

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock Thursday, March 11th, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General, The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I adjourned debate yesterday on this motion in order to get a chance to look at the report that is in Votes and Proceedings of which we have a copy today. As you know, I was not a member of the committee that drew up the lists and therefore I had no knowledge as to what committees I would be put on. I have now looked at the list of the various committees and I would kindly request that my name be added to the Privileges and Elections Committee and to the Statutory Regulations and Orders Committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: All those in favour please say aye.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I would like an answer on this question.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, this is a matter which poses a difficult problem. I think that it would not be advisable to accede to the request made by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland. I would point out to him that as a Member of the Legislature he is entitled to attend any of the meetings of the committees of the House, to participate in the debates, although not to vote, if he is not a member of the committee. I am inclined to think that the suggestion presented by the committee at this stage is a satisfactory one.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, if that is the case, I would then move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the report of the committee be referred back to committee for consideration on this matter.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): I think a point of order is at issue here, Madam Speaker, and I'm under the impression that the Minister's statement closed the debate, and therefore that no amendment is now in order. I wonder if that is the case.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, on the point of order, I thought that the honourable member had asked a question of the Minister. In fact, he got up specifically after and said, "Will the Minister answer my question?" So....

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): On points of order, Madam Speaker, may I suggest that you consider that the motion before the House is that the committee's report be received, not concurred in. It is normal, is it not, to have concurrence following it being received by the committee, and it would be at that stage, I'd suggest, when the report was being concurred in that the Honourable Member for Rhineland may make his amendment to refer it back to the committee to consider this matter. I think that that would be proper.....subject to your analysis at that point..

MR. FROESE:point of order, I doubt whether there are recommendations of concurrence on matters of this type.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I'm quite sure that I'm not in order -- I don't think the rest of the honourable members have been either -- but I'm unable to see why the government is opposed to the request made by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. If he wants to sit on these committees he is only one in a party, but I still believe whether he's one or ten that he should have some representation on these, with a right to vote, and actually who is it going to hurt if he is given that privilege?

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. All those in favour please say aye.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, on a further point of order, I made known to the committee the other day that bound copies of regulations are only passed on to members of the committee and I will be barred from getting such a report if I'm not on the committee.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may I pray the indulgence of the House to say a word? I don't think that I have any right to do this, but I would like to say that the problem here is in connection with the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations. It's a very small committee, and if my honourable friend is added to it it means that the whole structure of the commit-

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd)tee will have to be recast, and I really think that under the circumstances that it's open to question as to whether we should recast the committee under those circumstances. My honourable friend can attend it, can speak, can't vote. He will receive a copy of the bound orders because we have undertaken to send that out to every member. I can't remember what the other committee was that he asked to be on. . . .

MR. FROESE: Privileges and Elections.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I think that's a larger committee and he could be added to that one without any problem, but I'd ask him to consider the problem in connection with the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations. That's the problem there. If we put him on it means we will have to put on two or three other people as well; which probably will -- I really don't recommend it because that committee works admirably the way it is, and as my honourable friend is not barred in any way from taking part in the committee, except in voting, I think that should be a reasonable arrangement. I recognize I have no right to make these remarks and I thank the House for having given me the opportunity.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I think that you could skate everybody on side very easily here by simply putting the amendment that my honourable friend has moved, and then it's in order for any of us to make the remarks that we want to make. As I understand it, my honourable friend the Honourable Member for Rhineland has presented an amendment; it has been seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks; asking that the report of the committee be referred back, and I'm sure that that is in order at the present moment, and if that amendment were put then each one of us can say what we want to say on this matter without any.flirting with the rules of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Rhineland please present me with his motion?

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead):honourable member is writing out his motion, could I take this opportunity to direct a question to you, or to the Minister involved here, the Attorney-General. Is it the intention to move concurrence of this at some later time or is it being moved now?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, it is my understanding that it has not been customary to move concurrence in this report. It is moved to be received, and on its reception, if approved, then that is the end of the matter.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, that the report of the committee be referred back to the committee with further consideration of my request to have my name added to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and Statutory Orders and Regulations. All those in favour?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, inasmuch as it is now in order to discuss the question, I would simply urge that my honourable friend's request be acceded to, which would mean that we would hold another meeting of this committee and consider his request, because I think that as the honourable member is so anxious to serve on these committees that we should accommodate him. I know that through the years one particular committee -- Law Amendments -- has grown greatly to where, I made a quick count now and it appears to me as though there are 46 of the honourable members are members of that committee, which means that only 20 of the members outside of yourself, Madam Speaker, are not members of that committee. That has happened because of the fact it is recognized that a great majority even of the legislation goes to that committee and so more and more have been asking to get on it; and why shouldn't we allow the honourable member, if he is interested in helping out, to be a member?

Now as far as the particular work of the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations, I think the membership of that committee is twelve--(Interjection)--ten? I believe that only the Honourable Member for Selkirk and I are representatives of our group; the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks and the Honourable Member for Brokenhead of the New Democratic group. If my addition is correct that would add up to four. That would still leave the government with a majority. They would have six--(Interjection)--. Six. I'm figuring at the present time--(Interjection)--. My advisors here find that arithmetic too difficult to follow. Pardon? Six government and four from the Opposition. Well. Now if we have established that as being mathematically correct, then the point that I was coming to was that adding one more, just one -- let's get this straight -- would make it six to five. The government would still have a majority. Oh yes, oh yes. Then you elect a chairman, but the government still has the

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).....majority because in the case of a tie vote they have the man who has the vote. This is pretty simple, pretty elementary. And I suggest that it is not an unreasonable request, and as far as the other committee is concerned I say that even if the percentages are disarranged somewhat that it would be of no serious consequence.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, on looking over the report of the committee I find that the honourable member is on the Public Accounts Committee, the Agriculture and Conservation Committee, the Municipal Affairs Committee, the Law Amendments Committee, and if we put him on the two that he asks for, he will be on most of the committees of the House by far. I am, however, disposed to think the government ought to accept his amendment to have the matter reconsidered, and we will be glad to do that, but of course it will be on the understanding that we will have to reconstruct the structure of these two committees in order to keep the ratio between the various parties the same as it is now, that is relative to their strength in the House. So we have no hesitation in accepting the motion. It would have been helpful, I think, if my honourable friend had indicated in advance -- he certainly didn't do so to me; he may have done so to others -- what his wishes were in this matter, because our desire is to accommodate any member who wants to be on a committee. So we'll accept the particular motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Will you repeat the motion, please, Madam Speaker, because as I recall it it may not accommodate the First Minister.

MADAM SPEAKER: That the report of the committee be referred back to committee, with further consideration of my request to have my name added to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and Statutory Orders and Regulations.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if that motion is passed, it's specific and it only deals with the Member for Rhineland, and if the proposition that the First Minister has proposed to the House that the balance of the committee be considered, I think there should be an additive to the motion as proposed at the present time.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I certainly have no objection if they enlarge the committees. That is certainly up to the committee to consider if they feel that that is essential. Further, I want to thank the First Minister for giving consideration to the motion.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: The Honourable Leader of the NDP is correct. If you want to reconstitute the committees, change the numbers, you would have to have a different motion than what you have before you now.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, may I simply say that I don't know why reference is made to reconstituting the committees. I suppose it is the practice that you try to keep the committee strength in proportion to the strength in the House, but on the other hand, it is the practice in other jurisdictions to have members of the Opposition chair certain committees, like Public Accounts and so on, in the United Kingdom and at Ottawa. I think that this motion is a test of this government's magnanimity and political grace. I hope they support it.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, perhaps this would suit the situation if I were to adjourn the motion made by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland. That will keep the motion on the Order Paper and we'll come back and I'll ask the committee to meet some time before we come back again on this motion. If that is a solution to the particular problem at the moment, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills. The Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster) introduced Bill No. 73, an Act to amend The Horse Racing Regulation Act.

MR. PAULLEY introduced Bill No. 74, an Act to amend The Judgments Act.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks) introduced Bill No. 48, an Act to amend The West Kildonan Charter and to validate Bylaw No. 45/64/A of The City of West Kildonan.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews) introduced Bill No. 58, an Act to incorporate Strathcona Curling Club.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 78, an Act to incorporate The Manitoba Law School Foundation.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the resolutions standing in my name.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. ROBLIN: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first resolution for consideration by the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to establish The Highways Department and to provide, among other matters, that the costs of administering the department and carrying on the affairs of the department be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, you will remember that in the Throne Speech it was stated that we would be recommending a split of the Department of Public Works into two sections: the Department of Public Works proper, and the Department of Highways. These two resolutions are companion resolutions that give effect to that policy. The reason for doing this is because the work of the Department of Public Works as it stands now has been growing very rapidly, and particularly with the takeover of the very large mileage of municipal roads and new responsibilities in towns and villages, it's been decided that it's advisable to make this provision for two separate departments. This particular division will take care of the work load that we foresee in this area in the time immediately ahead of us.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, my first question is whether it is the intention of the government to have two separate ministers in the government to take care of these two departments now that they are set up as separate entities? Secondly, insofar as the Highways Department, will it be responsible now for all of the road construction -- that is, whatever road construction is done by other departments as well? For example, Forestry Branch who presently do some road work, or any of the other departments who have done some in the past, will they now be all concentrated under this? Secondly, the relationship with the municipalities and any work done for them, will it all be under this?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, respecting the personnel of the ministry, any changes in that connection will be made when decisions are reached with respect to them. I have no announcement to make at the moment about it. The department in effect will carry on the present functions that it's performing now, which includes practically all the things my honourable friend mentioned. --(Interjection)-- To a large degree it does. It takes care of a good deal of the Forestry -- it's maybe on a lease-out basis, but it actually does the work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution adopted? Second resolution: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting The Public Works Department and to provide, among other matters, that the costs of administering the department and carrying on the affairs of the department be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund. Resolution adopted? Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the committee has adopted certain resolutions, has requested me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 68, an Act respecting Highways and The Highway Department.

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 69, an Act respecting The Department of Public Works.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 60 Grade 8 students from Deer Lodge Junior High School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Mayer and Miss McGregor. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. James. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you. Orders of the Day.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to take a moment or two to invite the members of the Legislative Assembly once again to attend the Manitoba Winter Fair. As members who have attended will agree, it is an excellent opportunity to visit again one of the great show places of agriculture in the province,

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd). the other one being of course the Provincial Exhibition which is held in the summer. The Board of Directors and management have asked me to extend an invitation to the members of the Legislative Assembly and hope that as many as find it possible will accept the invitation.

MR. ROBLIN: I think that we would all like to express our thanks to the Honourable Member for Brandon for this annual invitation of his on behalf of the directors of the Brandon Institution, and I for one hope that the House will feel disposed to accept. In fact, it might be a good idea if we would agree to take the day, which I think is March 30th -- Tuesday, March 30th -- as a day in which we might pay this visit to Brandon. I know that some of my colleagues are considering the possibility of making some stops on the way to Brandon, perhaps to look at the civil defence installations at Shilo which have been attracting some interest recently, and if possible maybe some industrial installations, too. But in any case a program will be worked out in conjunction with the visit to Brandon, which will give us an opportunity to do some other things as well. So, if it's generally thought to be a good idea, we could anticipate setting aside Tuesday, March 30th, for this purpose.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Labour. Repeatedly we have had examples of fires being allowed to destroy property and endanger lives while firemen are waiting for permission to fight these fires outside of their own city boundaries. Now, a month or so ago a fire happened on a home -- completely destroyed a home on Rosser Road, and the lives of two children aged two and three were endangered. I wonder if the Minister intends to do anything to rectify this sad state of affairs and to see that all the people of this province are protected from fire when at all possible.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, this is a municipal responsibility. However, I would be prepared to take notice of part of the question and inform the honourable members of the House of the answer.

MR. DESJARDINS: May I ask what part of the question is -- I thought that the Minister of Labour was responsible for the fire fighting in all the province.

MR. BAIZLEY: No, the Minister of Labour has the responsibility for the Fire Commissioner's Office which co-operates with the municipal fire departments insofar as training is concerned and in the prevention of fires throughout Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, in a case like this shouldn't this be the responsibility of the Minister to see that this is done? This has been going on for a number of years and I don't think this should be allowed to continue. Maybe the Cabinet or the First Minister -- maybe I should ask the question of the First Minister.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Would he inform the House whether Metro has the authority to give a grant or make a contribution to the Pan-Am Games?

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, this is a legal opinion that my honourable friend asks for, and at the moment I'm not prepared to give it to him.

MR. SCHREYER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. I would like him to take it as notice, since I didn't have an opportunity to give him notice. I would ask him if there is any standing statutory order or regulation which requires that anyone commencing construction of a house must make sure that the house is a certain number of feet back of the right-of-way? This would pertain to the limited access highways.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): I think, Madam Speaker, without giving the honourable member the details, the answer is yes.

MR. SCHREYER: a supplementary question. Would the Minister be aware offhand of the footage or the number of feet involved?

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, I can't without knowing the location. It varies from 250 feet, I believe it is, to 1500 feet, at varying locations.

MR. SCHREYER: A supplementary question, Madam Speaker. Do I take it then that 250 is the minimum?

MR. WEIR: Just offhand -- I don't like to be too definite -- but it seems to me that 250 is the minimum. I stand to be corrected on further checking.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, pursuing the question to the Minister of Labour, is it my understanding then -- is it correct to say that the Minister will not accept responsibility

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)..... for this and does not intend to do anything to correct the situation?

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, I believe I informed my honourable friend what the duties of the Fire Commissioner's Office are, and that I will take notice of that part of his question in which there may be an improvement.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a further question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. With respect to The Metro Act coming under his department and the subject having been discussed quite frequently in the House, is this matter being considered by him, whether they have the right to make a contribution or not?

MR. SMELLIE: No.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Has the Metro the authority to levy for Pan-Am Games?

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, so far as I am aware Metro do not have this authority, but as I told my honourable friend, this is an expression of a legal opinion. Without complete perusal of the Metro Act I cannot give him a firm assurance that this is the case. I am aware of no provision that gives them this authority.

MR. GUTTORMSON: When does the Minister intend to make this perusal so the House will know the answer?

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to address a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Is it correct that a committee has been set up by the government to investigate the impact of the heat tax on low income groups?

MR. ROBLIN: I have no announcement to make in that connection, Madam Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House be issued for a return showing: (a) How much was paid by the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company Limited to Stone and Webster Limited for consulting services in the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and the last complete accounting year? (b) Has the Public Utility Board ever been required to make a ruling relative to these payments? (c) If so, when and why?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 41. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, it seems that in the past I have been too critical of the government. The untouchables on the front seats object to me talking about this lack of leadership that we have in this province. After all, it is rather embarrassing for them. I must admit, Madam Speaker, that on this occasion again it is very tempting to draw attention to this leadership, or rather lack of leadership, but for once I will try to be a real nice guy --(Interjections)--and knowing how much respect the members opposite me have for you, I thought that I would let you be the judge to see if we have the proper leadership here.

Now, I think it would be well at this time to look back at the uniform time story. Of course, we will have to look back at the infancy, you might say, and we shall look back at the session of 1962. In 1962, Madam Speaker, we can find on Page 69 of Hansard of February 21st, I made the following motion: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, whereas for many years some areas of the Province of Manitoba have instituted Daylight Saving Time for varying periods of the year, while other areas of the province retain Standard Time; and whereas the lack of uniform time in the province has caused concern, inconvenience, hardship and considerable economic loss; and whereas it has created great difficulties in school districts and particularly in those school districts which overlap varying time zones; therefore be it resolved that uniform time be established in the Province of Manitoba and that it be the Central Standard Time for the period from the first of September to the 31st of May inclusive, and Central Daylight Time from the first of June to the 31st of August inclusive."

Well, Madam Speaker, shortly after, this motion was amended by the, I believe the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, who wanted to include the Labour Day weekend. This was accepted by our party here and we were ready to go along with this, but then all of a sudden, after some discussion on this, the House was favoured with an amendment from the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). Honourable Member from St. James. Now the Honourable Member from St. James moved that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after "whereas" in the fourth line thereof and substituting the following: "the 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 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. "

Now the Honourable Member from St. James, while presenting this amendment, stated that he was in favour of uniform time but he didn't think we were quite ready for this. Well, one of our honourable members, who is usually very calm, was very disturbed by this motion, and this is what he said, and I would like at this time to read his complete speech, the speech from the Honourable Member from Selkirk: "Mr. Speaker, this is the weaseliest amendment that has ever been" -- this is a new word coined in this session -- "This is the 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." This is the end of the speech, Madam Speaker.

Now again as I say, I leave it to you to see if this was suggesting leadership on the part of the government. My friend the Leader of the NDP felt somewhat like the Member from Selkirk and he added: "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. "

Then we had quite a bit of arguing back and forth, and when it got kind of tough for the government, well of course the Minister for Mines and Natural Resources got up and got everything all mixed up again. This is what he said, somewhere around in his speech. He says, "We all agree that there should be some uniform time in Manitoba" -- uniform time, Madam Speaker -- "daylight and/or standard. And we say that, being in agreement, what are the periods that you two groups recommend?" He was explaining this was a good amendment. "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 the objection is across the way at all." And later on this is what he said: "So all I say to the honourable members opposite, Mr. Speaker, is that before we talk about weasel action -- and 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 problem," -- well that was a slip of the tongue. I think he was sorry that he said that, because I asked him a question about the school. -- "and I need only mention road building and we could go on right through. "

Well then, this is what my, to give you the idea of the comparison between this side and that side of the House, this is what my Leader had to say: "While 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) -- or 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 is 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 is, in the school divisions in particular. This is a very difficult problem in particular for those who are close to the Metropolitan area or other area that goes on daylight saving time. In a number of cases we

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) find a portion of the school district being on one time and another part being on another time."

Well, of course, the amendment carried and that killed it for that year--(Interjection)-- Oh -- no, I think there's something that would be -- I see I've a note, something that was said by the Minister of Agriculture -- that's usually very interesting. I'd better find this; oh here it is: "I am quite aware," -- this is the Minister of Agriculture -- "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 schedule and their life to a time schedule that isn't of their own choosing. I was asked not too 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 friggging around with the time. Now the first chapter of Genesis, "oh well I won't read the sermon; no, I'll give you the page. Oh yes, he talks about compromise here: "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." This was the Minister of Agriculture.

So then, of course, the vote was taken, as I said earlier, and the amendment preventing anybody from doing anything was passed. Well, Madam Speaker, is this leadership? I would like to ask you that question. Then, of course, the following session after I imagine receiving a report from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association, we would get some action -- at least, we thought we would.

Well, came the 1963 Session; and again, I announced before the session started that I would bring in the same resolution as amended and as accepted by -- the amendment following the amendment of the NDP, and I was very attentive in trying to listen to what would be said in the Throne Speech and I was rewarded, because these words, if I could find those words in there: "A measure to provide for uniform time will be proposed by my Minister." Well, I thought finally that the government would do something about this, so after that at the demand, mind you, of the Honourable the First Minister -- and we're great friends so I accepted this -- I withdrew my resolution because it was felt that it would be anticipating.

Well, the Minister of Municipal Affairs stood up in this House to present Bill No. 34, and he made a good speech. He explained the time that we had when this -- about 100 years ago people obtained their time from the church clock, or from the village hall; each community had its own local time; essentially communities on the same north and south line had similar times, but there was great variation. "So many different local times became exceedingly inconvenient and confusing as travel became more common, and as people moved from one community to another more easily the inconvenience of running railway trains through town after town separated by only a few miles but on different times became such that the adoption of a system of standard time zones was advocated," and then he explained about the time in England and different places, Canada and so on.

This is what he said a little later: "This haphazard use of daylight saving time throughout the province has created a situation which is remarkably similar to that before the adoption of standard time zones, and the confusion has bothered quite a number of people. In 1961 the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association each requested the enactment of legislation providing for the adoption of uniform time." Now, he states that the Union of Manitoba Municipalities in their 59th annual convention held in Winnipeg in November of 1962 passed the following resolution: "Whereas at the present time there are two different times being observed in the Province of Manitoba, causing various confusion; therefore be it resolved that the Council of the Rural Municipality of Rosser petition the Provincial Government to enact legislation making a uniform time in the Province of Manitoba mandatory, and further, that a copy of the resolution be sent to the Honourable Duff Roblin and a copy to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. And this resolution was carried by that convention.

"The Manitoba Urban Association in their convention held in the City of St. James in September, 1962, passed the following resolution: 'That the Manitoba Urban Association urge the Provincial Government to institute Daylight Saving Time on a provincial basis.' Recently the Manitoba Farmers' Union presented a brief to the government and to the other caucuses represented in this House, and in that brief there was a section which read as follows dealing

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).with Daylight Saving Time: 'We wish to express our disappointment that the Government of Manitoba did not show appropriate leadership,' -- the untouchables won't like this -- "'during the recent election by holding a province-wide plebiscite on Daylight Saving Time in conjunction with the election.' They went on to say, 'We are quite confident that the people of this province, including the majority in our urban centers, are dissatisfied with Daylight Saving Time for such long periods each year. We have stated on many occasions that farmers generally are opposed to it entirely. However,' -- you see, even these people wanted to compromise -- "'as outlined in our submissions during the past couple of years, we are prepared to compromise by going along with Daylight Saving Time for the summer holiday period' "'.

And then there was the Chamber of Commerce that made a resolution: "Whereas there is considerable confusion and inconvenience created by Daylight Saving Time when certain areas of our province change over to Daylight Saving Time for the summer months and other areas of the province stay on Standard Time; and whereas all indications are that Daylight Saving Time is here to stay; therefore be it resolved Daylight Saving Time be introduced on a province-wide basis to eliminate the confusion by an Act of the Legislature".

"Well the provisions of this bill on Daylight Saving Time, -- this is the Honourable Minister that introduced this that made this remark, -- "provisions of this bill on Daylight Saving Time are in many respects a compromise. It is similar to the recommendation which gave rise to the adoption of our present system of Standard Time. We hope that it may provide an acceptable solution to a time situation which has become increasingly troublesome."

Well so far -- mind you, he was just a year late but it was acceptable. This is what we had said in 1962 but all of a sudden, when things were going real well, this Minister, who was introducing this as a Minister, I had been asked to withdraw my motion because it was anticipating, and this is what he said. This again -- I'd suggest that you pay particular attention to this, Madam Speaker, because this will certainly have something to do, I imagine, with your decision, to see if you think we have the proper leadership, and I quote from Hansard. This is good, so I think I should give you the page: Page 1104, April 10, 1963; "The only thing that is evident is that at the present time the people of Manitoba desire some uniformity in the time that is adopted for the people of this province. While the government is presenting this bill, we have no intention of forcing this bill upon the people of Manitoba if this is not the desire of a large proportion of them, and this bill will not be treated as an expression of confidence in the government -- we do not intend to force it through." I don't know what he means here, "We do not intend to force it through". It must mean that they usually force things through. Of course, when I talk about steam rolling they don't like that either, so I don't know what to say to them, so you see this is what -- things were going well; all of a sudden there was no leadership; it was left in the air and it was -- well it didn't matter to him. He wasn't too interested at all.

Well, it was this business of uniformity that they wanted to bring in, and you see right here, Madam Speaker, at the end, after closing the debate on second reading, my Leader stated, "I don't believe I asked the Minister, but I asked him whether he was in favour of the bill or not, after its presentation," because nobody knew, I don't think he knew himself, if he was in favour or not. Well, I apologize to the Honourable Leader, Madam Speaker, I am in favour of the bill and I would suggest to the honourable member, that the time stated for Daylight Saving Time in this bill is a compromise, and like all compromises, it won't be satisfactory to everyone -- he knew this. Well, between those people who don't want Daylight Saving Time at all, to those who want it for a period of six months or more, and to those who think it should be a shorter period. But he repeats again and again, the principle involved in this bill is the principle of uniform time.

I suggest to the House that the length of time in which this province should have Daylight Saving Time is a matter of some dispute, and that is the point on which I have really no strong views. It didn't matter to him. Everybody in the House knew, realized that this would be difficult, but this was clear. I agreed with this. Madam Speaker, he said that the important thing, the principle, was uniform time; the period, well some people would be happy when we compromise and it would change, but that would be fine -- the period would change but not the principle. This was the main thing. In fact, at this time the Minister was very interested in knowing what I was going to do, and he was challenging me. Here, he said, "I would just say, Madam Speaker, that if the Honourable Member for St. Boniface thinks the bill should be withdrawn, if he doesn't like the bill, or the principle that's involved in the bill, then he should

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). either amend it in committee, or he should vote against it so that we know where the Honourable Member stands. Well I think I know where I stand. And I think the members of this House know where I stand on this. But we don't know where he stands. The principle involved in this bill is the principle of uniform time, again, I would suggest to the honourable members that they should vote in favour of this principle, so that the bill may go to committee where we may discuss what the time should be. Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried". That's it.

Well, what have we got now? This is a new bill, just a year or two years later. We have partly uniform -- everybody is on Standard for awhile; everybody is on Daylight; somebody is on Daylight; somebody is on Standard; everything is all mixed up again and where did the question of compromise -- this is all gone by the board. The principle of uniform time, this is all gone, too. Well, Madam Speaker, with this question of principle I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, that Bill No. 41 be not now read a second time, but that it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should not depart from the principle of uniform time throughout the whole province.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the Second Reading of Bill No. 14. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, this -- normally on second reading we're supposed to debate the principle of the bill, but as members can see obviously this particular bill before us contains no thorough going principles, but it's rather an omnibus bill containing many changes to the Act. The reason I adjourned the debate was because I was interested in the provisions of Section 984, coming under Section 21 of the bill, or Clause 21. Upon reading it for the first time, I gained the impression that what was being provided for here was an exemption from municipal taxation for public and private schools, and at first I thought that this was an innovation, to say the least. But upon checking with my colleague from St. John's and upon checking the statutes of 1958 and 1960 and so on, I find that it is not an innovation; in fact, I am not sure, on reading this section very carefully, I am not sure what the net effect of the proposed change here is. It is my understanding that as of 1958 it was possible to exempt the lands of private schools by means of a municipal bylaw, and it is my understanding that since 1958 it has been possible to exempt from taxation the buildings of a private school, including accommodation buildings, by means of a municipal bylaw. Now I take it that the effect of Section 21 and the reconstitution of Section 984 will be that now it is going to be taken away from local option? In other words, you are making it general and mandatory under the Act. I have no criticism to make of this, I am merely asking for information.

Also, but if this is the effect, Madam Speaker, then it is confusing to read on Page 8 of the bill, Section 21, Clause 3(b), the end of that long clause paragraph, there is reference to approval being obtained from the Minister of Education and exemption by bylaw of the council, so there is reference again to bylaw of the municipal council. If this is so, then this was the previous practice, and I don't know what the change is, if any.

And then I also find it a little confusing, Madam Speaker, to read in the bill, Section 21, paragraph 4, or clause 4, where it reads, "subject to subsections 5 and 6, the following lands are exempt from but only from, taxation levied by the council of a municipality for school purposes, namely, " and it goes on. And it makes reference there to the exemption, the possible exemption, of buildings and contiguous lands used in connection with a college or seminary, to the extent of 4 acres, etcetera. In other words, it seems to me that we are being asked to provide here for the exemption from municipal taxation, for school purposes only, of buildings and land held by a college. In other words, is a distinction being made here in this bill between a private affiliated college and a private elementary or secondary school? It would seem so.

All in all, Madam Speaker, after having gone through the original Section 984 of The Municipal Act as it appears in the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1954, and after having gone through the subsequent amendments passed in 1956 and 1958 and 1959, 1960, when comparing all that with the proposed amendment in this bill, I am not sure what the net change is with regard to taxation or the exemption from taxation, relative to private schools. If one were to ask I would say that I am certainly in favour of the principle of granting exemptions to private

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). and parochial schools, exemptions from municipal taxation. Well, when the Minister has a chance to read all this in Hansard -- I suppose I haven't been too articulate in putting my question to him, but I think that the kind of questions I asked are the kind that don't lend themselves to easy question and answer. And I would appreciate whatever enlightenment the Minister could give me at some subsequent date.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I think that before the question is put, I should attempt at this time to answer some of the questions which have been put by honourable members concerning this bill. The Honourable Member for Selkirk led off -- I think, pardon me, it was the Honourable Member for Inkster really who started the debate on this bill -- and his first question was -- I'm not exactly clear yet as to what he meant by his question but I would gather that he wanted to know what the exemption for schools was based on. And I presume that he was referring to the amendments to Section 984. This is really -- in this section there is a reference to the area of school property that is allowed exempt from taxation. And this is exactly the same as it was in the previous section, four acres. I might perhaps at this time also refer to the question of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, because he seemed puzzled by the same thing. This four acres can be extended in some cases, where for a variety of reasons a school may require more than the four acres for the ordinary purposes of recreation in connection with the school. It happened in cases recently where we have more than one school built on the same school grounds. For example, we may have had an elementary school site at one time, and then the Division Board has come along and built another school really on the same grounds, which has extended the area necessary for play area and this sort of thing. In many cases it has been necessary for the Minister of Education to certify that in his opinion it was necessary for the school to have more than four acres. That's the only reason why this is put in here. There is no change in principle as far as the area of property that the school is entitled to have from what it was before.

Now let us deal first of all with the change that is effected by the new Section 984. Under the old Section 984 most of the properties referred to as exempt properties were exempt from the payment of municipal taxes but they were subject to the payment of school taxes and local improvement levies. The new Section 984 is based on the recommendation contained in the Michener Report which said that most of these exempt properties had some obligation to pay municipal taxes because they did receive services from a municipality. There were some in which we have not been able to accept this principle, such things as municipal lands, the public schools and so on where we have not requested them to pay municipal taxes as such. But in Subsection (1) of the new 984 all lands are liable to taxation. In Subsection (2) we provide the first exceptions and these are those properties that are exempt from both school and municipal taxation and even local improvements, and there are only two exemptions there; they are the Crown lands and the Indian lands.

In Subsection (3) -- now this is where you come to a change in principle -- Subsection (3) these lands are exempt from municipal taxation except for local improvements. They are also exempt from school taxation. I think this is clear that the lands in Subsection (3), which includes schools and hospitals, etcetera, are subject only to taxation for local improvements but they will be subject to all taxation for local improvements; that is, for either frontage tax or for tax which may be imposed on the whole of the municipality as a special levy for a local improvement, not exceeding four-sevenths of the total cost of the local improvement.

When you come to Subsection (4) of the new 984 you find the properties that are exempt from school tax only. These properties are subject to municipal taxation and to local improvement taxation and this includes most of the properties that we generally consider to be of a public service nature, charitable organizations and the like. They include homes for the elderly, agricultural society properties, properties owned by colleges, and so on. Now by colleges, these are usually institutions of further learning rather than elementary or secondary schools. And buildings used for religious and charitable purposes, etcetera.

The provision is further made that the municipality may, if they deem it desirable, reduce the amount of municipal taxation that these people will be required to pay. This leaves it in the municipality's discretion. In the past the municipality had very little discretion because the exemptions granted an exemption from school tax, or from municipal tax rather. They were subject to the payment of school tax. A municipality could not pass a bylaw to exempt them from payment of school tax. They could, however, pass a bylaw to cancel taxes after they became due but in the case where they did this then the rest of the taxpayers in the municipi-

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd).pality were required to pay the amount of school tax that was levied against that property, because the municipality had to pay to the school the amount of money that was levied against that property whether it was collected or not.

Many of these properties such as, well, elderly persons' housing is a good example, because there you have many municipalities joining together in some cases in order to operate one institution. Under the proposed amendment the municipality in which the institution is built may determine how much it's fair that they should receive from that institution to cover the cost of services that the municipality provides for the institution, and they may exempt it from payment of any further taxation above and beyond what they feel is reasonable. Thus the people of one municipality are not required to pay taxes on an institution which really serves people of many municipalities or at least more than one.

The Honourable Member for St. John's then raised the question about ratepayer votes and the policy that is being followed in this connection and he indicated the change that had first been made by government, the change from 60 per cent to a simple majority of the rate-payers on a money bylaw. This policy was introduced simply because it's one of our democratic principles that if a majority wants a particular thing, the majority of the people that have to pay for it through direct taxation, then they should, by the expression of their will, be able to carry the vote, and it should not require more than the ordinary simple majority.

Then he went on to the question of why were there certain exemptions such as the exemptions for centennial projects. Well, the centennial project stands by itself because this is a once only proposition. Most municipalities will have only one centennial project. This is the hundredth birthday of our country, and will also be the hundredth birthday in 1970 of this province. So this legislation was introduced in order to give municipalities the opportunity to celebrate in a suitable way these two birthdays. It's a once only proposition. It is a limited amount, limited to one mill of taxation for eight years as the maximum or, under the proposed amendment at this time, to borrowing of an amount equal to eight mills on the 1963 assessment. I think this is a somewhat different proposition than others which are continuing where you could have a new proposal made by the municipality in every year, where they could have a borrowing bylaw for similar projects every year or every other year and the amount of debt created could be beyond the ability of ratepayers to bear.

And then the Honourable Member for St. John's went on to discuss the question of the amendment dealing with tax certificates, Section 1191, and the Honourable Member for Selkirk referred to the same matter when he was addressing the House, and I believe that both of the honourable members fell into the same trap. It wasn't intentionally designed that way, but in the explanatory note it is most misleading. The explanatory note says this makes it permissive rather than mandatory to issue a tax certificate and this is certainly not the intention of the amendment at all, and if my honourable friends had taken the time to go to the Act and read the amendment in conjunction with the existing section they would have recognized what the change proposed to do. The amendment says, "by striking out the word 'may' in the second line and substituting therefor the word 'shall' the section will now read as follows: 'The Treasurer of a municipality on demand shall furnish to any person a tax certificate which shall be in the following form' ". Previously it read "which may be in the following form". This does not make it permissive to issue a tax certificate. It's still mandatory but it is now also mandatory that the form of the tax certificate shall be the one prescribed in the Act.

And then the next form of the amendment again in Section 36 of the bill there is another paragraph added to the form of the tax certificate which makes it mandatory that the municipality must show to the person requesting a tax certificate whether or not the owner of that property is indebted to the municipality for hospital premiums. The purpose of this, of course, is to clearly cover the point that was raised by the Honourable Member for St. John's and by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that this information must be made available to people who purport to deal with land, else all kinds of unfortunate situations can arise. I would just like to reassure the honourable members on that point, that it will still be mandatory to issue tax certificates.

The Honourable Member for St. John's referred to my remarks, and perhaps I didn't make it quite clear what I meant when I was talking about the date for the filing of the assessment roll with the municipality. The previous date it is correct was July and the date now will be in October -- October the 1st -- and I suggested that this would make it possible for the assessment rolls to be delivered to municipalities earlier than in the past. In effect this is correct because when the assessment rolls had to be delivered in July, in many cases the field

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd).work on the assessment had not been done. The field work is done, particularly in rural municipalities, in the summer months and it's often quite possible to deliver an assessment roll to a municipality covering work done in that summer, by October, but it was seldom possible to deliver that assessment roll by July 15th so that in effect many municipalities will be getting their assessment rolls a year sooner than they would have under the previous provisions.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk raised some other points that are certainly interesting and I don't want to disagree with my honourable friend at the present time. He's talking about Section 430 (a) of the present Municipal Act which deals with the establishment of recreation commissions, and I agree with him that the Act could be much more specific than it is. I think, however, that this is a matter that we can well leave until the time of the complete revision of The Municipal Act. There are only a very small number of municipalities that are using this section at the present time and I think this is one of those things that can wait for the general revision.

I have noted also the other remarks that he makes concerning with delegated and municipal powers, and the suggestion that he has made that there perhaps should be a special Act dealing with this, and again I don't want to disagree with him but I don't want to debate it with him either at this time.

Then he raises another question concerning the levies for Centennial under Section 436 (a) and (b). At the present time, before this amendment, a municipality may levy one mill per year for the years 1963 to 1970, both inclusive. Most -- I shouldn't say most, but many municipalities have missed already the years 1963 and 1964 because in many cases they didn't have a Centennial project decided upon, or they didn't know whether they were going to have one at all or not. And if they did, they didn't really know whether they were going to need a mill in each year for all of the eight years possible. Some municipalities have gone ahead and levied the mill in spite of the fact that they didn't have a Centennial project in mind, firmed up, knowing exactly where they were going to go. The intention of the present provisions is, that if a municipality has already levied under 436 (a) they may now change their minds and levy under 436 (b), which is the borrowing section, where they may borrow the equivalent of eight mills on 1963 assessment, less the amounts that they have already levied, or less one mill for each of the years in which they have already levied. But if they have, if they take advantage of Section 436 (b) then it will not be possible for them to come back and make any levy under Section 436 (a) -- that is, the one mill per year from now till 1970. My honourable friend nods his head. I think we understand each other. It's a rather difficult point.

MR. HILLHOUSE:the other point was that if they have made a levy under 436 (a), then decide to make one under 436 (b), the amount of the levy under 436 (b) is reduced in accordance with the provisions of Subsection 3 of 436.

MR. SMELLIE: That's correct. If they have already levied under the (a) section they must reduce the amount that they borrow by one mill for each year in which they levied under the (a) section.

MR. HILLHOUSE: In other instances, if they have levied under 436 (a) and now levy under 436 (b), they can't now levy under 436.

MR. SMELLIE: They can't change their mind and go back and levy under 436 (a). That's correct.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wasn't sure on that.

MR. SMELLIE: I'm not entirely sure that I understand the difficulty that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead is having with the new Section 984. It is true, there is a distinction in the present bill as between a college and a private school. Private schools, under this section, insofar as municipal taxation are concerned are not treated any differently than any other school. But the colleges are subject to taxation for municipal purposes where the schools are not. My honourable friend nods his head so I think that perhaps we understand each other. The question of the exemption for more than four acres for a school, whether private or public, has always required the assent of the Minister of Education. This is no change from the previous Act, although the type of taxation will have changed. But it will still require the approval by the Minister of Education merely so that somebody takes the trouble to ensure that this property is really needed by this school, is not being held for speculative purposes, or something of that nature.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, previously the exemption was discretionary by municipal bylaw. Now, it is mandatory by law and the municipal council have discretionary

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd).....power only that amount over and above four acres. Is that the difference?

MR. SMELLIE: No, I think my honourable friend still does not understand it quite correctly. Previously the land owned by a school meeting the requirements of the School Attendance Act was exempt from taxation for municipal purposes and if they had more than four acres it required a bylaw of the municipality and the approval of the Minister of Education for the extra, over four acres. This is still the same. There is no change. But now they are exempt from the payment of school taxes, but they are not -- school taxes and municipal taxes -- there is really no change in this provision at all. They still need a bylaw of the municipality if they have more than four acres, and the approval of the Minister of Education.

Madam, I think this gives the answers to most of the questions that honourable members have asked during the course of this debate, and I expect that there may be other matters of detail that could more properly be discussed in committee where the opportunity will arise.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would permit me. I should have asked him this question during his discussion and if it's out of order for him to reply now, that's okay by me. But I would like to give him notice of this if he is not able to answer. I'm concerned with Section 2(a) as to a definition of what is meant by the property in the Crown and this section prohibits a municipality from levying taxes on land belonging to or held in trust for the Crown. I have a peculiar situation in my own City of Transcona where a railway installation claims that it is operating on behalf of the Crown in the rights of Canada, and I was wondering whether this might be an additional hurdle for the City of Transcona should it ever vote a liquidation or attempt to levy taxes against the railway holding in Transcona.

MR. SMELLIE: The previous section read that all land shall be liable to taxation by municipalities subject to the following exemptions: (a) lands belonging to or held in trust for the Crown, and so there is really no change whatsoever in the principle of this matter.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the Second Reading of Bill No. 7. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, I adjourned this debate for the purpose of discussing certain of the contents of this bill with certain municipal people. I've had my discussion and I'm prepared to vote for the second reading of the bill. However, I would suggest to the Minister that it might be advisable to include this bill among some of the other municipal bills which you were going to refer to that committee which was going to sit during recess, as I am of the opinion that there are a number of municipal people who would like to go into this matter of planning a little more thoroughly.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I just have one short comment to make on Bill 7 and that is that while the bill seems to commend itself in most respects there is one particular provision here which is rather disturbing and that is 23 (b), Subsection (3), where it gives the Minister the jurisdiction and the authority to quash -- to vary, confirm or quash any order or decision of the responsible planning appeal authority. And it seems to me rather unreasonable that we should be making provision here for the establishment of advisory planning commissions and for the establishment of planning appeal commissions or boards, and then to give the Minister on the other hand this sort of power to override and quash whatever decisions these boards might come to. Maybe this is something that's not unusual, but reading it in the context of this bill alone it seems unusual and I suppose the place to deal with that is in committee. But it's a reservation that I would have,

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I note the comments of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that perhaps this Bill should go to Committee, but I would be rather reluctant to take this procedure because it means delaying the introduction of the effect of the bill for a year. Basically, all the bill does is give the local planning commission a lot more authority than it had previously. It's a much simpler procedure than the previous one for minor amendments to a planning scheme. This is the procedure used now in the metropolitan area where minor amendments such as well, side yard requirements was the example used before, would go to, in the metropolitan area goes to the Board of Review. In this case, it would go to the planning commission of the municipality where they would decide the question on its merits. Then they have, as my honourable friend from Brokenhead pointed out, an appeal to the Minister. They have always had this appeal, anyway. Under the present section, they have to introduce a new planning scheme or an amending planning scheme and that planning scheme has to be approved first of all by the planning commission, then go to council. The council may hear objections by any person whose property may be affected and council may make a decision, one way or the other; they may reject the amendment or they may approve it. If they approve it, it's then forwarded to the Minister for approval, and really you have the same sort of thing here except that the persons who object to this minor change by the planning committee must appeal to the Minister and the Minister then has the right to review or to have the Municipal Board conduct the review and a public hearing. The only intention here is that the Minister —he doesn't generally speaking, upset an award by a municipality. If there is an objection raised to the Minister, the policy has always been to send it to the municipal board for a public hearing and the decision of the board is accepted, but I think it's necessary that you must have this provision for appeal because people may have the feeling that their rights are being over-ruled arbitrarily and without some method of appeal from Council I think we would have a storm of protest from some people who believe their property might be injuriously affected by such a decision.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I realize that I would be out of order to speak at this point, but I would like to ask the Minister whether it would not be a good idea since it is the policy by his own admission, for the Minister to refer the decisions to the Municipal Board so that there may be a public hearing. That's the key, that there may be a hearing of the two opposing groups. If it's policy, why not have it in the Act?

MR. SMELLIE: The only reason why it comes to the Minister in the first place Madam Speaker, is because in very exceptional cases, but there are some, you do receive very frivolous appeals which are intended to embarrass council or to embarrass the local planning committee. The procedure of going to the Municipal Board is more costly. It costs on the average, an appeal to the Municipal Board runs somewhere in the neighborhood of \$110 to \$120 in costs. So this is just a method of screening out those few that we think are really frivolous appeals and don't really mean anything, in which case the Minister exercises his prerogative and approves the amendment. But this happens very very seldom. I think only once in the time that I have had the responsibility.

MR. SCHREYER: could put one more question to the Minister. I can see the point that this would be a method of screening out the lesser cases and the semi-frivolous or frivolous ones, but even where the Minister does exercise his prerogative then and makes the final decision, doesn't he think it would be more fair to allow for both sides to be represented in his presence, even in these other cases?

MR. SMELLIE: In even the frivolous ones we have had, both sides had full opportunity to explain the case and where there has been eventually a reference to the Municipal Board we have still heard the parties to the matter and as I say in only one case where we determined it was frivolous, both parties were certainly consulted and given the opportunity in the presence of one another to make their case known and I don't think that even the person who made the frivolous appeal was too deeply disturbed.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 35. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, Bill 35 before us amends the legislation passed last year which was also Bill 35. The first section deals with section 10 which just changes if anyone is affected from the producer to any person that might be affected. I don't have any quarrels with this. I think this is good because certainly we do not want to harm people even though they may not be producers but still might be affected. But my objections come to the other parts and that is subsection (1) of subsection (20) and I'd like to read the section of the Act passed last year

(MR. FROESE, cont'd)..... --and I'm quoting now: "Section 20, subsection (1) Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council a producer board may make regulations, imposing fees and charges on producers of any regulated product under its jurisdiction and may collect the fees and charges so imposed." This Bill that is before us now, would change the onus from the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and place it on the Manitoba Board to make regulations and imposing fees and charges and so on, and the collection thereof. It seems to me that the government is trying to get out from under. I have a suspicion that they do not like or probably do not even support some of the actions taken or the regulations that are being imposed on producers, and it seems to me that they are just trying to wash their hands of some of the things that are taking place today.

It also seems to me that they don't want to take the responsibility that they should assume and that they did assume under the old section. In my opinion we are delegating undue powers, undue legislative powers which have the force of law, to the Board, and they in turn can delegate those powers to the Producer Board. This I think is wrong. And the other section, section (3) which refers to subsection 29 delegates the same powers to the commission. One deals with the producer board, the other one with the commission, so that in a way they are identical. They delegate powers which in my opinion are wrong, and as stated by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that I too think that they would not stand up in Court if they were challenged.

I objected to the legislation when it was brought in last year, and I objected most strenuously. I still object to that legislation and much stronger to what they are proposing now.

MR. GRAY:on the same question, is the marketing board responsible to anyone?

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

HONOURABLE GEORGE HUTTON, (Minister of Agriculture), (Rockwood-Iberville):
Madam Speaker, if no one wishes to speak or put any more question, I'd simply like to point out that the delegation here is from the Legislature to a Producer Board in the one case, or to a Commission in the other, under the other section under part 3, subject to the approval of the Manitoba Marketing Board. The Manitoba Marketing Board has certain specific responsibilities. It is their responsibility to enforce the regulations under the Act, and to supervise the operations of any Boards and Commissions which may be established under this legislation. There is no question whatsoever about the constitutionality of this delegation of authority. As a matter of fact, if you were to refer to section 17 --I'd just like to read section 17 to the members. It says "Subject to the approval of the Manitoba Board, a Producer Board may make regulations fixing minimum prices or maximum prices or both maximum prices and minimum prices at which a regulated product of its jurisdiction, etcetera." Now if we are going to delegate the authority to fix prices to a producer board, subject to the approval of the Manitoba Board, certainly there is nothing very sinister about delegating the authority to a Producer Board or a Marketing Commission to impose fees or charges on the producers subject to the approval of the Manitoba Board.

The Manitoba Board after the legislation was brought into force in 1964 has been expanded. There are now representatives of the business community. Stewart Searle Jr. is serving on the Manitoba Board, Mrs. Harry Mather is representing the consumers on the Manitoba Board, Mr. Edwin Dalglish is representing the producers, Mr. Darwin Chase the Director of Co-operative and Credit Union Services Branch is the government representative on the board and the Chairman is Dr. Art Wood of the University of Manitoba. So the Board presents a representative group from the community at large whose responsibility it is to see that any boards or commissions or plans that are established under the legislation operate not only in the interests of the farmer producer but in the best interests of the community at large. I do believe that even after this short period of time, the changes that we made last year have fostered a sense of confidence in this type of approach to marketing that we didn't have in the past and I would recommend this small change to the House.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 38. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, may we have this matter stand. However if anyone else wishes to speak we would have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, this has always been an interesting matter as far as the New Democratic Party is concerned, the question of the Election Act in the Province of Manitoba. It is not my purpose this afternoon to attempt to cover the Act in its entirety, but I am intrigued however, with one or two matters concerning the Act and also one or two omissions I think in the Act. But I was intrigued the other day when the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition proposed his amendment when he said that the Liberal Party especially in Manitoba has always been concerned about the extension of the votes to 18 year olds in the province. --(Interjection)-- Yes, the extension of the franchise to those of 18. And he indicated that the Liberal Party of Manitoba had been to the forefront in their endeavours to get votes for 18 year olds and over. However, I want to say to him that I've taken the trouble of reading back over a few years and I find that this is not so. I also find, Madam Speaker, which is quite interesting, that at one time the Conservative Party in Manitoba were very desirous of having those of 18 years and over have the right to vote. As a matter of fact, back in 1953, the Honourable present First Minister of Manitoba, the Honourable Dufferin Roblin, voted with --(Interjection)-- well you were Dufferin then, you've become somewhat abbreviated in the ensuing years. However, at that particular time, Madam Speaker, my honourable friend joined up with the then CCF against the Liberals who were opposed to the vote, or the extension of the franchise, as the Leader of the Opposition calls it, to those of 18 years. So here we have the situation of where the Conservatives in Manitoba are on record of being in favour of the votes for 18 year olds, we have the Liberals, despite the assertions the other day of the Leader of the Opposition, we have the Liberals in opposition to the extension of the vote.

Now as I say I referred first of all back to the year 1953 when the then Liberal government defeated the united efforts of the Conservatives and the CCF to have votes for the 18 year olds. And then in 1954 a very interesting event took place. For another a motion was proposed to attempt to have the franchise extended to those of 18 years of age and the Liberal government at that time used what was one of their gimmicks of the day in having one of their backbenchers amend the resolution, which was a straight resolution calling for votes for 18 year olds, to amend the resolution to call for joint action in this regard between the Federal Government and the Province of Manitoba. Now this would appear, Madam Speaker, to have been a slight advancement, that whereas they were opposed to it completely in 1953, they thought possibly in 1954, well, we'd better just hedge slightly and say that if we can convince our colleagues, again the Liberal Party, at Ottawa, that 18 year olds should be entitled to vote, then maybe we can have unified action. Of course, I don't need to point out to you, Madam Speaker, that at that particular time, 1954, there was a Liberal Party here in Manitoba, there was a Liberal Party in Ottawa, and of course the Liberals have always been in favour, according to my honourable friend, of the extension of the franchise to 18 year olds, but

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might just on a correction --I think what I said was the Liberal Party had been in favour of the extension of the franchise in general terms. I referred to the vote for women and the vote for Indians.

MR. PAULLEY: No, my honourable friend, Madam --no, I looked it up in the Hansard and he did say, he did attempt to take the credit and took the credit for the extension of the franchise insofar as Manitoba was concerned under a real Liberal-- and I give him full credit for it-- the former Premier of this province, T. C. Norris, who was a real Progressive Liberal, and so progressive that he has made the Liberal Parties pretty well, who have followed in his position since, look real reactionaries. So he was a very progressive Liberal and I give due honour to T. C. Norris. But I want to say to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, he mentioned specifically the Liberals in respect of the 18 year old vote in his remarks the other day and I don't think he can get off of the hook on that one.

However, however, Madam Speaker, in 1954 as I say, after the CCF Party, who has always been consistent in this matter, has introduced this resolution, then as I mentioned earlier, typical of the Liberals, a backbencher amended the resolution in order to reach an appeal to Ottawa, the then Leader of the Official Opposition, the Member for Turtle Mountain, attempted an amendment to the amendment which would in effect bring back the original motion so that we would have to deal with the matter here in this Assembly. And it's quite interesting Madam Speaker, to look at the Journals of 1954 because the amendment to the main motion which read; "that the government give consideration to the advisability of lowering the age of eligibility for voting in Manitoba provincial elections". Then there was this proposed amendment by Mr. Clements who was a member of the Liberal bench at that time. He moved that all the words after the word "that" be struck out --"That in the opinion of this House the Federal Government

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd).....and the Government of Manitoba should jointly consider the advisability of lowering the age qualifications of persons voting in federal and provincial elections. Gather this very carefully, Madam Speaker. They weren't too worried about what they were doing in their own House, but providing we could get our brothers down east there, and providing we imposed this in federal elections, then we would have it in both. Then, as I say, Mr. Willis, who was then the Member for Turtle Mountain, and the Leader of the Official Opposition, moved that the amendment be further amended by striking out the words "the federal government" and adding the words after the end of the amendment "in order to recognize responsibilities now assumed by persons under 21 years of age." Mr. Speaker of the day ruled the amendment to the amendment out of order because it in effect established the original proposition was votes for those under the age of 21.

So here, even in 1954 we had our friends across the road, when they were in opposition, asking for votes for the 18 year olds just as we now have today. The Liberals who have crossed over the water on this side saying that they want the votes for the 18 year olds. So Madam Speaker they all want it. We, of the New Democratic Party wanted votes for 18 year olds for some considerable time, the Liberals have wanted it or now wanted it. They have their pals down at Ottawa, --again, unfortunately, the Conservatives. They were in favour of it. But 18 year olds still haven't got the vote here in Manitoba. So anyway after we had passed that motion, Madam Speaker, in 1954, whereby joint representations would be made to Ottawa, a year later, in 1955, an Address for Papers was made to the then Liberal administration for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the Government at Ottawa respecting the resolution that was passed the year previously calling for joint action. And what was the result, when we got the return for the Address for Papers? Nil! No correspondence at all except that the then First Minister did say "I expect to take it up at the Dominion-Provincial Conference which will be forthcoming in a wee while." Now I give them credit that while they didn't conduct any correspondence on their memory being jogged by Mr. Swailes, one of our colleagues at that time, the First Minister said that it will be taken up at the Dominion-Provincial Conference.

Then in 1957 the record shows that the previous Leader of the CCF Party, Mr. Lloyd Stinson, by Bill 94 introduced a Bill into this House again calling for changes in the Election Act to make provisions that 18 year olds may have a vote. What was the result then? A complete coalition between the Liberals and Conservatives in opposition to this Bill.

Then in 1958, another resolution was presented by the former Member for Burrows, Mr. Hawryluk. What was the net result? Back to Ottawa we go again with an amended resolution calling for joint unified action in the matter of extension of the franchise to the 18 year olds. Well, anyway, you would think, Madam Speaker, that after first asking for joint action back in 1954, despite the fact that in 1955 there was a revelation that there was no correspondence, but the matter was going to be taken up according to the First Minister of that day at the Dominion-Provincial Relations Conference --you would have imagined that at least by 1958 we'd have known what the situation was insofar as action, unified action between Ottawa and Manitoba. Oh, no, nothing doing. So back in 1958 it went to Ottawa. And then Madam Speaker, in 1960, a committee, we had a change of government here in Manitoba, we had a committee set up.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, may I ask my honourable friend who has the floor, a question? I'm just asking him if he would not care to complete the record and tell what progress report the gentleman who was then leading the House put on the record? He seems to have forgotten that.

MR. PAULLEY: No. I frankly confess, Madam Speaker, I've tried to find some reference to it and was unable to. There was nothing --(Interjection)-- No it's not convenience, and I resent that -- but I did look in the records, the past journals to see if there was anything in the intervening years on this and if my honourable friend tells me that, and he may have, I don't dispute it, made a report on this matter to this Assembly, Madam Speaker, I accept his word as being correct. But I want to assure him, Madam Speaker, and this House, I'm not deliberately overlooking any of this matter. He of course has the opportunity of taking part in this debate.....and again I want to assure my friend that any omission has not been deliberate but I see nothing in the journals which I perused to find any reference to a statement of my friend.

So anyway, Madam Speaker, back in 1960, a committee was set up by this Assembly to take a look at The Election Act once again and also this matter of votes for 18 year olds, or, any other agreed upon age, because too we had mellowed slightly and we weren't adamant in it being 18 because in Saskatchewan and Alberta I believe the vote was reduced to 19 and in British

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd). . . . Columbia it was 20 and we were prepared to start lowering the age in Manitoba, not necessarily to 18. However, as I say, Madam Speaker, a committee of this House was set up in 1960 to consider the matter and the press records that on November 8th, 1960; "Paulley batted 1000 percent in the committee in that all of his motions were defeated and among the motions was one calling for the lowering of the voting age from 21 to 18." But it's quite interesting to hear reference in the press that recorded that meeting to hear what the then Attorney-General of the Province of Manitoba had to say. He is now the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. What did he say? Honourable Sterling Lyon, Attorney-General said he could bring the subject up at the next Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference in January. So here we have the same old thing from the Tories as we had from the Grits. We'll take it up at constitutional meetings of the Dominion-Provincial Conference. In the meantime Madam Speaker, still no votes for the 18 year olds in the Province of Manitoba.

Then the committee made its report in 1961 for concurrence. We raised the point again without avail. Still 18 year olds no vote. Then following a year or so we note that the Liberals at Ottawa apparently at long last may be taking a few steps along the trail to get votes for 18 year olds or some age under 21, and there was an all-party committee set up down at Ottawa --and I'm sorry I haven't got the exact date of this clipping, Madam Speaker, but I note, and I believe it was last year, I find a newspaper clipping that's headed "Manitoba Might Too. Premier Duff Roblin indicated Friday that Manitoba would probably drop the voting age to 18 if the Federal Government takes this step. Reducing the voting age at the federal level would have a marked effect on Manitoba's election practices. However I reserve my opinion at this time as to my personal feelings on 18 year olds voting." So maybe as he becomes more mature insofar as years are concerned, he becomes less mature insofar as judgment because as I illustrated, Madam Speaker, back in 1953, he joined this progressive party, the CCF Party at that time, in asking that 18 year olds be given the vote, or the franchise as my friend the Leader of the Opposition calls it. So here we are once again, here we are once again, considering a report of a committee which was charged with the responsibility of looking into the Election Act in the Province of Manitoba.

Now I must apologize lest it be not understood. I must apologize that I was not at all of the meetings of the Committee on Elections and Privileges this year. I was not there on the day that the Honourable Member for Emerson moved a motion in the committee asking for the voting age to be lowered to 18, I apologize and I believe I apologized at that time too to the committee; I apologize to the House for not being there at that particular time to support the Liberals. And I only sincerely trust and hope that the fact that the Honourable Member for Emerson has now moved this vote, that this is indicative that maybe the Liberal Party in Manitoba will stay with this question until it is resolved and the younger folk have the right to a vote.

Now of course, there's reasons, I think, I think there are reasons why the Conservatives, and I think there's even reasons why the Liberals today may not want the extension of this vote too much; because if one takes the time to read what happens in the University Parliaments across Canada they find that in, I think it's six out of 12 major universities the government is held by New Democratic Party Government of young people which is indicative to me, Madam Speaker that the intelligence of the younger folk is gradually increasing and I trust and hope that it will retain so. No, they didn't do it here in Manitoba. They didn't do it here in Manitoba, but they did in McGill, they did in the Toronto University, they did in Western University, they did in the Lutheran College and I have two or three more, I don't remember them all, But we're doing pretty good. Also not only are we of the New Democratic Party doing good insofar as advancing in the universities of Canada, it's obvious, it's obvious with political morality elsewhere being at such a low ebb that we're gaining in the field of the adult voters as well as indicated by recent polls.

However, Madam Speaker, however, Madam Speaker, I could not help but draw this matter of the history of the endeavour to have an 18 year old be given the privilege of a vote in Manitoba and I don't think, I do not think, that with the possible exception of the interjection of the Member for Lakeside to tell me that I omitted his report back from a conference, I think with that possible exception I have given an historical documentary to prove that the Liberals and the Conservatives in this House, depending on their position in the House, have wanted votes for 18 year olds here in the Province of Manitoba and I --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Can I find a copy of that historical sketch in the library?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, it will be because I believe Hansards are in there and if my honourable friend cares to reread it --and if my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk will take the time to read the journals of 1953 he who among others in the Liberal Party who now stand up and wave the flag in favour of 18 year olds will find that in 1953 he was one of those gallant leaders in democracy of the Liberal Party who voted against this very resolution that they are now proposing to this Assembly. And I ask my friend if he will deny it --(Interjection)-- he say's it is true. Fine.

Now then Madam Speaker, so much for the question, the vote for 18 year olds --(Interjection)-- oh, yes, maybe so much for me too. As a matter of fact I'm convinced Madam Speaker, more than ever as the days go on in this session that the likes of the Honourable Member for Lakeside would be glad if there was less of Paulley and his New Democrats in this House because of the fact that we're drawing to the attention, for historical purposes as suggested by the Member for Selkirk to record in the library of this province, this very type of political philosophy that is so obviously absent from the Liberal Party here in the Province of Manitoba. And when I say in this House, when I say in this House that they're bankrupt of political philosophy, Madam Speaker, it's not only going to be recorded in the history of this province in the library; it's going to be historically correct as well.

MR. CAMPBELL: Bully for you!

MR. PAULLEY: Bully for me! --(Interjection)-- I have one bright idea, Madam Speaker respecting my constituent, the Member for St. Boniface I'm afraid though you might even rule me out of order on that one. --(Interjection)--

Well, Madam Speaker, that's insofar as the voting age.

A MEMBER: You mean, you're in favour.

MR. PAULLEY:.....Now then No. 2 of the amendment as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, dealing with the question of the two enumerators. We accept that and we are going to support him in his resolution. Also, question No. 3 was raised in the committee, never finalized, and while there is differences of opinion, as far as I'm personally concerned, and the Liberal members of the committee on that question dealing with the blackouts, I'm prepared even for the committee to take a look at that as well. Now, Madam Speaker, I could have quite easily.....

MR. MOLGAT:Madam Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Certainly.

MR. MOLGAT: Does he not denote a shift in philosophy from the position he had three weeks ago at the Committee, on that question?

MR. PAULLEY: No, not at all, Madam Speaker. I said three weeks ago in the Committee that I won't accept this. I don't think that it's right when the likes of the Liberal Party or Conservative Party have the financial advantage over we of the New Democratic Party --and I fear it, that if this blackout was lifted --(Interjection)-- Oh, it's a mute question to my wealthy friend from Ethelbert, but it's not as far as I'm concerned as the Leader of the New Democratic Party and the Honourable Member for Radisson. But, it's no shift, Madam Chairman. I'm at least prepared to vote for the Committee considering this matter once again.

A MEMBER: You voted against it three weeks ago.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, I voted against it and I'll vote against it again in the form that you proposed it at the committee. But I think there may be alternative methods by which this can be handled. And if it goes back to the committee for consideration I'll offer some alternatives.

Now then, Madam Speaker, I could have quite easily proposed an amendment to the amendment on the motion to refer this matter back to committee, some of those matters that we have also been concerned with in this party over the long years. One of them dealing with the question of the elimination of the \$200 deposit fee in respect of candidates. I don't think, I don't think that this is necessary. I don't think that it's democratic. I think it should be eliminated. I think that every individual who wants to offer themselves to the public service, the public life of this province, should be able to do so without requiring him or her to place a deposit of \$200.00. I certainly don't agree with the contention of the former Attorney-General of this province when he said at the previous committee meetings, that this deposit is there for the purpose of keeping the scatterbrains out of public life. Goodness gracious, haven't we got enough of them in here now and the \$200 didn't keep them away?--(Interjection)-- I certainly think we can, and gee whiz, I might lose a vote from a constituent because I say this, but, by gosh, I think that it's --(Interjection)--

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd).....

There was another matter that I thought I could have proposed an amendment to the amendment to have reconsidered by the Committee. And that is lengthening the time between the issuance of the writ and nomination day, back to what we had prior to amendments of two or three years ago. I could think of another amendment I could have proposed. To have the Party name of the candidate listed on the ballot paper in order that the voter might know, not only in addition to the individual that they are voting for, but the parties they represented. So I say, Madam Speaker, I could have added an amendment to the amendment dealing with many other aspects. I am not going to, in order to answer my constituent the Member for St. Boniface, because I feel almost certain that the amendment as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition will be defeated, as would an amendment by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, in an amendment to the amendment. So I say, Madam Speaker, let all of us in this Assembly --I don't know what is the stand of the only other political party who has a representative, that of the Honourable Member for Rhineland who is a social creditor-- but I do know historically the Conservative Government of Manitoba is in favour of votes for 18 year olds. I do know, Madam Speaker, that the Liberal Party in Manitoba is now in favour of votes for 18 year olds. I do know that the New Democratic Party has always been in favour of votes for the 18 year old. If I can only convince, if indeed he needs convincing, the Honourable Member for Rhineland who is a social creditor to join us in this, then this House is unanimous in its support to allow 18 year olds to have their vote. And I trust and hope that the Honourable the Attorney-General will be introducing a Bill at this session to give effect to what I think this afternoon I have historically proved as being correct.

MR. FRED GROVES, (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, I must say at the outset that I enjoyed the Honourable Leader of the NDP's speech, as much as I enjoyed serving on this committee. Because I must say that this committee which studied the Election Act since the last session, is one of the best committees that I have served on. We set this committee up with all the members that were to serve on it knowing that there were reforms necessary and changes needed in our election machinery in Manitoba, and amendments necessary to the Election Act to accomplish these. Many of the suggestions that were made by members in speeches as to what should be done with this Act, have been incorporated in the report of the committee that we have before us in this motion.

We went into this committee too, Madam Speaker, knowing that there were certain basic areas of disagreement amongst the different groups in the House and knowing that these basic areas of disagreement had been debated and settled in debates prior to the setting up of this committee. These differences have been mentioned by both the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the NDP, when they were as a matter of lowering the voting age to 18, extending the time of an election campaign from the time that is in the Act at the present moment. The matter of having the two enumerators that is mentioned in the honourable member's amendment and the 48-hour blackout with respect to TV and radio advertising, also have been discussed at length. We expected that these matters would be raised in the committee, Madam Speaker, and they were. They were debated at length in the committee and it was decided by a majority vote of the committee that these matters should not be included in the committee's report, and nor are they. These matters were thoroughly discussed, Madam Speaker, by representatives of both the other groups who sat on this committee, and I can see no point in now referring this report back to the same committee to rehash old straw. I think that since the matters that are raised in the amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, since they can be raised in the future by way of a resolution in this House, that there is no point in referring this report back to the Committee and it's not my intention to support his amendment.

We should proceed now, Madam Speaker, with the many needed reforms that are included in this report upon which all of the members of the committee have agreed. Apart from the few areas of difference which I mentioned, this committee approached this task, I think, in a constructive and a congenial manner. Our discussion, I think I can say, was completely free and of a non-partisan manner and a great deal, in my opinion, was accomplished. And I should say now, that we did miss at, I think it was two of our meetings, the presence of the Honourable Leader of the NDP. We did miss him and we were sorry that he had to miss these meetings for the reason which he did. So, except for the points that have been mentioned by these two gentlemen that proceeded me in this debate, there was pretty generally all party agreement on some real constructive reforms in our election machinery in Manitoba.

(MR. GROVES, cont'd).....

With respect to the reducing of the voting age, I must admit that I enjoyed the honourable member's historical account, and even although the Conservatives in 1953 were for people of 18 voting and the Liberals were against it, and now they have switched positions in the House, they are vice versa again, I must say that I was not in the House in 1953, and I like the honourable member that spoke last, am at least consistent, because we were both of the same opinion, or we both had the same opinion in 1953 as we have now, although in reverse, because as far as I'm concerned I was against in 1953 and in earlier years, 18 year olds having the franchise in Manitoba or in Canada, and I still am. When we're talking about lowering the voting age to 18, we're talking really about more than just that. We're actually speaking of lowering the age of adulthood. And I think that lowering the age of adulthood is more serious that it appears on the surface. Are we prepared, Madam Speaker, to allow 18 year olds in beer parlours? Are we who have daughters prepared to allow them when they are 18 years old to go into mixed drinking establishments or cocktail lounges? And are we prepared, Madam Speaker, to allow these 18 year old girls and boys to purchase liquor at our liquor stores? I think not. And yet, I think we would be inconsistent if we were to say that these people were mature enough and old enough to be able to vote, and yet not old enough and responsible enough to be able to do these other things. If we were to allow these young people to vote at 18, then surely we must be consistent and allow them to do these other things that adults of 21 and over are able to do. If we allow them to vote at 18, Madam Speaker, then they must be prepared to accept the responsibilities of adults insofar as our courts are concerned and insofar as the law respecting the buying and selling of property.

The arguments are used that boys and girls of 18 because of the information that is available through the media of TV and radio, that they are more mature than they were in the earlier days of our country and I think Madam Speaker that this is not a good argument now but might have been a good argument fifty years ago when boys and girls of 14, particularly boys, did have to get out to work to help to support their families and to assume generally speaking, the responsibilities of adulthood. Young people now are subsidized and sheltered longer than they have been in the past. We keep them in school longer than they have been kept in school in the past and their parents are subsidizing them during the period of their education. We subsidize them through university and the parents still pay their costs of clothing, board and room etcetera while they are at home and attending university. The State subsidizes their studies by some 81% of the total cost of running the university and in addition, provides these same young people with scholarships, student loans, bursaries, etcetera. So as far as I am concerned Madam Speaker, when these people of 18 years or 19 or 20 are old enough to accept the other responsibilities of adulthood then they are old enough to be able to vote; and when they are paying their own way in this world that's time enough for them to be able to exercise their franchise. And in addition to that Madam Speaker, I can find no real interest in this subject amongst the very people to whom we are trying to give this privilege.

With respect to the two enumerators or the suggestion that we have two enumerators, as is suggested in the honourable member's amendment, I must admit there may be some advantages to this, and assuming that there was a lot of abuse, it could eliminate abuses of the nature which the honourable member mentioned. However, I am of the opinion that the advantages of having the two enumerators would not really be material. I don't think that there are abuses, serious abuses to any serious extent and the cost therefore of doubling the number of enumerators in a provincial election could not be justified. I am convinced that this would not as the Honourable Leader attempted to argue, do much toward the improvement of our voters' list and to make sure that everybody who wanted to vote, was able to do so on election day. With respect to the matter of people left off the voters' list, and giving everybody the opportunity of voting, I think the report makes an admirable, great stride in this direction, because a good many of the recommendations that are included in this report are there and have been suggested by the committee solely for this purpose to make sure that we do have a more accurate voters' list than we have had in the past and that it shall be easier for persons wishing to vote to be able to exercise their franchise.

We have eliminated in recommendation (7) the use of the field book which was one step in the preparation of our voters' list that afforded opportunities for error. We have also agreed and suggest in the report that those people who are 21 years of age on polling day should be enumerated, therefore eliminating the inconvenience that these people have.

The report also suggests that in section (11) that section 17 (3) be repealed and the following substituted: "Any person who is or becomes qualified whose name does not appear on the original list, shall be entitled to have his name placed on the list of voters by the person making

(MR. GROVES, cont'd).the revision." We are also providing that enumerators are to prepare additional copies of the enumeration sheets for distribution to the candidates of the various parties which gives their organizations an opportunity to check on the accuracy of the list — A better opportunity than they are afforded at the moment.

It is also recommended that larger notices appear in the press in connection with the Courts of Revision and that these also be advertised over radio and television. The report makes it easier for persons to vote at the advance poll. The certificate that has been required in the past is no longer necessary and those who are incapacitated are able to now vote at the advance poll where they were unable to do so previously and the suggestion is being made that advance polls be held on the ground floor in order to accommodate these people.

So Madam Speaker, there are all through this report, recommendations that will accomplish what the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party or the Opposition has desired.

Recommendation 39 for example provides specifically for the example that he mentioned in his speech where large blocks of people are left off the list, and this recommendation 39 suggests that where there are a large number of voters left off the list, and where they are living in close proximity to one another and have been inadvertently omitted from the voters' list the returning officer could apply to a county court judge or a magistrate for an order authorizing the addition to the list of the names of such persons. So certainly this solves the problem that he mentioned, which I think occurred in the constituency of Osborne. I was reminded at the time that he spoke of the joker who got a job as an enumerator in a provincial election, I think a few years ago, who was called in by his returning officer who was to instruct him in how to enumerate his poll. The returning officer told him that the boundaries of his poll and the area that he had to enumerate were along this street, down this street, across this street and then back up to the original starting point. And sure enough when this enumerator had completed his enumeration he did this street, this street, this street and this street and did nothing in the center. So this will certainly solve that problem --(Interjection)-- And also Madam Speaker, I am reminded by my neighbor here that you can now, if you are left off the voters' list, be put on the voters' list on election day with only one voucher instead of two.

With respect to the blackout which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned in his speech. At first I was of the opinion that this was rather a silly regulation of the folks at Ottawa and that it was discriminatory against the radio and TV media. However, I have to admit that radio and TV give pretty broad and pretty massive coverage in these days of electronics and they can give something which the newspapers cannot --and that is, last minute coverage or last minute advertising on behalf of either a party or a candidate-- and I'm of the opinion now that if this regulation was removed that it could lead to some rather serious abuses. For example, political parties or individuals could tie up in the early stages of an election campaign important last minute time on television and radio and they would be afforded the opportunity by tying up this prime time of making last minute statements that could not be answered by their opponents. So all in all, Madam Speaker, I think that even although the answers which we got from Ottawa certainly didn't tell us the original reasons or the present reasons why this regulation is here, I think that it has a lot to commend it and I think that as far as Manitoba is concerned we have done without it and done fairly well up to now and I think that we could continue to get along with that regulation.

So I think Madam Speaker that we have before us a good report and I think that every member of our Committee including the members of all the different political parties can take credit for having done a good job on our Election Act. I think that the Government should proceed after the adoption of this report to draft, to redraft The Election Act, and it will take a very lot of re-drafting, and I'm sure that all of us who are dealing with this Election Act, every three or four years as the case might be, will in the future be a lot happier with it.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I'm not a member of the Privileges and Elections Committee although I wish that I could be, but I suppose many members in this Chamber wish that they could be members of that committee. One reason why I would like to be a member if I had the opportunity is because I feel that there is so much of basic importance to be decided in the way of electoral reform. This is not to say that we have not made many improvements over the course of the years, and I think it was Manitoba in fact that really took the initiative in electoral reform only a matter of a few years ago with the establishment of an independent commission to look into redistribution and so on.

As a New Democrat who rises to speak on Election Campaign Methods and on Electoral Reform, I am somewhat hesitant because very often the charge is thrown at us, that we have a

(MR. SCHREYER, cont'd). . . . "holier than thou" attitude. Now perhaps this charge or accusation is justified from time to time, but I do believe that there is still room for righteous indignation at times; at times righteous indignation is the proper response to a situation. Now my leader has spoken a good deal about what he would like to see done in the way of amendments and changes in our Electoral System. He has taken the Liberal Party to task for their about-face on the issue of the voting age, and he dealt with a good many other matters as well. But I feel --and the Member for St. Vital touched on some important points, but I feel that one important aspect of the electoral process that has been ignored in debate so far, is one that has to do with election campaign financing and the way in which this financing is regulated and handled.

Madam Speaker, it's my contention that the cost of election campaigning is increasing drastically during our time, and that this increase poses a threat, or if not a threat, at least a serious problem to democratic processes. In the United States where these trends always show up first, there is mounting concern because it is felt that if present trends continue, what with high pressure advertising which is very costly, and all of the latest gimmicks and techniques in election campaigning, all this seems to be pointing toward a situation where in the future only those who are independently wealthy will be able to stand for office. Madam Speaker, it is a fact that even in the local state legislatures that the average, or at least many state legislators are spending as much as \$10-\$15,000 to fight a campaign which even if elected, brings them a two-year term, in some cases, four, usually a two-year term in the state legislature and brings them an emolument or indemnity of \$1500-\$2000-\$2500 per year. In fact they are paid less in some of the legislatures than we are here --some of them receive much more. This is a problem at the state level and it's certainly a problem at the national level in the U. S. And it's becoming one here, Madam Speaker, and I don't think that we should take any steps here in Manitoba that would in fact add to the cost of election campaigning. The extension of television coverage or the extension of the time period would merely add to the cost and as such I don't consider it a good proposal that is being made here by the Leader of the Liberal Party. I believe, Madam Speaker that we must try to hold the line, and not only that, I feel we must tighten up regarding the disclosure of funds expended by political candidates and political parties.

Now it's true that under the present orders and regulations under the present electoral laws that there is requirement for disclosure by candidates. Well, this is one side of the coin only. The other side is that the amount expended by the provincial headquarters does not have to be accounted for in any satisfactory way and I feel that we should tighten up at this level. I feel that we can head off a threat that is being posed by rising election costs. I feel that we can do something to head off any abuse which might creep into our electoral system if we were to follow the lead of the Province of Quebec --I'm not talking about the Federal Liberals in Quebec -- I'm talking about the Provincial Government in Quebec, where they are providing as of three years ago, for a basic contribution to the election expenses of the political parties based on their proportionate strength, or based in proportion to the vote polled by the parties in the previous provincial general election. Obviously there has to be some basis upon which to make this allocation of funds to the political party and I believe that it should be done in proportion to the votes that they were able to draw from the electorate at the previous election.

I believe we must do this, Madam Speaker, because what is the alternative? The alternative to requiring full revelation of campaign funds and the alternative to providing a basic amount of public moneys to political parties, the alternative is what we have had in the past and what we have now, namely, a situation where the parties go to individuals, which is not so bad; in fact it's good; where it goes to vested interest groups and solicits from them large amounts of funds, and this is bad, I suggest. Allthrough the course of history in Canada we have been plagued intermittently by scandals. And why have we had political scandals? It's not because the men in positions of power were so depraved and corrupt, but because they owed some sort of obligation to people who had a short time before given to them, donated to them, large financial contributions.

Members here must surely remember the unholy mess that occurred in Canada's political history in the 1920's with the Customs scandal and the Beauharnois scandal. MacKenzie King himself admitted by self-admission that he had been forced to walk through the valley of humiliation. Why? Because the Liberal Party had been investigated and found guilty of taking \$800,000 by way of kickback from the Beauharnois Public Utility Corporation. And then the Conservatives made a big hue and cry and began to , just before that had begun to investigate and the investigation stopped when it was found, during the investigation, that certain

(MR. SCHREYER, cont'd)..... Conservative Party representatives had accepted contributions from the Beauharnois people and so having found themselves tainted by the same brush they called off the investigation. And then the Customs scandal. And now, the present, Madam Speaker. The reason we are having this scandal at the present time, and I believe it is a scandal of epic proportions, one that will take years to live down, one that certainly will not be ignored when history of this decade is being written. The reason we have that is not because the political leaders are depraved or corrupt, but because the Liberal Party has accepted funds in large amounts from certain individuals in the Province of Quebec who have connections with the underworld. It's not because the leaders of the Liberal Party are themselves corrupt or operating under some very low code of ethics. It's because of the very nature, the very nature of how political parties in Canada gather and collect funds to wage political war; to wage elections.

I think that any member here who is really serious about trying to make improvements in our electoral processes, in our electoral system, would want, among other things, he would want not just to make changes in the time period, he would not want only merely to make changes as to how the voters' list is to be revised. He would not want to make changes only about how the ballot paper should look --whether it should be rectangular or square-- which seems to me one of the things that this committee concerned itself with. These things he would look into, but more important than all that, he would want to make some basic changes, some reforms in the way in which political parties are allowed to solicit funds and I would hope that honourable members here will not just act on this in a completely partisan manner but will think about what is good for the province, what is good for democracy itself.

Madam Speaker, I think it is only logical to suppose that where a person or persons contribute in large volume to a political party they tend to expect, they tend to view as a right a chance to approach men in government to ask them for favours or to ask them for help when they themselves come into times of crisis, they come into times of trouble, and any human being who has obligated himself by way of belonging to a party that does accept large contributions would be less than human if he did not react to a contributor's problems with a sympathetic ear. This is at the root of the whole problem that we are having in Canada today. I'm not suggesting that the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party in Manitoba is experiencing this sort of situation but that's only because of the nature of our province. It's a small province, small in population, outstanding citizenry, in most respect; but in a large nation, when you're dealing with large population and all segments of society, I think it's absolutely crazy to have an electoral system where parties continue to send bag men out to collect money in large amounts from influential persons from business and so on.

I make the assertion that the whole Dorion Inquiry which is now taking place, is a direct result of the way in which the Liberal Party in Canada has been collecting and soliciting funds. Members who have any knowledge of just what is involved in the Dorion Inquiry must realize that it began as an investigation into a bribery attempt and --an alleged bribery attempt, rather. And once the inquiry started, what did we find? With each passing day of the Inquiry more and more people seemed to be implicated. Fund raisers are implicated; Senators who are fund raisers are implicated, directly or indirectly; and it's one of those situations where the more you think you're coming to the root of the whole matter, there's always more being exposed as you go along.

Madam Speaker, people may regard us in the New Democratic Party as being naive when it comes to politics, and the way the wheels turn in politics, but I want to suggest that it is not unrealistic to ask for the kind of basic reform that will require complete, but complete revelation of the major source of funds; and until we do that, we are going to be continuing with a system which has allowed for intermittent graft and corruption for the past 100 years in our country. I think a case can and should be made for open election funds revealed fully and completely to the public by means of disclosure. We require it these days in public utility regulation; we require more and more public accountability. Why not do the same thing for the political parties that exist --full public accountability. In that way you avoid mischief.

Now the Member for Selkirk is laughing. I presume he is laughing at my naivete. I would tell him that I might be accused of naivete about our sexual mores but I don't think I'm naive about politics. I grew up with it. I came along with it from a young age and I think that I know what's going on in politics. It's not bad in Manitoba but it's certainly rotten in Canada today; and I, as a legislator of this province would like to do my part to see that what happens nationally never happens here.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, there is one point, I would like to make the honourable member clear upon. I was not laughing at him. It had nothing to do with what he was saying. It was just a little exchange that took place between myself and my colleague here.

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.