? He represents the town of Flin Flon which is a large area, some 12,000 souls living in that town. It doesn't matter a hat on a garbage can to them whether Winnipeg's on Atlantic daylight time because they're far removed from the rest of us. And similarly, it doesn't matter a row of beans to us whether they're on daylight saving time all year. And so before one grasps too quickly at the absconding of rights from local authorities, one must stop to think that while a good case can be made for uniformity there are other areas. I mentioned Flin Flon; I can mention Thompson; I can mention Churchill. Does it matter to the people in Churchill whether they're on daylight saving time 12 months a year and we follow the plan that we do? Ask the people in Churchill. They may not be totally in favour of a uniform time, and that's precisely why we want to ask the urban and the rural associations what they think, because while it's all very well for us to stand up and say it would be a desirable thing, should we not hear from the local authorities who presently are charged with that responsibility before we take this authority away from them?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think too much more need be said on this. I'm in the unhappy state, at the present time, of having a six-week old child at home, and I want to tell you right now that I wish daylight saving time was in effect at this moment because that child wakes up with the sun and, for my money, the sun gets up too early these mornings at six o'clock. You'll get varying opinions on this subject, as I am sure, from each of us as you go around the House. At this particular moment of my life I would like to see daylight saving time in effect because it would give me an extra hour's sleep in the morning, but that's by the way. So all I say to the honourable members opposite, Mr. Speaker, is that before we talk about weasel action -- and may I say, may I say, it ill comes from a group such as the Liberals to talk about weasel action in this House at any time, because if ever there was a record of "weaseling" action not on matters like daylight saving time but on matters of real substance, and I need only mention the school problems and I need only mention road building, and we could go on right through, then we could talk about weasel action.

MR. DESJARDINS: problems on the school question. That's right.

MR. LYON: But Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to get into that field because I can see right away that my honourable friend from St. Boniface is already irritated and it was not my purpose to stand up and irritate the Honourable Member from St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Talk about the school question You'll be the first one that will on that side.

MR. LYON: So Mr. Speaker -- if I can be heard over the approving shouts from across the way -- so Mr. Speaker, I say that some support should be given by the members of this House to this amendment because I'm sure that on reflection they will agree that they're in favour of local rights, that they would not take a matter of local jurisdiction out of the hands of a municipal authority without first canvassing that municipal authority. That is what the amendment says, and I'm sure it will get unanimous support.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the amendment to the motion is moved, I would like to speak on this matter, because my honourable friend the Attorney-General simply moves me to say a few words because of the great courage that he's just exhibited, Mr. Speaker. There is the honourable gentleman who on matters such as Metro, for example, important would he say, vital would he say, to the life of our great city here? What was the position that my honourable friends took at that time? We suggested at that time that you should consult the people of the City of Winnipeg before you took away their rights from them. What did my honourable friend say? "Oh, no, no, this is the thing to do." Now we were only dealing there with the basic matters of government in this great area; we were changing completely the whole structure; we were bringing on a new level of government. We were doing tremendous changes in the City of Winnipeg. My honourable friend said, "No, we can proceed on this." Now we come along to something like daylight saving time

MR. LYON: Will my honourable friend permit a question?

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. LYON: Does my honourable friend remember whether or not the municipalities of Greater Winnipeg were consulted about the Metro Bill on at least three occasions before it was brought in?

MR. MOLGAT: Was that a question or a speech my friend was making?

MR. LYON: I was asking if he remembers that or not.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, when we suggested that you should consult the people of the City of Winnipeg, you refused to do so. Correct? And now we bring along something like daylight saving time. Every organization mentioned by my honourable friend from St. James said that something should be done about this. They were all in agreement. They may not have been in complete agreement as to exact timing, but they all agreed that it should be uniform time. Those whom we consulted agreed with us that they were prepared to make a compromise.

MR. LYON: What months?

MR. MOLGAT: Well we're suggesting some months. It is a compromise. It's not going to suit everyone. We can't adjust the clock or the sun to suit everyone like the Attorney-General who happens to have a six-months old baby. --(Interjection)-- Oh, six weeks, I'm sorry. We'd be very happy to accommodate the gentleman but it can't be done; but the fact is that we can arrive on this matter at a reasonable compromise. And this is what our resolution recommends. It's not going to suit everyone, but surely it is sufficiently acceptable to a large enough number of people that it can be made to work. If it's found out subsequently that the length of time chosen isn't exactly correct, it can be changed, but the point is let's take the action now and get this thing started, because it is creating a great deal of confusion throughout the province right now. My honourable friend the Minister of Education I'm sure will agree with that, that in the school divisions in particular, this is a very difficult problem, in particular for those that are close to metropolitan area or other areas that go on daylight saving time. In a number of cases, we find portions of the school district being on one time and another part being on another time.

MR. LYON:

MR. MOLGAT: Well you don't argue that but you're not prepared to take a stand; you're not prepared to make a decision which -- You've got to go back and ask everybody else but on other matters you're quite prepared to jump in. I simply cannot understand my honourable friends. The great leadership, the courage of this government, this government who was going to do things, no procrastination, all the great words in prior elections and now we come along

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) to an issue like daylight saving time, and "No, we can't make up our minds. We can decide on a lot of other things but we can't make up our minds on this one." Mr. Speaker, I can only agree with the words of my colleague from Selkirk, "weaseling".

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I was enjoying a happy and a quiet life on this side of the House in this interesting debate before some words of my honourable friend who has just spoken prompted me to intervene, because one or two matters in which he has flagrantly misstated the facts which I feel I must in justice correct. Let me say at the first instance that I think the kind of debate that we're having this afternoon is a very good thing. Far too often in this House when matters of interest are discussed, we have this perpetual adjournment as if people couldn't stand up on their own feet and say what they thought about things without going home to read what everyone else said and come back with a real haymaker that's going to lay 'em all in the aisles. Oh, I suppose in some issues it's only to be expected that one should consider very, very carefully what's said and that procedure might be in order, but surely there are others where we can enjoy the intellectual stimulation of having a debate on the terms that we have it here this afternoon. I don't wish to say a great deal because I think that most of the points that are worth making have already been made on both sides of this issue except to defend the government, if that should be necessary, with respect to this charge that we're unable to make up our own minds. I think, Sir, that anyone who examines the records of the past three or four years will have no difficulty --

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask the honourable friend a question?

MR. ROBLIN: No, not at the moment. I think that those who examine the records will have no difficulty in substantiating the fact that we're able to make up our own minds all right but we also think, as my friend the Attorney-General said, that where we have the opportunity to do so it's wise to take counsel. Now my friends on the other side of the House had many years to play around with daylight saving time -- many years. They never thought it necessary even to go so far, as I recall it, as to ask the municipal governments, who have by law -- who have by law the power and the right to rule on these things at the present time. As far as I recall -- and please correct me if I am wrong -- they never saw any occasion to take action on this matter, and it seems rather odd that all of a sudden they discovered that this becomes the burning issue that can't wait for appropriate consultation. I think appropriate consultation is a good thing and I suggest that we'll do no harm or no injustice to anybody if we do consult and, depending on the answers we get, we can determine the next step that we can take. I am with those who agree that some solution to this problem is a good thing. We must work for it and that's what we will do, but I think we can do so in a way which does no injustice to anyone by following the path that's been proposed.

Now I just want to say a word about a referendum on Metro. That really is what -- if you want to know, that's really what brought me to my feet, because my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has skated around the facts there in a pretty skillful manner. I'd like to point out to him that the suggestion that we should have a referendum with respect to Metro was proposed by the then-leader of his party and was made the subject actually of a vote against the bill on third reading, but I also would propose to the House that if they examine the record they will find that the present leader of the Opposition -- in my opinion to his credit -- voted with the government on that third reading. He did not vote against third reading on the ground that we should have a referendum and we were not having one. He voted for third reading which included the government's policy in that respect and, while he is perfectly entitled to give the credit to my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, and the Member for Turtle Mountain, and the Member for Emerson, and the Member for Carillon, and the Member for Rhineland, on that subject, because they are the six who voted against the bill on third reading, he is not entitled to accept that distinction for himself, and I imagine he is rising to tell me that he does not do so.

MR. MOLGAT: No, I'm rising to tell the honourable member, on a point of privilege, that in committee, when the referendum was proposed, I was one of those who voted in favour of the referendum.

MR. ROBLIN: Well I'm glad to hear that, but on ballot I see my honourable friend decided to support the bill without making his reservations on the referendum made known on third reading, which is the course followed by those who held that view strongly, and I think that that

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)is the course that he should have followed if that were his view. Now I would also like to say to him on this connection, that we had first of all, in 1950, a municipal investigation by the municipal officers themselves, of the Greater Winnipeg area, suggesting a Metropolitan form of government. It was their request that led my predecessor to establish a Royal Commission to investigate the whole matter, so it is perfectly obvious that the municipalities of Manitoba -- of the Metro area -- were early consulted. In fact it was on their initiative that the Metro process began.

MR. PAULLEY: What's that got to do with daylight time?

MR. ROBLIN: Well he's accusing us of -- if my honourable friend had been listening carefully it wouldn't be necessary for me to explain.

MR. PAULLEY: I know you're miles away from daylight time.

MR. ROBLIN: Well I'm simply trying to point out the fact that the idea of municipal consultation is not such a bad thing, and that's what was done in connection with the Metro bill and it was brought into this House on the strength of the Royal Commission, so I think to draw any comparisons between our action on Metro and our action in this respect is to ignore the facts. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment that is before us is one that can be supported on the grounds well stated by the Attorney-General, and I must say that I decline to accept the strictures of the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the comparison with Metro and also with respect to whether or not we know what our own minds are. We do -- and we've expressed them very clearly and forcibly on other occasions and will do so again, but I think that on this occasion, on this subject, consultation with the municipal authorities, who have, by statute at the present time, the right to decide this matter, is not such a bad thing.

MR. CAMPBELL:ask the honourable member a question? He has said that the municipalities have this right by statute. Is that a fact?

MR. ROBLIN: I believe that it is, Sir. I am subject to correction on it but my recollection is that they have by statute -- and I believe it is in the Municipal Act -- the power to set variations in the time zone.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the Honourable Member for Selkirk and the Leader of the New Democratic Party, that this is the most "weasely" amendment -- if this is the right word -- that I have seen in this House since I've been in this House. To suggest by a government in power to consult the municipalities, especially when they know before hand that these municipalities don't agree on this matter, and the government to expect to have a recommendation from the municipalities -- I think it is absolutely ridiculous. Absolutely. It is just one way for the government not to want to support a suggestion from the Opposition. I think that if the vote was called off that there would be another vote from that side.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. May I point out to the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that this is a private member's resolution -- this is a private member's resolution.

MR. PREFONTAINE: But the Premier said that it was a government resolution. He just said it now.

MR. ROBLIN: On the allegation that's been made, if I said it was a government resolution-- and I don't recall saying so -- I'm obviously incorrect. It's a private member's resolution. That's what we're discussing this afternoon.

MR. PREFONTAINE: But, Mr. Speaker, this side of the House was chided by the First Minister and by the Honourable the Attorney-General because we had as a government in the past not dealt with this matter. Our leader has always taken the stand in this House that there were some people in Winnipeg here who wanted Daylight Saving Time, that he thought it was not important enough for the government to pass legislation on this matter, but there has been quite a change from those years. We have had a new system of school administration in this province with the divisions and this is causinggreat.....confusion in and around the larger centres in this province -- great confusion. I think we have come to the point where it is of such importance with respect to education that we should pass now some legislation, and I am sure that the Minister of Education who asks us now to spend 33 million dollars to help education, should see to it that every dollar spent for education purposes should be fully used and should not be wasted because of this confusion. He knows very well what's going to happen -- what has been happening in all these areas close to Winnipeg -- with changes in time from one municipality to another. It is hopeless to have order in these areas at all. He knows it very well. And he

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd) knows very well, and he has certainly been told by educationists in this province that to ask boys and girls to get up when it's dark in the morning and go to bed when it's so nice at night -- you can't get the best out of these children when you have daylight saving time for six months of the year, from April to October. You're not getting the best results from these children. And we are told by the Honourable the Attorney-General that "what do we care about what's happening in Flin Flon?" There are kids in Flin Flon who are receiving money from this government, and this government has the right to expect that this money goes as far as possible in Flin Flon and in Thompson and everywhere -- that the children would come well rested to school in the morning -- not with their eyes half shut and not to take advantage of the first hour. We have that responsibility and it's no laughing stock -- it's an important thing. I have spoken to a lot of school teachers who tell me that in the first hour in the morning under daylight saving conditions, especially in April and September, the best results are not obtained. This to me is a very serious consideration. I for one have been personally against daylight saving time -- completely against it -- for the whole twelve months of the year. I represent a constituency that is highly developed with respect to the dairy industry -- the most highly developed dairy industry constituency in this province. Now these people, in order to supply the market in Winnipeg, have had to get up at four o'clock in the morning when the plants here were operating on daylight saving. It's been a very difficult situation for these people and I would prefer standard time the whole year round, but I am ready to compromise because there is a substantial group of people here in this area -- in Winnipeg-- who favor daylight saving. I am ready and willing to compromise. I would have preferred that the period would be from the end of the school year -- the end of June -- to the first week in September, as proposed by the member from the party who has moved the amendment. But I am ready to compromise and I know there are lots of people in Winnipeg now, in St. Boniface, everywhere, who favor this compromise, and I think we should establish it as law, not to ask the municipalities, the Urban Association and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities to give us a recommendation. We have to deal with it anyway and I think it's time that we should, and I cannot understand a responsible government -- a man, the First Minister, who has told us -- who laughed at us, because we were do-nothings; we were not suggesting to do anything; we were doing nothing, and I think he used some language like this: "Those who do something will go further than those who do nothing," something like that. Well, what's the government doing now on this issue? What has the government done on the issue of better roads in Unorganized Territory? Pass it on to the municipality. It's a lack of courage.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to adjourn the debate but apparently the Leader of the House doesn't believe that this should be done too often, so I have decided that I will speak now. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I know I have the right but he's usually pretty good in his advice and I'll follow his advice if you don't mind, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know -- I think he should have thought a little bit before he said that though, because he'll realize that this particular motion was brought in I think the first, or first week that we've been here, and we've heard something about the honeymooner a little while ago, and that's the only one from that side of the House that's said anything on this question, so I think that they took an awful long time to decide also.

A MEMBER: The honeymoon isn't over yet

MR. DESJARDINS: I think that there are a few other resolutions also that have been standing for an awful long time. I hope that if this is any indication, any change of attitude of the government, we might have some discussion on that. It would be very interesting to hear something about this -- some resolution that I have about this committee of youths and recreation. I would like to hear something on that fairly soon. That's been standing for quite a while. Now there's no doubt that the members of the government are a little embarrassed today. I think that they don't feel too good about this resolution themselves. When you have the two great big guns of the government, the Attorney-General and the Premier themselves, speaking practically one after the other -- when they shoot the works right away it means they're a little embarrassed, because there's no doubt we have to give credit to those two -- they can do a better job of white-washing than anybody I know around here. They do a very good job. The Attorney-General especially -- when they're in trouble he gets up and he has the knack -- he'll take something and turn it around and point the gun right at you and sit down by saying that the Liberals are voting

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) against Colombo Plan because they have no heart. He's good at that -- he did it again today. We're trying to take everything away from municipalities -- he did it again today. He did it in that special session -- he did a good job there. Tax the people of Manitoba. Don't embarrass Diefenbaker -- he's the big shot out there and we've followed him -- but let's have a reduction of premium. That's a good idea. The people of Manitoba -- the Liberals are voting against a reduction of premium. They're awful. They forget about the rest of the things -- he's good at that.

Well I think that I can have a couple of minutes to talk about the Throne Speech, the way it's been going on the other side of the House. So, Mr. Speaker, then came Metro. Well I know that I don't count in the eyes of the Leader of this House, but just to set the record straight, I'd like to say very mildly of course -- that I opposed Metro a few years ago very mildly, but that I also voted in favor of referendum. Do the members the time that he was wishing that the people of St. Boniface would have a more perspicacious member, or something like that, representing them -- around those days anyway. Now I might say that they also stated that the municipalities had been contacted. That's true. They contacted the municipalities then turned around and did exactly what the municipalities didn't want them to do that's true. They had a brief of all they said. They told them what they wanted. This was ignored. . . . after that they this, "We are the creator of the municipalities." Remember that? Those were fighting words then when I told them not to play God. Remember that? He was fairly insulted. But they listen to the people and then they ignore them. That's what they did. Then they decided they should do the right thing on this famous question of margarine. They decided they'd have a commission on that. They got their commission -- poor man. He brought in a recommendation and they ignored him again. They ignored him again, but those that were . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm ruling the Honourable Member should debate the resolution instead of margarine. I don't like to call time on him but

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, it's a little embarrassing that you can't answer some of the -- (interjection) -- Maybe I missed a point here -- What's that? -- (Interjection) -- of leadership? Yes, leadership. I was going to say that we're given terrific leadership in the field of education, but I don't dare. The Attorney-General mentioned that. I think that he was a little sorry that he mentioned that, but nevertheless he told us about the great leadership in the field of education. This is the right of the people. Let's ask them what they want. Yes, 11,000 students, fathers and mothers -- we ask them what they want. They told us. All right. There's the question of Metro; the question of lack of leadership in those fields. Now, this government has been telling us how terrific a job there were doing of leadership. Brought in the question of fitness for three years in a row -- nothing was done. But now we've got a bill; we'll hear more about that. I'll try and get back on this subject, Mr. Speaker, before you stand up again.

All right, we'll go back on this question of daylight saving time. We are told that we had years and years to play on this, to talk about that, and all of a sudden they're going to decide. They're going to ask. They didn't have the same years -- I don't know where they were during those years, but they didn't ask anybody in that time. The Liberals should ask -- not them. Now they're going to put the blame on somebody else. They are afraid, Mr. Speaker, of making up their mind, but more than anything else, they know that the members from this side -- the two parties from this side -- the three parties, I should say, are right, and they cannot admit it. They cannot. They ask us to give them good constructive criticism. Bring in your plans. They'll invite the Leader of the Opposition -- come and tell us all about -- Oh no, that's away from medical -- from -- I was just going to say something about the medical plan but that's not on the subject. So they invite us to do that. And then we'll ask somebody else; then we'll bring it in; it will be all right when everybody -- they'll tell us that when everybody's for it, then we will lead. We will show leadership -- when everybody's for it, we'll show leadership. We won't be afraid. We'll be right in there and we will vote for daylight saving time. They're a little mixed up -- they're a little mixed up. They're talking about -- the Attorney-General wants daylight saving time because he wants to sleep in. I don't know how he figures that out. That young son of his must have him really going around the bend, because he's a little mixed up on that.

Well, we know, Mr. Speaker, we know that we will not please everybody. I'm a little lost. Listening to the member from Inkster, he wants to please everybody and makes everybody

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) separate. we are trying to compromise. It's just like a married couple. Sometimes the wife will do something she likes and sometimes the husband. You try to compromise, and that's what we're trying to do -- get along together. I fooled you that time, I'm still on the subject. Well anyway, I think that we're ready to compromise. We think that we should have -- that the people of Greater Winnipeg, some of them like this question of daylight saving time. It certainly has some advantages, there's no doubt about that, but the honourable member that made this amendment told us that everything depends on time -- everything rotates around time -- and that's true. We want to help Manitoba on this and it is a hardship on the people. The main thing of our motion we'll tell you, I think that it is plain, and it's this idea of trying to get together; to live together and to work together. Some people want daylight saving time -- we'll give it to them. But let's not go all the way and say, all right, if you want daylight saving time we'll give it to you 12 months a year. That's not the point. It started slowly. I think that the people -- the former leader of this Party who stated himself that he always opposed daylight saving time before. He admitted that himself and he's had time to think, but now he's ready to compromise. If we leave it like this, we'll never get anywhere. It's the same as this margarine -- you might get some cockeyed colour and think that you've achieved something, but that's no good. This is just wishful thinking. That's right -- that's what it is. So now we realize that some people want daylight saving times and others don't.

Now I'm from the city. I represent members from the city and, all in all, those people want more daylight saving time. Some of them told me, "Well worry about your own constituency; don't worry about the other" -- but I don't think that's right. There's different ways of looking at our mission here -- our work. We can be a rubber stamp for the constituency or we, if they've got confidence in us, we will try to do the best we can. If we're off base too often, well then they won't return us here, but I think we have a responsibility. We can't think only of our own constituency. We must think of what's good for Manitoba. Now this is perfectly logical. We have asked the people to compromise. It was very difficult in our own caucus. It wasn't just automatic. We had to discuss this thing and we arrived at a compromise. I might say that I wanted it a little longer -- daylight saving time -- but I realized I had to compromise also before I expected others to, so this amendment was a very good amendment. It was an oversight and this is the way I think we should work for the betterment of the affairs of Manitoba. We accepted that and if the members of the government, when they go home tonight and their wives tell them, "well you were kind of childish out there today, you better get on the right track again and don't make a fool of yourself -- pretend that you've got a little bit of leadership in you." Well when they come back and vote for our motion, I think that in committee they might have a chance to discuss this question of this amendment again. I hope so anyway.

But the fact, Mr. Speaker, is that we are ready to compromise. We know that we're not going to please everybody. Those who are in favour have to compromise, have to give in a bit; and those who are against have to give in; but in Manitoba let's have a uniform time. That's the main thing. We're after the uniform time. We think that during the holidays it won't be too much of a hardship to have daylight saving time and we think that after that, let's give a break to the mothers of the children -- Mrs. Lyon included, I'm sure -- let's give the break to these people and let's go back to the ordinary time given to us by nature.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I've got to have a word to say about uniform time -- daylight time or standard time. I represent a constituency that, because of its location, lying right next to Greater Winnipeg, probably experiences as much grief and dissatisfaction from the current uncertainty as regards time in the province as any other constituency in this province. I am quite aware of the problems that exist as a result of these two time schedules -- standard time and daylight time -- the fact that at times you have two schools in one centre, one operating on daylight time and one operating on standard time -- the mother has to keep lunch warm for two hours every noon hour. Also, the fact that farmers in that area, who are serviced by Greater Winnipeg to a great extent, are compelled to fit their work schedules and their life to a time schedule that isn't of their own choosing. I was asked not long ago why it was that the farmer was opposed to daylight saving time, and I expect that I gave the answer that the farmer, I think with understandable justification, objected to people "frigging" around with the time.

Now the first chapter in Genesis tells us that God made two great lights -- the greater

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night. He made the stars and He set them in the firmament, and He set them there to rule over the day and over the night and to divide the light of the day from the darkness. I suppose the farmer is on pretty sound ground when he objects to mankind making, in their wisdom, adjustments with the times of the day and the night that were pleasing to God.

It is true, as the Honourable Member for Carillon said, that in some instances, in the nature of his work, the farmer is -- his work is laid out for him by the sun and it is the sun that dictates what he does and not the clock. So he finds himself at times put to some disadvantage by the fact that he must compromise and adjust his work schedule and his life to daylight saving time. On the other hand, there are many communities, and even small communities that, because of the fact that daylight saving time is not just a matter of provincial incidence but of nation-wide incidence; because of the fact that transportation in some aspects -- certainly the news media and communications media -- adhere to daylight saving time; many centres want to operate -- even small centres -- want to operate on daylight saving time.

It is essential, as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has said, that we come to some compromise. I believe that the time is right, that more people today are prepared to move from an extreme position, either of daylight saving time or of standard time, than ever before. They want to get together, but a poor compromise or a bad compromise, an unacceptable compromise is better than no compromise, especially in regard to the matter that we have under consideration. To come in with a law of the province that compels people to adhere to a time zone that was unacceptable to them to the extent where they not only have reservations and doubts but where they were stimulated into outright opposition, wouldn't solve the problem at all. What I feel about this amendment that has been moved by the Honourable Member for St. James is that it safeguards you and I, as members of this Legislature, of coming down with a decision that is not going to be acceptable to the majority of the people. I am sure that those who have indicated their opposition to this amendment would be very careful in respect of other matters, of adhering to the will of the majority -- very careful.

It seems to me that there is an ill-considered rush to do something -- not necessarily the right thing, but to do something -- anything is better than what we have now. I don't agree with that at all. I think that we can have something better than we have now, but just anything isn't better than what we have at the present time because, at least at the present time, this Legislature is not imposing its will upon the people of the province. They are left free, at least at this time, to make their own decisions, but the minute that we step into the picture they are no longer free and they have to live with our decision. I'm not so sure that any change is better than what we have now. I'd want to be very careful and give a great deal of consideration to any motion or any act on the part of this Legislature that established a time throughout the province -- a uniform time throughout the Province of Manitoba.

Somebody has referred here to the question of colouring in margarine. Well, didn't we consult -- didn't we consult -- and I think it's common knowledge that if it hadn't been for the fact that the dairy industry was willing to compromise; was satisfied that, in spite of their inherent objection, that this was the best thing to do under the circumstances; if it hadn't been for this position that they took, that compromise wouldn't have been possible, and here we have the same thing. We want to know that the compromise that we undertake in this House is going to be acceptable to the majority of the people in this province. How better a way than to go to those people who represent the people in the province at the local level? This isn't a referendum that we're asking for. We're saying, let's get a recommendation from two bodies who represent, at the local level, the peoples in this province. Let's see what kind of a compromise they can come to, and we indicate that we are willing to make it law in this province when they come forward with a recommendation. Is this weaseling? It seems to me that this is a sensible point of view to take.

Certainly I don't think that we are prepared at this time, with the little bit of consideration that we have given to this, to come in with a firm proposal that we shall have uniform time in the Province of Manitoba; that it will be compulsory -- yes, twenty years. We never really got down -- the governments of the past never got down to really giving it any serious consideration before, but if we're going to give it serious consideration, let's not rush into it and say to everybody throughout the Province of Manitoba, regardless of their location or their

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) . . . interests, this is going to be the time and there's nothing that you're going to have to say about if from here on in. That is what the Liberal group in this House is saying -- this is going to be the time and there's nothing more that you're going to have to say about it. Well, this is quite a departure from Liberal principles as I've been taught them in this House -- quite a departure. The only reason that I can think that they would take such a stand is that they think that the question of time is relatively unimportant, because on no other grounds could they possibly advocate such a line of action. That's the only possible reason because I give them credit for being thoroughly responsible legislators -- thoroughly responsible. I don't think that they would recommend such hasty action in regard to a matter if they really thought it was of any consequence in the province and to the people of this province, but if they really think it's so important, I think that they had better follow the advice of the Honourable Member for St. James and let the Union of Municipalities and the Urban Association get together; talk this thing over; and come to this government with some recommendations so that we can act here with a reasonable chance of bringing down something that is going to please the majority of the people in the province.

. Continued on next page.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, it looks as if some of us have strayed from the amendment before the House. What we're on is not whether we should have uniform time or not, but the question before the House is who is to decide whether we do or we don't and what will it be. Well, the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture has on more than one occasion established himself as being one capable of speaking a long time and saying very little, and I don't think that he has done any more than that just in that little bit of discourse that he gave us a moment ago. He's under the impression that this side of the House has taken the stand of imposing their will upon the people of the Province of Manitoba. Well, of course, that's nonsense, Mr. Speaker. If there's any imposition here at all it's the imposition of the government on the two municipal bodies -- the two associations who are respected associations in the Province of Manitoba, and who shouldn't be taken advantage of in the fashion that this government intends to do. I think it's an unfair advantage. We have two bodies here who are representative of the people, who expressed their opinions in the past and I think they've made it quite plainly what they want. All the rural associations have gone on record -- and I think quite plainly too. If the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and the other members of the front bench had paid any attention to what the people of the province wanted they wouldn't say that there is any imposition in the resolution that is before this House. Both the farm organizations have stated quite plainly they're prepared to compromise on this issue and they're prepared to compromise on the resolution that was placed before this House for the consideration of the members. The Urban Association wanted Daylight Saving Time -- they probably -- at the time that they expressed their opinion, probably wanted it for a little longer period than the resolution covered, but I'm quite sure that they are reasonable people and would have come to a compromise.

I really couldn't understand why the government has taken this attitude. Once you hear that it isn't a government measure and then again you hear that it is, and we don't know whether it is or not. But what surprises me, Mr. Speaker, is how it is that there isn't a single member in that government, barring none, that can't see the sense -- the commonsense in that particular resolution -- that's beyond me. I can understand how the front benches can be wrong most of the time, but how all of you could be wrong all the time, I can't understand that -- and you're certainly wrong right along the line this time. I'm quite sure that you're not going to make any marks with either the Urban or the Rural Association in this regard, because I think it is taking an unfair advantage of these people and putting them on the spot, and if there is any such thing as a responsible government, then it certainly is to take the responsibility and not to pass it on to somebody else. --(interjection)-- There is no such thing as municipal law that says that the towns or the municipalities have the legal right to set the time -- there's no such thing, with due respect to the Honourable the First Minister. The responsibility is here, that's where it is, and I think that long -- if they every do -- I was going to say long before they get a report from these two associations. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, whether the government will have the audacity to refer the matter to these municipal bodies. I think this is just straight evasion. They'll find some excuse when they come around here in a year from now and say -- well, we didn't refer this to them because so and so and so and so. Those silver tongues across the way there have cost the people of this province pots of gold, but when it comes to time I think they're wasting the time of both associations in this respect. I think that they should reconsider the whole matter. It's a private member's amendment according to some of the front benchers, and if it is a private member's motion then I say to you that you can even now change your mind for the better. There's nothing to stop you -- it's not a government measure. The government isn't going to be defeated. And I say to those honourable members who down deep in their hearts know that the motion is a proper one, then stand up and be counted and really --(interjection)-- we're not asking you to go against the front bench; this has got nothing to do with them whatsoever. And if they tell you it has, then you just don't listen to them. For once, this is your opportunity to show the people back home that you have got what it takes to stand up for their rights and do what you think is right.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything on this subject but after listening to a lot of the -- oh, I don't know I would call it "drizzle" in a way, they talked about weaseling, and so I say a lot of their conversations has been "dribbling" about this matter of time. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, they're dealing with central

(Mr. Corbett, cont'd.) . . . daylight time and central standard time or daylight saving time. I'd like to inform a lot of these members that there's no such thing as daylight saving time. There's daylight saving which means tinkering with the clocks, but standard time was established many years ago by the best mathematicians in the country to coincide more or less with the movements of the sun from east to west, and, as such, they tried to arrive at some definite conclusion whereby as the sun moved forward and man's life work in this world was regulated by the sun, that we would arrive at something that'd be at least fairly uniform. They made little jogs in the line where the times changed, but we have a central time here which coincides with -- I think Greenwich is the foundation of the time system -- and it went across the continent, and what we're asking them to do now is to take a little slice out of Manitoba and say in Manitoba that we just advance the clocks one hour, therefore that will be all right; it won't interfere with anybody else. But it's not universal in Manitoba. Our railway systems and that sort of thing they cannot come in with that idea without running foul of all their systems across the continent. Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen say they're willing to compromise. The Honourable Member for Carillon says he's willing to compromise with this, but I wonder if he could speak entirely for his whole constituency? Would they be willing to compromise with this matter? --(Interjection)-- Pardon?

MR. PREFONTAINE: They have confidence in me. They sent me Mr. Speaker, what I'm doing.

MR. CORBETT: That's all right. You have every confidence but I haven't that confidence in your constituents myself. And the Honourable Member for St. Boniface he has confidence, I quite agree, probably his constituents, they're an urban district they will be quite willing to compromise with this. They would probably want a little more, but they'd take this as the best they could get. But anyway gentlemen you speak of this weaseling idea of referring it to these municipal organizations, the urban and rural. Who in the world is in a better shape to decide on this than the elected representatives of those two organizations? They represent the wishes of the people, I think, in a great many cases a great deal more than the members sitting in this Legislature on certain things that are definitely confined to the management of their rural and urban areas. Therefore I say, this is not a weaseling resolution, this is a commonsense resolution. If they can't come to any conclusion, then I would say have a general referendum across this Province of Manitoba and say, "we want to get away from the central time in here, which is the standard time which has been in effect for well over 100 years and has worked always successfully, and, as far as I can see, all you have to do to get a little more daylight is to get up a little earlier on this thing and let it go at that. And there's no sense in this tinkering with the clocks and trying to upset -- in other words, you get out to the middle of the Pacific Ocean and we lose a day there -- we advance a day; we go back a day, whichever way you want to look at it -- and in this way, we'd say, "well, so far as Manitoba is concerned those fellows write a letter out there, it's got to be an hour later for three months in the year, but when you change the date line, when you dress up Father Neptune and cross the Equator or cross that date line they have some rite that they go through -- well, we must see that all those ships out there coincide with the wishes of Manitoba's elected representatives, must put their celebrations crossing that date line back an hour for three months in the year, but the other nine months it will be all right because it will be standard time. Thank you.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, after hearing so many of the members talk on the subject, there's probably very little left to say, but I don't think that this matter of daylight saving time or uniform time, that has been discussed is a question that can be avoided, and it should not be avoided, and I don't think we do want to avoid it. Many of the associations such as the Home and School, trustees, municipal people, and those people in charge, have passed resolutions at their particular conventions asking the government to consider this matter and take action in having uniform time across the province. Personally I feel that the time that is devoted to daylight saving time during the summer is too long for most of the farm people. The farmers find it inconvenient in many respects in going to the city, and very often when they have trouble with their machinery and so on that by the time, it can still be early in the day, that they won't be able to get any parts or repairs and so on, so that it will have to be left to the next day.

On the other hand, I don't think we do want to deny the people in Greater Winnipeg and

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . the surrounding cities here -- deny them of the extra hour in the afternoon that they may use at their own discretion for whatever purpose they so desire. I think the matter should be a matter of having a referendum on the matter. The Honourable the Attorney-General, he's not in his seat now, referred to local option. I think local option is what we have now. Local option is a status quo. And if that is what we want, we don't need any further action. The resolution that is before us and the amendment that has just been defeated, I think were in line and could have been supported. Now we have the amendment by the Honourable Member for St. James and I'm just wondering whether it is designed to get opposite recommendations from the two groups or whether it is actually designed to bring in a recommendation that is going to be workable. It looks too much like this passing the buck. If it were going to bring in a solution to the problem, I'd be willing to support it. I don't think the matter of letting it ride for another year -- I think this could be afforded if we have a solution to the matter that will be acceptable to the people of Manitoba. Once more, I feel that this matter should be decided by referendum and that the people in the province should have a say in the matter themselves.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, the amendment makes reference that this resolution be referred back to the two municipal bodies, the Manitoba Urban Association and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. I wish to draw the attention of this House to resolutions that have already passed and have been presented to this government which, I think, in my opinion gives sufficient directive that it is not necessary to stall and stall it over for another year. First of all, last spring in Transcona at the Manitoba Urban Association a resolution was unanimously passed at that semi-annual convention that the position be put on record that that association approved of daylight time from April 20th to October 21st, and it was approved. Later in January or in October, at the annual meeting of this same organization in Portage la Prairie they changed the original resolution and reduced the daylight saving from April 30th to September 30th. Now, Sir, mention has been made that the Union of Manitoba Municipalities are against daylight saving time. But, Sir, I would like to point out to you a resolution that was passed at the last annual meeting of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and which says this: "Whereas some communities observe daylight saving time and while others remain on central standard time resulting in considerable confusion, therefore be it resolved that the provincial government be requested to enact legislation making a standard time in the Province of Manitoba mandatory." Now, Sir, I can't see anything more directive and more pointed than the fact that the Union of Manitoba Municipalities wants this government to set up a time as a standard time. They didn't ask for daylight or central standard time; they asked for a standard time be made mandatory within the Province of Manitoba. And I see no argument in the fact that you are, by referring it back, are taking any of the rights away from the elected municipal authorities because they have already now given this government -- the Union has asked for a mandatory standard time to be set out by this government and the Manitoba Urban Association has asked for two different dates and I see nothing to conflict in the stand of the two organizations in accepting a time as presented by the resolution as presented to this House.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks made by the First Minister, other speakers and the Minister of Agriculture -- I'm sorry he's not in the House at the present time -- I think that we should give serious consideration to the responsibility which we are placing on the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association. It's quite obvious with respect to the remarks made by the First Minister and the Minister of Agriculture that those of us who are in this Legislature and this Chamber, were not sent here to make any decisions. It's quite obvious that we were sent here, according to their remarks, to pass on any contentious matters to other people, to renege from any responsible leadership, any forward-moving, any serious decisions. And so in view of all this, Mr. Speaker, I think that we are placing too much responsibility on the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association requesting them to give consideration to this problem of uniform time and to the recommendation as to what period uniformity or daylight saving time should be in effect. So, Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, I'd like to move an amendment to the amendment that the amendment be further amended by adding the following words after the words "Manitoba Urban Association" in the 8th line thereof, and placing the following words, "and the Manitoba School Trustees Association, the Urban School Trustees Association, the

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . Manitoba Teachers' Society, the Home and School Association, the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture, the Manitoba Farmers Union, the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce, the Winnipeg Chambers of Commerce" and that the word "too" in the 10th line be deleted and the word "s" be added to the word "recommendation" in the 11th line thereof. I move this, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that we may be able to place responsibility where it properly belongs, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface.

MR. SPEAKER: The resolution does appear to be a bit frivolous.

MR. ROBERTS: I believe it was properly moved and seconded, Mr. Speaker. I believe it was properly moved and seconded, was it not, Mr. Speaker?

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest, Your Honour, that I doubt the frivolity in this amendment because it deals with a group of organizations which have direct contact with the public, and would be affected with the general matter before the House.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, if you are going to put it, I would like to make just one or two comments. I opposed the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for St. James because of the fact that I thought it was a dereliction of duty because I was of the opinion that this was a matter that we should resolve ourselves here in the House, and also the matter that there was the division between the two organizations mentioned in the original amendment, and to be consistent -- and I'm generally consistent in this House, Mr. Speaker -- I will have to reject for the same reasons the amendment to the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. It's true that he has added a number of other groups which the government may listen to and have consultive advice from, but the basic principle is still the same albeit a little bit broader than that of the original amendment which we opposed. It does not give to us an opportunity of placing responsibility where it actually, in our opinion, belongs so, therefore, we are going to have to vote against both the amendment to the amendment and to the amendment itself.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I said that, in my opinion, the only reason that the Liberal Party in this House was taking the position they were taking was the fact that they considered this to be a matter of little consequence or an issue of little consequence when they recommended that this legislature arbitrarily come down with a compromise, and I think that the amendment moved by the Member for La Verendrye has substantiated the remarks that I made at that time, because I think, Sir, that when you termed the amendment rather frivolous, you were absolutely right. It can't be considered in any other light than of just having a little fun on this question. The reasons for requesting the recommendations of the bodies representing a group of people who are sovereign in their own areas of jurisdiction, is altogether different than asking for the recommendations of such a large number of organizations that the numbers in itself precludes any hope of getting a recommendation, and it seems to me that one can hardly attribute any sincerity to the efforts of those who would recommend such a course of action. They can hardly be sincerely striving to find an answer, a satisfactory solution to this problem of time that has been haunting us. And so, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface built himself a mousetrap hoping to catch a bear and --(interjection)-- Yes, he built a mousetrap to catch a bear, but he'll have to build better than he has. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that no member in this House, regardless of his political affiliation, could possibly support the amendment before us now.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say one word on this. The amendment proposed by my honourable friends doesn't make sense in this particular resolution in our mind. We have no intention whatever of supporting it. My honourable friend's colleague, the Member for La Verendrye proposed his sub-amendment to prove and show how this doesn't make sense, and there's no reason why you shouldn't add dozens more organizations to the views that my honourable friends over there are expressing. You could add on and on and on -- all the labour organizations could be asked as well to present views if this is how the government proposed to proceed with legislation in this House.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. TANCHAK: May I be permitted to --(interjection)-- Am I too late to say a few words?

MR. SPEAKER: You wish to speak, do you?

MR. TANCHAK: Just a very short -- I haven't spoken on this subject and I could elaborate quite a bit -- but it seems to me -- and I must inform the House that I almost made a buck before it was permissible to make bets in this House, but I was reminded it wasn't. But I did say that I was sure that the third big gun, the Minister of Agriculture, definitely couldn't resist the temptation to get up and alleviate the embarrassment that the government was placed by former members, and he did. I could have won a buck there. But I am going to oppose this amendment because my mind is made up; but on the other hand, I should however vote for the amendment to show that I am in complete agreement with the members of the government that they have no mind of their own.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the "yeas" have it.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for St. James and seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after "whereas" in the 4th line thereof and substituting the following: "the desirability of uniform time throughout the province is self-evident and Whereas the authority to deal with this matter has for some time been exercised by the municipalities which can by general consent establish uniform time, Therefore be it resolved that this House requests the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association to give consideration to the problem of uniform time at their first convenient opportunity, And be it further resolved that these two organizations be requested to place their joint recommendation on this matter before the Minister of Municipal Affairs and if daylight saving time is recommended, the period in which it should be in effect."

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney, Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas - 32; Nays - 20.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The question before the House is the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Inkster as amended. Are you ready for the question?

MR. ROBLIN: I believe the original mover, Sir, was the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh yes, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. MOLGAT: Same division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Agreed here.

MR. ROBLIN: Same division on this side, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. Carried on division.

Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fisher and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fisher and the proposed amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'm still trying to obtain some information and I would like the matter to stand, but I have no objection to any other member speaking on this resolution if they wish to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that after what has been said this afternoon about members engaging in debate on the same day in which the debate arises, that the honourable members of this House will agree I have not been exactly precipitous in rushing into this debate. However, Sir, I felt that there was some information that it was essential I should have before I did take part in this debate and I have gone to some trouble to try and clear up a few points on which I was not clear in my own mind, and I might say that the longer I study this question the more I realize that there is no simple and easy solution to the problem that faces us.

I would like to say in the beginning, Sir, that I believe that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was motivated by a sincere desire to remedy the situation which confronts us as legislators in presenting this particular resolution and that I hope that he will feel when I am through that if I offer any criticism that it is offered as constructive criticism and I hope that he will agree with the criticisms that I offer.

In this matter of the issue of the responsibilities of the various healing arts, there exists in the minds of many considerable confusion. I think that it is only natural that there will be a certain reticence on the part of those practitioners of healing arts which have been recognized -- generally recognized here and in other areas -- to accept claims of those practitioners of other healing arts who have not been so recognized; and yet there are many who feel that there are practitioners of other healing arts who have some legitimate claim to some area of responsibility in the wide spectrum of comprehensive health care. I would think, Sir, that there is perhaps a gradual tendency to give some greater acceptance to some of these other healing arts, and yet if you speak to practitioners of those healing arts they will tell you that this tendency -- this progress is so slow as to really be stagnation. If there has been some progress I would suggest, Sir, that there are two reasons for it. First of all I believe that in some of these healing arts they have made a very real effort to improve their educational standards, and I feel too, Sir, that some of them have made a very real effort to establish a code of ethics for their profession and to take a professional attitude towards the public which was not always the case in such healing arts. And secondly, Sir, I feel that there has been on the part of many leaders of the medical profession a real desire to view this matter objectively, and I think, Sir, that our own Minister of Health is one of those who has made such an endeavour -- has really taken great pains to try and look at this matter sincerely and objectively and without prejudice, as much as is possible for someone who is vitally interested.

First of all, Sir, I would like to take a look at this resolution because, as the honourable member said when he introduced it, that it should be clearly explained so that the members of this House would not jump to false conclusions, and yet I think even with his explanation there is still some doubt as to what is meant in certain areas. For example, Sir, the first recital reads as follows -- "Whereas at the present the members of many different branches of the healing arts have been extended the privilege of using the title "doctor". If we take this in its literal sense we must take into consideration those of other training who have not actually received degrees of doctor and yet who are, under our Medical Act, entitled to practise in the Province of Manitoba. Under Sections 26(a) and 27(a) of the Medical Act we recognize the equivalent training of our Doctor of Medicine issued from other universities, and I would refer, Sir, in particular to the degree of Bachelor of Medicine -- or Bachelor of Surgery, issued by many universities in the United Kingdom, and in particular, Sir, this degree is issued by the University of Birmingham, University of Bristol, University of Cambridge, University of Durham, University of Leeds, University of Liverpool, University of London, University of Manchester, University of Oxford, University of Sheffield, University of Wales, University of Aberdeen, University of Edinburgh, University of Glasgow, University of St. Andrews, University of Belfast, University of Dublin, National University of Ireland. There are also other licenses or degrees issued by -- for example, the Royal College of Physicians of London, the Royal College of Surgeons of England, the Society of Apothecaries of London, the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, the Royal Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow, the Royal College of Physicians of Ireland, the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland and Apothecaries Hall of Dublin.

I am quite sure, Sir, that it was not the intention of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface to include those persons within the ambit of this resolution and yet I think that we must

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.) make it perfectly clear that this resolution does not apply to them. Next, Sir, we would come to those persons who have degrees from schools and colleges -- degrees of doctor -- and yet the schools and colleges from which they received their degrees are ones whose standard of training is not recognized by the University of Manitoba as reaching the standard of excellence which we could recognize, and therefore in those cases it has been necessary to restrain the holders of these degrees from the practise of their healing arts in this province. Arrangements have been made so that some of these persons can qualify by taking a series of examinations and by serving a period of internship in hospitals here. I am informed by the University of Manitoba that most of these people have been unable to pass the examinations and I then enquired from them as to the reasons why they were unable to pass. In particular I wanted to know if their failure was a result of a language barrier or was it from some other reason and I was assured by the university that most of these people have demonstrated in their internship at hospitals here a complete lack of acceptable training in the fields of medicine -- at least that our university here considered acceptable. Yet at home in their own countries many of these people are entitled to practice medicine and to call themselves doctor.

Now, Sir, let us look for a moment at the first operative section of this resolution: "That a committee of this House be set up to consider the advisability of recognizing only doctor degrees properly conferred by the universities." It is possible that this may cover the situation for those who hold doctor degrees that are not recognized by our university but, I think perhaps, it could be spelled out even more clearly than that if we said something to the effect that it should be universities which have a reciprocal agreement with the University of Manitoba. The second operative section of the resolution deals with the examination and registration of practitioners of the healing arts by the university. This, Sir, appears to me to be almost the identical situation that we had in this province under the Basic Sciences Act which was passed by this House in 1945. Under that act there was a provision which required that -- although the university did not register these people, that they could not be registered by their own societies and associations until they had received a certificate of credit from the university to show that they had passed examinations at the university in certain of the basic sciences. I recognize too, Sir, that this act did not cover all of these professions; there were some exceptions. If I remember correctly the Optometric Society was one of the exceptions to the act.

Now at first glance, Sir, this seems like the simple and easy solution to the problem. But I am informed by those who know more about it than I do that in practice it simply didn't work out. Those people who presented themselves to the university for examination and failed are convinced in their own minds that they failed through some intervention of medical doctors in the examinations. The university will tell you that it was not only medical doctors who set and marked the examinations but these were set by other scientists at the university in many cases and that many of the examiners could still not pass them. Those who set and marked the examinations will tell you that there was not the standard of excellence that the university could accept. Now, Sir, I don't think that either side may be totally wrong. I don't know which side is right, and I would suggest to you, Sir, that there are few, if any, members of this House who have any qualification to decide as to which side in this matter is right. And this was the feeling, I believe, Sir, of this House when in 1953 the Basic Sciences Act was repealed.

Well Sir, let's take another look at this question from another point of view. Just what is a doctor? What does this word mean? I've looked it up in Webster's dictionary in the Library down the hall and Webster gives a great many definitions of the word "doctor" -- a great many. And I don't propose to burden the honourable members of this House with all those definitions but I think a few of them might prove interesting at this time. The first one is: "a teacher; one skilled in a profession or branch of knowledge; a learned man." The second one is: "an academic title implying that its possessor was so well versed in a department of knowledge as to be qualified to teach." The third one: "one duly licensed to practice medicine, a physician, a surgeon, a wizard or medicine man in a savage tribe." The fourth one, I found rather amusing: "a makeshift mechanical contrivance or attachment for remedying a difficulty, a donkey engine, a soldering tool." I don't know whether Webster can contribute much to our deliberations here today, Sir, but I thought this might be of some interest to the committee.

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.) When you ask the university what is meant by a doctor, they will accept the first two definitions that I read to you, "the teacher; an academic title implying that its possessor was so well versed in a department of knowledge as to be qualified to teach." I asked Dr. Saunderson, the President of the university what he felt were the prerequisites for a degree of doctor and he said, in practical terms he believed that to qualify for a degree of doctor a man should have at least six or seven years of university training after matriculation. And from the university standpoint, Sir, I think this is an acceptable yardstick for measuring how we should determine who should have the degree of doctor. At this time, Sir, there are few practitioners of the healing arts other than medical doctors who could qualify under this sort of a definition.

Chiropractors and optometrists particularly have done much in recent years to increase their academic standards. They have made some real attempts to improve the standards in their own professions, but they still are far short of qualifying under the university's definition of a doctor. Yet at the same time, they approach closer to this standard than is recognized in many areas. Both of these professions, Sir, require four years of training at their respective colleges in Toronto for a license to practice in their respective areas. This is as compared with the six years that the university feels is necessary for a degree of doctor and as, in fact, the medical profession require of their students at this time. I don't want to suggest to this House, Sir, that in my opinion their qualifications of optometrists or chiropractors equal the qualifications of the medical profession. I do not wish to leave this impression. And yet Sir, there are many who believe that these people do have some great qualification, if not even qualification to practise in a certain very limited field.

To other people in our community the word doctor has different meanings. The late Stephen Laycock when granted an honorary degree of doctor from the university later when on a holiday cruise through the Carribean and while he was on that cruise one day when he was lounging on the sundeck, a call came over the loudspeaker system advising all and sundry that a certain young and rather beautiful actress had hurt her knee and if there was a doctor in the crowd would he please report to the purser's office. He didn't think anything of it until the call came through a second time and then he thought, "by God, I'm a doctor." And he said he rushed immediately to the purser's office but he was beaten by two Ph. Ds and one Doctor of Divinity.

I think Sir, that we must recognize that to the general public the word "doctor" has really only one connotation and when they refer to a doctor they refer to a medical doctor. And I think it's obvious to all of us that those practitioners of the other healing arts who wish to call themselves doctor, wish to do so because of the prestige which the public feels goes with the title "doctor." And some of the practitioners of other healing arts have the legal right to call themselves doctor in the Province of Manitoba. That right was granted to them by this House. True, they must qualify the word "doctor" by adding after the word "doctor" the particular healing art to which they belong. For example, a Doctor of Chiropractics. But in my opinion, Sir, it is not fair for us at this time to ask the university to remedy a wrong -- if we feel it is wrong -- that was created by us. If it's wrong then let us change it.

I would suggest to you, Sir, that there is a growing public awareness of these different branches of the healing arts. I would suggest to you also, Sir, that because of this growing awareness, there has been created a public demand for the services of practitioners of these other healing arts; and because of that demand they have gained a certain amount of recognition in public circles. Some insurance companies today recognize, under certain circumstances, the rights of chiropractors and optometrists and so on to treat certain cases, and they are prepared, under certain circumstances, to pay for those services. Workmens' Compensation Boards have also recognized certain of these other healing arts. And the government of this province has recognized in certain cases, for example, under medicare.

I believe, Sir, that the only satisfactory answer to this problem is for those practitioners of the other healing arts who wish to call themselves doctor is to establish at a recognized university, a faculty for the teaching of their own particular art. And just what are the chances of such a thing occurring? I made enquiries of the University of Manitoba as to what was the possibility, for example, of establishing a faculty of chiropractic at this or some other university, and I was informed that at the present time the cost of establishing such a faculty

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.) . . . without regard to any capital cost of establishing it would run probably in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars a year, and it was felt that at this time there weren't sufficient demand for the services of such a faculty to warrant such a great expenditure. The honourable member asks if that is the only reasons and I must frankly say that it was not the only reason. That at the present time in the minds of some of the leaders at the university the qualifications of some of those teaching in the schools of Chiropractic or the College of Optometry did not meet the standard that they felt was required. And I think that also, in order to have a degree of Doctor conferred by a recognized university it would probably be necessary for practitioners of those particular healing arts to make the same type of pre-medical training as the medical doctors do at the present time prior to their formal training in their particular science. But I would suggest to you, Sir, that the day when such faculties may be established is not too far away because of the real effort that is being made by some of these professions to increase their academic standard to a place where it will be satisfactory to a recognized university, and I sincerely hope that in their interest they may achieve this standard soon.

For a moment, Sir, I would like to take a look at the position which has been taken by the Province of Manitoba in this matter, and in particular, the Minister of Health. This position was established in chapter XI of the submission to the Royal Commission on Health Services. This is a very brief chapter, and with your permission, Sir, I would like to read it: "Non-medical professional groups rendering health care in Manitoba. Services are provided by non-medical professional groups who work directly with the public in the provision of elements of health care. Included are the following groups: The Manitoba Optometric Society, the Manitoba Chiropractors Association, the Association of Chiropractors, the Manitoba Naturopathic Association, the Manitoba Osteopathic Association. These professional groups have in common, problems resulting from the fact that their schools of learning are not affiliated as yet, with any Canadian university and that limitations are placed on their scope of practice compared to the medical profession. These groups have legislative recognition and sanction to practice directly with the public within the scope of their profession. The Government of Manitoba, under its Medicare program authorizes and has arranged for the provision of chiropractic and optometric care when the patient requests it; however, under present regulations the patient must seek medical consultation first in order to rule out systemic disease. The Chiropractic Association and the Optometric Society feel these regulations to be an unjustified restriction of their activities and are anxious to establish their qualification in total patient care. The question of the qualifications of these groups has been referred to the University of Manitoba but the university authorities have been unable to resolve the problem in any definitive way. Manitobans have the right to seek out the care and treatment they desire from any professional group. The Government of Manitoba believes that the services of these recognized non-medical groups are important in any extension of health services. The participation of government in the provision of comprehensive health services necessarily involve a decision of the role of these groups in such services, and the manner in which, if at all, they are integrated with general health care. The professional standards of these groups has more than local concern" -- and I would underline this, Mr. Speaker -- "The professional standards of these groups has more than local concern and federal participation requires definition of the relations with these groups." Recommendation: "The Government of Manitoba therefore recommends the future role of non-medical groups in the health care spectrum be defined insofar as government services are concerned."

Mr. Speaker, I like the attitude that has been taken by the Minister of Health in this submission. I like what he had to say in this submission to the Royal Commission. The Members of this Royal Commission are persons well respected and eminent in many fields in our community. It is true that there are medical doctors on this commission, but they do not form the majority of the commission and I think that it is possible for us to trust that the decisions of this commission will not be overbalanced in favour of the medical profession as against the rights of other non-medical groups in the health care field. It is my sincere trust that this commission may be able to offer to us an acceptable definition that we can use in this matter. Acceptable, I say Sir, not just to me as a Legislator, but acceptable to all practitioners of healing arts carrying on their art within the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba. And

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.) . . . therefore, Sir, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "degrees" in the 4th line thereof, and substituting the following: "possessed by the non-medical professional groups are not conferred or recognized by any Canadian university and their "Doctor" title must be qualified by designation indicating the type of practice, and Whereas at present these non-medical professional groups have legislative recognition and sanction to practice directly with the public within the scope of their profession, and Whereas schools exist in the Dominion of Canada which confer a doctor's degree upon these non-medical professional groups, and Whereas Manitobans have the right to seek the care and treatment they desire from any professional group, and Whereas this becomes of importance to this Legislature and Government in the future extension of comprehensive health care services to the people of Manitoba, Therefore be it resolved that this House endorse the recommendation of the Government of Manitoba to the Royal Commission on Health Services, that the future role of the non-medical groups in the health care spectrum be defined insofar as Government services are concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne, that the motion be amended by striking out all of the words after the word "degree" in the 4th line therefor, and -- Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Would you read the "therefore" part, please?

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could make sure that the other side of the House have a copy.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that you might consider calling it 5:30 on the issuance of the printed copies, and then put the motion immediately following 8:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne. I have no alternative but to put the motion.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion, I wonder whether there may be some conflict with this amendment and another resolution that we have before the House at the present time which deals with endorsing the presentation of the government to the Royal Commission on Health.

MR. ROBLIN: I really think, Mr. Chairman, now that the point of order has been raised, that there is no conflict, because the second motion referred to has to deal with medical insurance which is in the first part of the brief, whereas the item that's being considered now is in the second part of the brief that was submitted by the Minister of Health.

MR. PAULLEY: Then there's no connection then, I take it, Mr. Speaker, between the -- this was in another part of the brief, eh?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't really think there is any connection.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Call it 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock this evening.