

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 24th, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 54 Isaac Newton School students, Grade 8 students, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Shah and Miss Motheral. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Burrows. There are also some 40 Grade 7 and 8 students from St. Malo School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Peloquin and Mr. Courcelles. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Carillon. On behalf of all Members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table a return to an Order of the House No. 3 on a motion from the Honourable the Member from Brokenhead.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to advise the members of the House that Mr. Ray Slough has been appointed Director of Corrections for the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Slough comes to us from the Province of Saskatchewan where he has been for some twelve years associated in the corrections field in that province. Previous to that he was an extended time in the probation work. He is a graduate of the University of British Columbia School of Social Work. He is a veteran of the Second World War and has had teaching experience. He commenced his duties today.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. I would ask him if he has to this date received any formal submissions or briefs from any organization or group from the Town of Beausejour or the Municipality of Brokenhead regarding the County Court Centre that was removed from that area.

MR. McLEAN: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the First Minister. Some time ago it was announced that Manitoba was going to proceed with the establishment of a Manitoba Flag. Is it still the intention of the government to proceed on this?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I am not able to make any announcement at the present time, Madam Speaker.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): May I address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General regarding the case which was disposed of by Magistrate Rice, either yesterday or the day before yesterday, with respect of a young boy who had been sentenced to Portage la Prairie for two years and who escaped from there and who was subsequently brought before Magistrate Rice and given, I think it was 30 months or three years in the Manitoba Penitentiary. Have any representations been made to the Honourable the Attorney-General about the principle of double jeopardy which exists in our law in respect of juveniles?

MR. McLEAN: No, Madam Speaker.

MR. HILLHOUSE: can the Attorney-General entertain an application for a review of that matter by the Law Reform Committee?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, although the law in question is not the law of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I quite agree -- I'm quite aware of that fact, but would not the recommendation from this House to Ottawa go a long way towards reforming the law?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee to consider and report of the Bills listed in the Orders of the Day.

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 House with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Bills No. 6, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, and 26 were read section by section and passed. Bill No. 43: Sections 1 to 107 were read section by section and passed.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, to come back to 48. You are going too fast to follow and I don't blame you, I think it's better to curtail time, but there is one word that I would like to have it changed, or suggest to be changed in 48. Will you give me leave to bring it up now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is it?

MR. GRAY: Well there is a term called "Illegitimate." We have had quite a few arguments in this House since I am here about calling any child of unmarried parents "illegitimate" and I was just wondering whether those who are expert in the English language could use another word -- like coming from unmarried parents or something else. We don't want to have the word "illegitimate." There's no such a thing as illegitimate child in my opinion. A child from unmarried parents perhaps, but not illegitimate. I would very much like to have this eliminated, this term from the Vital Statistics Office, and I wouldn't like to see in the Bill or any other Bill that term "illegitimate." There's no such a thing as illegitimate children.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What amendment do you propose?

MR. GRAY: Well, unmarried -- or anybody else could put another word. I mean to change the particular term "illegitimate", and I think we have sufficient experts in the English language to find a word, a proper word. If they don't I'd like to move we change it to "un-married parents."

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I understand from the legal people that this term of "illegitimate" is the one that is recognized in law and that it has a great number of ramifications. I'm afraid that it would be too late for us now to try to consider any other possible term, but if it will be of any help to the honourable member during the next year I will investigate with the lawyers whether there is another term that can fit this term "illegitimate," but it's here because it is the legally recognized term.

The remainder of Bill No. 43, and Bills No. 53, 54, 57, 61 and 64 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has considered Bills No. 6, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26, 43, 53, 54, 57, 61, and 64, and has adopted all of the Bills without amendment.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. , (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Wellington, that the report of the committee be received.

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

Bills No. 6, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26, 43, 53, 54, 57, 61 and 64 were each read a third time and passed.

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

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, it has already been said that this question has been before us on many occasions. I have hesitated to even try to make any researches about the number of times that I have heard it discussed and the number of times that I have taken part in the discussion. I have been in the House when proposals have been made, resolutions or bills introduced that have advocated Standard Time, Daylight Saving Time, optional, compulsory, and almost every variation that you could imagine. Through the years this subject keeps recurring and quite frankly it appears to me that we are no nearer to a general agreement on it than we were the first day that I heard it debated in this House.

Because I have been here so much of the time, I have more than once found it necessary to explain my own position, and I suppose some people can say to me with regard to some of the things that I advocate, "Why didn't you do it when?" I plead guilty to that accusation because though I held my own views very definitely and very sincerely, I always hesitated to

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) impose those views or to attempt to impose those views by asking others to accept them as to what should be done by way of legislation, and certainly I hesitated to impose the views of the government of the day upon a large section of the population of the Province of Manitoba. I have never tried to disguise the fact that personally I am a Standard Time advocate. Like others who have spoken, I see no necessity of changing the clock in order to go to work an hour earlier in the morning, and I see many arguments for why Standard Time is, in my opinion, preferable to Daylight Saving Time.

On the other hand, I have always been a friend toward uniformity. Some people I know think that I am a bit of a slave to the principle of uniformity, but I do in general see a lot of benefit in uniform practice if it isn't at the expense of too great a compromise on principle. During the time that I had the privilege of being first as a private member and later as a member of the government and later as the head of the government, on the government side of the House I was more than once asked to put in legislation, sometimes by one group, sometimes by the other, in this regard.

I managed to achieve that position which I think is the horror, the nightmare of any practising politician, and that is to manage to fail to succeed in pleasing either side of the argument. I managed to an extent to disappoint both my friends who favoured Standard and those who held the other view of wanting compulsory Daylight Saving Time. And many times, many times, usually in the rural parts but a few times in the urban centres, I have been challenged on the public platform about my stand on Daylight Saving Time, and I always said, we all try to pretend this I know, but I'm sure that I always said the same thing whether I was in the urban centre or in the rural parts of Manitoba. I always said this: Look, I don't like Daylight Saving Time; I don't think it's necessary; I think it is an inconvenience. There's some other reasons that I have against it. I don't like it personally. I don't think however that we should legislate on the matter and I personally would not head a government that would say to approximately half of the population of Manitoba that you can't have something that you want even though I don't like that thing myself.

I continued to maintain that position because Greater Winnipeg held at different times at least two votes that I know of -- I've not researched this matter and I may be inaccurate to some extent in my recollection of what took place -- but as I remember, at least two votes were held in Greater Winnipeg and I think those votes were significant for two or three special reasons. One was the extremely small number of people who voted in them. That seemed to indicate to me that even the people of Greater Winnipeg did not regard this as as serious a question as it would appear to be by the number of times that it comes up in the Legislative Assembly.

The other thing that to me was significant was the small majority, numerically speaking, the small majority that Daylight Saving received even in Greater Winnipeg. The third thing that I thought particularly significant was the fact that -- and again I'm speaking entirely from recollection, Madam Speaker, because I have not taken the time to research this question at all thoroughly -- but if I remember correctly, on one of those votes two municipalities of Greater Winnipeg registered a vote against -- a small majority against Daylight Saving Time, and so it seemed to me that actually it was not as serious a question as we would be led to believe.

But I still took the position, and I took it in rural Manitoba every time I was ever asked the question, that inasmuch as there had been a vote, and later on a second vote, and inasmuch as there had been a majority, albeit that few people had voted and albeit that the majority was small, inasmuch as there had been a vote, later on two votes, and inasmuch as there had been a majority for Daylight Saving, that I for one was not going to take the position that by government action we would deprive almost half the population of something that they had said that they wanted. And I must record the fact, Madam Speaker, because I think it's worth mentioning in a democratic province, that even in the areas where the people were definitely in the majority who supported Standard Time, they always seemed to me to be rather impressed by that answer and to not disagree with it too much.

So I mention that point to answer in advance anybody that is inclined to say to me, "Why didn't you do it when?" Well the reason we didn't do it when we were in office was that I considered then, as I consider now, that it's not a matter, in spite of my own views on it, that is of great enough importance to impose the will of any government upon the people that want to act according to their own wishes in this matter.

But as time went on and later on when a different government was in office, there came a period of time when it seemed to me that there was an area here where some compromise was feasible, and after considerable discussion and after farm organizations and others had been

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) consulted, it seemed to me that I could go along with the decision to have legislation which would impose Daylight Saving Time for a certain period of time by legislation compulsorily, and we started out by making that period fairly short and gradually we went along a little further.

I think I should say to complete the record as far as my memory goes with regard to the votes that were held, that in Greater Winnipeg the question that was submitted to the electorate was simply the simple question of, "Are you in favour of Daylight Saving Time? Yes or No." With no, as I recall it, with no time mentioned and with no alternative proposition given, simply the direct question. In the first vote as I recall it in 1946, the vote for Daylight Saving Time was 46,000-odd and the vote against, 20,000-odd. As I recall it in 1949, and I may even be out a year or two on the year, the same general question, the simple question of Daylight Saving -- for or against -- was submitted to Greater Winnipeg. And here I think was a very significant thing to me, that the "for" vote, the vote in favour which had been remarkably small before, only 46,000, had dropped by this time to 40,000-odd and the "against" vote had risen from 20 to something over 30,000 votes.

Some time later, in fact quite lately, a vote was taken in the City of Brandon and that vote, if I remember correctly with regard to it, was for Daylight Saving for a stated period and a short period, only three months, June, July and August, and there again -- well the vote was almost a tie, and again with a small number of people voting, but with a small majority, I think only 200 or thereabouts in favour of Daylight Saving.

My feeling is, and of course I can't prove this, but my feeling is that if it had been suggested at the time of the Greater Winnipeg plebiscite on this matter that the period should be anything longer than three or four months, that there would not have been a majority for Daylight Saving at all, and I think the Brandon vote rather bore that out. But my feeling also is that in spite of the fact that we hear a great deal about Greater Winnipeg wanting Daylight Saving, that even today if a vote were taken and if the period were mentioned as being anything like as long as six months, that it would have a very difficult time in passing right in Greater Winnipeg; and as far as the rest of the province is concerned, I would guess that it would have no chance of passing.

But as I say, at last an arrangement was made whereby there was a reasonable consensus toward a compromise that was something over four months, and on the basis of this compromise a good many of us, who the public may think had rather prided ourselves on our stand with regard to Standard Time, were willing to go along; but to go along, and especially to the longer season, on the basis of it being uniform time. I think that uniform time, uniformity in this is still the most important central principle and I still think that it's worthwhile to aim for uniformity.

But, Madam Speaker, in my opinion the present bill departs again from this principle of uniformity. It's true that it is uniform in one regard, it's uniform that it fixes the daylight saving compromise that was arranged before on a permanent basis, and as these things must be, on a compulsory basis; but it completely violates the principle of uniformity for another six weeks or two months, and I think that this is not only the matter of principle of uniformity but it is also the matter of principle of playing unfairly with the people who made the compromise possible, to get rather general agreement for the four month or little better than four month period.

And so I say that I do not find the present proposed legislation satisfactory. I do not find myself able to agree with it. I feel that I shall have to vote against this bill because I believe that it violates not only the principle of uniformity but that it violates the spirit of compromise that led to the present arrangement which I think -- of course there were some people on both sides that didn't support it --but which I think was growing in public favour largely because of the fact that it had been a compromise rather reasonably arrived at and had, in my opinion, served a useful purpose.

So I say not only do I find myself in opposition to the present bill, but I find myself in the position of feeling that we are no nearer to a permanent solution of this question than we were before, and we are no nearer to meeting the objective of my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation of making people happy, that we are no nearer to achieving that principle than we were before. I have the feeling that the friends of my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation and myself, and in spite of our lingering small differences of opinion at times, his friends and my friends are generally speaking the same people, and I'm afraid that his friends and my friends are going to be far from happy.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) I think that they are going to feel that their friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, exercising the great influence that he undoubtedly does in the councils of the present government, has not taken into account their position to the extent that he could and should have done if he wanted to really keep them happy, and that he has not exercised in the councils of the government the great influence that he could bear if he tried to do so.

And so I'm disappointed at the legislation. I'm disappointed with the position that we find ourselves in because I believe we have not achieved the objective that we want, and so what would I suggest as an alternative? Well after all these years, I think, Madam Speaker, that I would come back to the principle and agree with my honourable friend from Carillon that it is time that we should consider a plebiscite on this matter. I do not believe -- that is a provincial-wide plebiscite -- I do not believe that a plebiscite on this matter would raise a city-country issue.

I think that the principles are well enough understood on both sides that it could be conducted with benefit to the province as a whole, and that in my judgment we would, some of us would be surprised at the vote that you would get right in Greater Winnipeg, because though there are a great many folks in Greater Winnipeg who support daylight saving, there are also a great many mothers in Winnipeg who make a good job of looking after a great many children, and a great many of them do not like daylight saving. I think that a properly conducted campaign, a good campaign throughout the whole of Manitoba, far from causing any difference of opinion and any misunderstanding, would actually be of benefit at this time.

Then for fear that somebody charges me with inconsistency on another ground that I take a pretty consistent stand on, the spending of money, somebody says this would cost a lot of money. Then I would say do what the City of Brandon did and hold the plebiscite at the time of the municipal election. I think the cost there was very small under those circumstances and I think that the educational process would be very well worthwhile the small amount involved.

So, Madam Speaker, to conclude I say that I shall not be supporting this bill, believing as I do that the principle is wrong. Secondly, I do urge an alternative. I think that the interests of Manitoba would be advanced if we considered that alternative. And thirdly, in the meantime I would suggest to the government of the day that they leave the situation as it stands in the interval until a plebiscite has been held.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, before we close this debate I think there are a few comments that I would like to make. There has been a lot of debate on both sides of this question in the last few days and basically it boils down to the one principle, the principle of uniformity. This has been the matter that has been under discussion in almost every one of the addresses that have been made in this Assembly.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside says that we are now no nearer to general agreement than we were when this matter was first discussed in this House. Well I would like to take issue with him on that subject, Madam Speaker, because I think that in the past two years the people of Manitoba are to be complimented on the acceptance that they have had of the official time, the concept of uniformity which has been accepted by and large by most of the people of Manitoba.

I think that particularly we should compliment the people of rural Manitoba who in the beginning were opposed to any period of daylight saving time, and really they have accepted this matter I think calmly and philosophically. Some of them have even changed their minds as to the advisability of daylight saving time. Some of the people, particularly in the small urban centres scattered throughout the area of rural Manitoba, have come to appreciate daylight saving time. And there are many people in those communities, people who like to work in their gardens in the evenings, even farmers have spoken to me concerning the cut-off of daylight saving time in September and suggesting in years when their harvest was not completed that they too would appreciate daylight saving time lasting a little bit longer, and I think that perhaps these people are still in the minority in these communities. I do not think that there is any general acceptance of a longer period of daylight saving time in those communities.

But what are we talking about when we talk about uniformity in this matter? I think it depends on where you are and who you are talking to, what people mean by uniformity of time. I know that if you go out into the rural areas and you talk to people in small towns or in the farming communities about uniform time, they are talking about uniformity within Manitoba, but you come into the city, and not just the city of Winnipeg but all of the cities in the

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd.) Metropolitan area and in the city of Brandon and many of the people in the city of Portage la Prairie and other centres in Manitoba who have great business dealings with other centres in Canada, and when they talk about uniformity they are not talking about Manitoba, they are talking about uniformity of time differentials across the whole nation.

So I think that when we talk about uniformity we have got to recognize that uniformity means different things to different people, and when we have had plebiscites in the past, or referendums on a municipal basis, I think that there too in many cases people who voted on those referendums were concerned that they should have some uniformity of time with their neighbours, and I think this had a great bearing on the referendum that was taken in Brandon. The people in Brandon didn't want to be out of step with the people in the trading community immediately surrounding Brandon with whom they did business.

We have had a lot of talk about referendums. Recently it was suggested to the Federal House that on a matter that touched every Canadian, the matter of a national flag, there should be a referendum. But there the Prime Minister said, and I think rightly so, that this is a matter which that House had a responsibility to decide, and they made the decision and we as Canadians should accept that decision, and I think that now we have a decision to make in this House.

The Liberals in this debate particularly have been consistent. On this particular occasion they have all said that uniformity is the most important principle. I wonder if they realized what the amendment meant that they brought in? The amendment that they brought in would have made time uniform throughout Manitoba all right, but it certainly would have prevented any extension of daylight saving time in the Metropolitan area where many people earnestly desire this extension.

I wonder if they remember what they said in 1963 when we were debating this matter? When I suggested, Madam Speaker, that the principle of uniformity was desirable in this province, they scoffed at me. They said it could never be done, that the people of Manitoba would not accept it, but this is not the argument that they use today. They suggest that perhaps we would be surprised if another vote was taken, and I think that they might be surprised too if another vote was taken on a provincial basis at how many people within this province would be prepared to accept daylight saving time, even for the longer period if it were uniform throughout the Province of Manitoba.

We are now getting letters -- and I get them by the basketfull -- from people on this topic, and many many people throughout rural Manitoba are suggesting to us now that they would be prepared to accept even a longer period of daylight saving time if we could keep time uniform throughout the Province of Manitoba. I think that the time is not yet ripe for an extension of daylight saving time throughout the whole of Manitoba, but I believe it will come. In the meantime, I think that the bill that is before this House at this time represents the greatest degree of uniformity that we can have that is acceptable to a great majority of the people of Manitoba.

And I would remind this House, Madam Speaker, that the proposal that is before the House in this bill now will provide for uniform time in the Province of Manitoba throughout ten and a half months of the year, and that for only a period of approximately six weeks will there be any differentiation in time. I believe that this is as far as we can go at this time, this is as far as public acceptance will allow us to go at this time, but that the time is not far away when the people of Manitoba will accept uniformity of time for six months of daylight saving time. And I would ask the honourable members of this House to consider well before they vote against the proposed bill.

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

MR. SMELLIE: Yeas and nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the Second Reading of Bill No. 41, An Act to Amend The Official Time Act.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Patrick, Paulley, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 41; Nays, 11.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

The adjourned debate on the Second Reading of Bill No. 28. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate not because I had any doubts about the content of the bill but because I wanted time to analyze the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Burrows. I've done so and I have no substantive comments to make.

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. 39. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I'd ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the Second Reading of Bill No. 47. The Honourable the Member for Ethelbert-Plains.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK Q. C. (Ethelbert-Plains): Madam Speaker, on reading this bill I think that it is somewhat ambiguous and I'm not quite sure that I know the intent of the bill. In Section 44, 7, 1 (d) Subsection 1. it reads, "establish a school division." But then if you go down to Subsection 2 you find that it reads, "withdraw territory from a school division established under Subsection 1." Now does it mean that the Minister wants to establish one school division north of Township 22, or does it mean that he has in mind more than one school division north of Township 22?

Now north of 22 isn't very far north, Madam Speaker. North of Township 22 we have the Town of Dauphin, the towns of Gilbert Plains, Grandview, Roblin, Ethelbert and Ste. Rose. It's a fairly large portion of this province that is settled, that there are organized municipalities in. From the way the bill reads and what the Honourable Minister said when he spoke on the second reading of this bill in introducing it to the House, he said that the intent was to establish a division at Cranberry-Portage, and he told us what it was to be all about, but in doing so he used the words "and other places."

Well, if we are to interpret the bill as meaning that the Minister will have the right to establish more than one division north of the Township 22 and have the right to withdraw parts from existing divisions and add to other parts, that he can change anywhere from 10 to 15 existing school divisions north of Township 22. I do not think it is right and I do not think it is fair that the Minister have the right to change the divisions that now exist. There's no appeal from his decision in these provisions that I can find.

What happens when he establishes a school division north of the 22nd? An official trustee is appointed, and if there are any existing trustees of divisions up in that area and they happen to come within the area established by the Minister, then they are disbanded. They no longer exist. And what do we have in their place? We have a committee, an advisory committee appointed by the Minister.

In other words, the people north of the 22nd, insofar as school divisions are concerned, will have no vote as to whether they want that particular type of division that the Minister is setting up; whether they are satisfied with the boundaries; whether they won't want their democratic right of voting for a board taken away from them. It's in direct contrast to what will be existing south of Township 22.

I may be wrong in my interpretation, but I suggest, Madam Speaker, that it is an interpretation that can be taken from the bill as it now reads, and unless the Minister can satisfy me and other members of this House who agree that there is an ambiguity here, I'm afraid that we'll have no choice but vote against the bill, and not because we are opposed to the establishment of a school division in the Cranberry-Portage area as outlined by the Minister. I for one think it's an excellent idea and I think it's not only a step, it's a leap in the right direction. But I certainly don't think we should endanger the existence and the rights of the school divisions that are now established north of the 22nd Township.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I'm not acquainted as the previous speaker is with the situation up north and just what divisions are north of Township 22 and so on, but it seems to me that we're imposing a division on this area now without a vote. This is a precedent, in my opinion, because all the other areas or divisions were brought in by vote, except the one district division in the Greater Winnipeg area.

Now I would like to know from the Minister whether the grants that he described -- was it last week? -- and which will also be pertaining to Bill 39, will be available to this division? Then I find that in the Section 471 that the official trustee of this division can arrange for living

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) accommodation if necessary, and also if necessary, to provide a residential school. Will these provisions also be made applicable to other divisions or will this provision only apply to the one division mentioned in this bill? I think these are questions that we should have answered before we continue.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I'd like first of all to answer the last speaker. I've answered the question of grants. Grants will be dealt with as I outlined the other day, imposing without a vote. I have before me a map of Manitoba which I had hoped to have at our committee stage. Those green squares are all existing special schools operated by the Minister now, 100 percent except for local contributions. The red squares are school districts, remote school districts in northern Manitoba. There are 3,300 children north of the 53rd parallel. I've said three times in this House, four in Grade 12. I'm not waiting another 80 years. We're going to get on with the job of building a residential high school to meet this special need in the north. This bill is for this purpose -- (Interjection) -- No, but you've got to get some more responsible statements from the Honourable Member from Rhineland, some understanding of the problem here. I've said it often enough and if he would read the Hansard he would understand more. I'm just a little irritated that this is all we're trying to do, bring greater educational opportunities to hundreds of boys and girls who now have no high school or a one-room high school and not in attendance at high school in this area -- four in Grade 12. We've got to have a residence if we're going to cut the mustard, and we intend to cut the mustard.

Now the member from Ethelbert-Plains has a very good point that he mentioned in the House here. The intent is, Sir, that this whole contiguous area, there's not much point in calling -- the idea was to call all these areas, these neighbourhoods as you call them, you know the remote school districts that have an organized district plus these special school areas initially in the division, and it's true it comes right down to Township 22 here which is just -- in fact it's the north end of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition's constituency, Hillboro -- (Interjection) -- is it? But the idea initially -- it goes to the north of Line 2, Matheson Island, which is not in any division at the moment. Now supposing Matheson Island came into a division closer to home in time, then we would withdraw our division description from the northern division that we have here. This is to get a start. We thought we should draw from all of these areas and then transfer back as we go along. Certainly the intent would be wherever possible to move into the central division.

Now the legal description of this I checked with the Deputy Minister, and with the legal counsel -- I think if there's anything there that could be sharpened up in Law Amendments, I'd be only too happy to look into it further. But this is what the intention is, so that we would be flexible. But I do think that for instance that Matheson Island is impossible to get a child in to the divisional high school unless you board him in. Now that might well be effected and if that's the case then you might drop that particular remote district from your division. So we wanted that flexibility and we may be able to answer special questions when we come into this Law Amendments. But I would hope that the question asked by the Honourable Member from Ethelbert-Plains would be satisfied to our mutual satisfaction. I would want that to be the case.

There's no attempt here to step on the rights of existing divisions or to interfere with them in any way. In fact if anything we can do to enhance them through this kind of action, we'll be very happy to do so. But I do reject, Madam Speaker, out-of-hand, the principle that we're imposing something. It's doggone well time that it was imposed. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Will the Honourable Minister permit a question? Was I right in saying that this bill gives you the authority, as it now stands, to take jurisdiction over quite a number of established divisions in settled areas? That is what's worrying me.

MR. JOHNSON: There's no intent to do that. We have a board of reference to in and out part of divisions. There's no intent or desire to get into a division with this plan that is existing now. The idea is to form this division and as our population increases and as our opportunities become greater, as transportation increases, we can then withdraw or close out where necessary.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Another question, Madam Speaker. I'm not imputing anything as far as intent is concerned here, Madam Speaker, I'm just asking whether that still makes it possible for you to do so. That is the point. I'm quite prepared to let it go to Law Amendments, but if there is any possibility of that being there, certainly you're going to get opposition to it.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, in answer to that question, it's my understanding from the legal counsel that this is the case. However, I will check and re-check this point.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, will the Honourable Minister not answer my question in connection with residential schools?

MR. JOHNSON: want to know further? This is a special residential school for northern Manitoba. We'll deal with any further questions in Committee.

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

. continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 62. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, it is my intention to ask to have this bill stand for the time being, but I would suggest that anyone who wishes to speak on it of course is able to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Anyone wishing to speak on it? 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 Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, the resolution states here that the report of the Committee be not now concurred in but be referred back to the Standing Committee of the House on Privileges and Elections to consider the following matters.

In my opinion, enough has been said on No. 2, the second matter, the advisability of following the practice of Federal Elections Act providing two enumerators. I go along with that completely. I feel that this would be a step in the right direction and there would be less criticism if this was implemented. The advisability of requesting the Government of Canada to eliminate the 48 hour blackout on certain media at election time is another one that was discussed and I go along with that.

However, although enough has been said on the last two matters, I feel that there is still some room for discussion on the first one, namely, the advisability of reducing the voting age to 18. The Leader of the New Democratic Party would like us to believe that all progressive ideas originate from his party. Although he is wrong and we know it, and I know that he does too, I'll not argue that point. If it makes him happy to indulge in this kind of talk, I like to see him happy, and I'll make him still happier by saying that we are grateful for his support, and I hope his party's support in this matter, in the matter of reducing the voting age to 18.

I am sorry, however, that I cannot say the same of the Conservative members across the alley here when it comes to extending franchise. But, Madam Speaker, it is no wonder. It seems to me, and I think it's a fact, that they always come last when it comes to progressive ideas.

Now this attitude of the Conservative Party to the extension of franchise is quite typical of the Conservative Party if you go back in history. This is not the first time that I speak in support of reducing the voting age to 18. I have spoken on previous occasions. I spoke on this last year and I'd like to say this is not the first time that the Conservatives voted against this -- by this I mean the extension of franchise -- not the first time that the Conservatives vote against this. I spoke in support of a similar resolution last year, and what do you know? The Conservatives voted against this. At the Standing Committee meeting this summer, just before this session, I tried to convince the Committee to give support to recommend this change, and again the Conservatives alone voted against this.

Let us go back in history and see, and I'll prove to you that the Conservatives vote against this continually. Manitoba has the honour of being the very first province in Canada to extend the franchise to women, and did the Conservatives give them that privilege? No. The Conservatives voted against this. Again in 1893, the first petition was presented by the women of that time asking the Conservative government of the time to give them the right to vote, and again the Conservatives voted against this. That's why I say it is typical of the Conservative Party.

In 1914 the Liberal Party in that year's election campaign, in their platform promised to enact a measure of equal suffrage. However, the Liberals were not elected.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, on a point of order, what's this got to do with the amendment?

MR. TANCHAK: I think it is relevant to the amendment, very relevant. However, the Liberals were not elected at the time and again the Conservatives voted against this. In 1953 or 1915 the women tried again by pleading, by ridicule, but again the Conservatives voted against this.

The Honourable Member of Hamiota told us that under no circumstances, and I have his quotation, "Should our young boys and girls be exposed to political partisanship. That's poor business," but I'll say that they should and that they are exposed. We just can't help that because they live among us. They are informed enough and they are mature enough to take part in politics, even at 18. In fact the majority of them I will say are just as well informed as some of the members of this Chamber here, just as well.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).....

Now let us consider the University students of whom a greater number -- students I mean -- are under the age of 21. They take an active part in mock parliaments, protest marches and so on and so forth. Whether they are right or wrong, they show great interest in it. Boys and girls up to 18 are under the protection of their parents and under their guidance up to 18. They are exposed to politics through their parents, through their environment. They take interest and this broadens their understanding of world affairs.

Now at 18 the majority of our young people strike out on their own, quite a number of them. They have new problems; they have other things to think about; so they lose contact with their former interests. So here between the ages of 18 and 21 is a void of three years where they lose contact. A period of three years where they begin to lose interest in provincial, in national and international affairs because they receive no encouragement from us elders or older people. In fact, we are telling them, you don't know enough. We do not want you to vote. We do not want you to take an interest. According to the Honourable Member from Hamiota, they shouldn't. We, the so-called mature ones, deny them the opportunity of participating and expanding their appreciation of such affairs as I have just mentioned, so at 21 they are not prepared to take their share of responsible judgment and that's an error. To the Member of Hamiota, all I could say is be the first Conservative to vote for this.

In last year's debate on the same subject, I was amused by the reason the Minister of Agriculture gave us when he opposed reducing the age to 18, and what did he say? He said that 18 to 21 year olds do not want to vote. They do not. I wonder how he knew? But if they do get the franchise and do not wish to exercise it, is anybody going to force them to vote if they do not want to vote, which I don't believe. Nobody is going to force them to vote, so if they don't want to vote they can abstain. But again it is typical of the Conservative thinking they do not want to vote. I say they do.

Here I shall read into the record a similar argument used by one of the former Premiers, and this refers to the time when I mentioned it that the women came with the petition to see the Cabinet about extending the vote to women, and here's the answer that they got: "It would never do to let you speak to the Cabinet," he said in the tone that one uses to a naughty child, "even if they listened to you, which I doubt, you would upset them and I don't want that to happen. They are good fellows, they do what they are told to do now. Every government has to have a head and I am the head of this one and I don't want dissension and arguments. No, you can't come in here and make trouble for my boys just when I have themand eating out of my hand. Now you forget all this nonsense about women voting. You are fine young women. I can see that, and take it from me nice women don't want to vote." Just like the Honourable Minister of Agriculture said.

A MEMBER: Who are you quoting?

MR. TANCHAK: It was a former Minister.

A MEMBER: Would you mind tabling it please?

MR. TANCHAK: No, I don't want to give the name of the honourable member who is gone now, but if the members are interested, I'd refer them to --

MR. ROBLIN:delicacy touches me deeply.

MR. TANCHAK: I would refer the Honourable Members to Government of Manitoba, page 74.

MR. SCHREYER: Is the honourable member referring to a former Premier?

MR. TANCHAK: Right. I said so in the first place. And I'll just say now that history repeats itself in the person of the Minister of Agriculture -- "They do not want to vote." I say our young people want to vote. They are capable of right decisions and should be given the right to vote.

In my opening remarks I stated that Manitoba had the honour of being the first province to give the vote to women. In 1916 when the Conservative government was defeated, the Liberals granted them the franchise. I have another quotation here and it says, dated Free Press, February 15, 1916, and here is what happened. The Free Press described the scene in the Legislature: "Amid scenes of unparalleled enthusiasm, the bill to amend The Manitoba Election Act so as to give the suffrage to women of the province on the same terms as the men was passed in the Legislature yesterday. When the third reading had been given the bill, the ladies thronged the galleries, stood up and in rich soprano 100 female voices sang O Canada."

Now in conclusion I'll say this, you members opposite of the Conservative ranks, beat the Liberals to the punch this time. You have a chance. Vote in favour of this. If you don't,

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd). after the next election the Liberals will give them the right to vote, and I hope that after this session I will not be able to say the Conservatives voted against this.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, it had not been my intention to take part in this debate in regard to the voting of our younger people, but inasmuch as I have been accused by three parties of the Liberal benches I thought I should state my point once again. They have taken great glee over the statement I made and I suppose now they can double over with laughter, because I'm going to state it again.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone stated that he was quoting me when he made the following statement: "I recall what the Honourable Member for Hamiota had to say at that time. I'm quoting again and he said, 'Young people shouldn't be allowed to associate themselves with any political party'." Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member from Gladstone can't even read let alone speak, because the words that I used in that speech at that time was "identify themselves", not "associate themselves". --(Interjection)-- To identify yourself is to prove to be absolutely the same, and to associate is one who is frequently in the company or the society of another.

Madam Speaker, I believe that young people, whether they are 15, 16, 17, 18 or 19 should associate themselves with political parties. At the last Conservative Convention I was one of the members that instigated the young people, high school people, attending the convention. As a matter of fact I brought a 17 year old high school student to that convention. He happened to be a member of a Liberal family. I said to the parents of that boy when I invited him that I thought it would be good for him; that there were no strings attached; that I thought he should attend both the Liberal and the New Democratic Party Conventions; and that I didn't think that he would be capable of forming a proper opinion as to what politics he should follow until he had experienced something in all these different fields. I still maintain the same thing. I don't think that a young person up to the age of 21 should be identified with any party. --(Interjection)--. I missed that comment, Madam Speaker, and I intend to ignore it.

Regarding the other points in the resolution, Madam Speaker, regarding the two enumerators in the urban voting divisions, this doesn't perturb me too greatly although the opportunity of getting your name on the rolls has been enlarged on several different methods, and I would think that it should be given a try regarding the blackout. This amazes me, Madam Speaker, because I would have thought that the government would have been advocating this lifting of the ban for 48 hours and the Opposition opposing it. The government would know when the election was going to be held. It would give them an opportunity to book the television hours at the end of the campaign and the oppositions would be kept out entirely, so I commend the government for their broadmindedness in carrying this out and trying to maintain the 48 hour ban for the benefit of the political gain in this province.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the previous speaker permit a question? Well I interjected the words "should one ever". I want to ask the member if he thinks that an individual, an adult even, should identify himself with a political party. I ask that because he said that young people should associate but not identify, and I would ask him if he thinks that adults should identify rather than associate.

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, it's my opinion that an adult is capable of making up their own mind. If it is their desire to identify themselves with a Communist Party or any other party, that's their business and they should be responsible for that action.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Emerson has kind of irritated me to the point where I think that I should stand up. I don't like his words, "come last". I was always of the opinion that the Conservatives were progressive, and especially our Party. I think that if anybody came last, I think it's the Liberal Party, because who stood up and voted against crop insurance? Who stood up and voted against agricultural credit? He was the very man that did that. And a number I can mention, go down the line, school division plan. Who voted against that? And continue down the line, who came last there? The Honourable Member for Emerson did. I think that he should be the last one to tell us that we're coming last, because I think that since 1958 we have brought in progressive legislation and, in most cases, he was the last one that went along with it. In fact, he never has gone along with it. He has criticized from the time that it was brought in. So I think that he should take a second look at himself and maybe vote against this amendment.

He said this is quite typical of the Conservative Party at coming last. Well that's his

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)..... opinion and I'll be content to go along with mine. But I would like to suggest to him that he look at the various provinces across Canada and decide when they are allowed to vote, and if he will only look at the Federal Government -- he was so consistent in the last resolution that we voted on on the uniformity of time, uniform time -- the last resolution he mentioned he was so anxious that we have uniform time across Manitoba, why isn't he consistent in this resolution? The Federal Government voted the age of 21. Is he not consistent with his federal buddies at Ottawa or does he want to be different from them?

So I would ask him to decide whether he wants to be uniform with the Federal Government or not, because they do consider a man capable of voting at the age of 21. In British Columbia, they are a little different up there as the Member for Rhineland has told us many times, they vote at 19; Alberta is at 19; Saskatchewan at 18 -- they're different; Manitoba, as I told you; Ontario at 21; Quebec, 18; New Brunswick, 21; Nova Scotia, 21; Prince Edward Island, 21; Newfoundland, 21. So you find that the majority of the provinces decided that the age of 21 is the right age for people to be allowed the privilege of voting.

He mentioned about the young people have asked that they be allowed permission to vote at the age of 18. I never have had anyone at the age of 18 come to me and ask that they be given that privilege. In fact, in one collegiate in my constituency they took a poll and they turned this down completely. In fact, they even turned Sunday sports down in that collegiate, which was something I thought they would be anxious to have, but they turned that down too. So they, I don't think, are asking for the privilege of voting. I think the only ones that are asking for the privilege of having these people vote are the Liberal Party. I am not going to associate the New Democratic Party because I know that they have always taken that stand over the years, that young people have the right to be a member of a political party and show their decision on that day.

I was a member of that committee that sat during the summer, or during the fall, including my seat-mate here, the Honourable Member for Hamiota, and we heard these very things mentioned at that time and when the votes came up they were voted down. We heard the next resolution too on two enumerators, the same as the Federal Government, and I will admit they were uniform with the Federal Election Act on that point. Living in a rural area, I have seen no need for it, so I couldn't go along with that.

Regarding the 48-hour blackout, I think that this is one, as the Honourable Member for Hamiota has mentioned, that we on the government side could use to good advantage. I know myself, living on the edge of Brandon if I got on the good side of the Premier and he told me an hour in advance of what he told the rest of you, that I could tie up CKX-TV along with the Member for Brandon, and it would be impossible for other opposition members to get any radio time or television time, during that last 48 hours, that would be providing we had enough money to buy that time, which I know is very expensive. But it's possible that we might be able to do that.

But I think that all these arguments are of no concern I think to the most of us, to the people of Manitoba, and I would ask that all the Members in the Legislature here use their good judgment and vote against this amendment.

MR. TANCHAK: Will the honourable member permit a question? Will you? Yes? I stressed that the Conservatives were always last to extend franchise. Doesn't the honourable member agree with me?

MR. McKELLAR: No. You admitted we're always last at everything and I admitted we weren't.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member will permit a question? Did I understand him correctly to say that he's in favour of uniformity across Canada and with the Federal Government insofar as the voting age?

MR. McKELLAR: I think that if the Federal Government changes the voting age, we will change it too. In my opinion, this is the only way we should change it.

MR. MOLGAT: So I gather that he is in favour of uniformity; that I gather that he is not in favour of uniformity however on other sections of the Act such as the enumerators.

MR. McKELLAR: Well, I don't consider that of too great importance in my area so I can't see -- in fact, I don't think that elections are won or lost on this point.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Sorry, Madam Speaker, I have very little to add to this debate except for one thing that I believe is becoming more and more of a problem or a headache in regards to the day of election, and this item is the matter of picking up or

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd).....providing transportation for the voter to the polls. This particular feat has bothered me to no end really, the gimmicks and the ideas used to persuade people that are being pulled, or driven, or transferred to the polls. I think this method is not correct. Not only is it expensive they tell me, it seems to complicate matters a lot when big organizations try to get these people to the polls, and it seems to have become a habit today that either you try and get your best political friends or the so-called persuaders to make them available for election day.

While we were discussing the different items under the Elections and Privileges, I thought possibly something could be considered in this line. I don't think we're ready to suggest that we should go as far as our friends do across the line, possibly even register, although sometimes I'm not sure if we asked the people that they must vote unless they have some real good reason such as religion and others, I think possibly this transportation might just be cleared up a little bit. Therefore, I thought while we were discussing the matter it might only be another important subject on Privileges and Elections, to go a little further while we're discussing it.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I forget whether I spoke on the amendment or the main motion. I didn't speak twice, Madam Speaker. I didn't speak twice on this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please. Until the Clerk of the House returns with the knowledge we need, the honourable member will please stay in his seat.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the previous speaker if I could ask him a question. Does he want to say that he favours registration as opposed to enumeration?

MR. BARKMAN: I have no definite answer on that, but I think if the percentage of voting decreases as they have the last years, this may be one of the solutions, yes.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone may proceed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am sorry to have thrown a monkey wrench into the affairs that were running along so nicely there, but all I really want to do is ask my honourable friend, or two, or three, a couple of questions. The Honourable Member for Hamiota suggested that I couldn't read. Madam Speaker, we were reading two different articles and that explains why there is a misunderstanding here. I was quoting what the Tribune had to say on February 26, 1964, and that fine picture of the lady and the gentleman there, my honourable friend, the Minister of Agriculture and the Honourable the Member for Pembina.....

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. What has that to do with the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I want to read what it says about what the Member for Hamiota said. It says, "Also opposing the motion was Barry Strickland, PC." And it says here, "Young people," he said, "should not be allowed to associate themselves with any political party." I was reading from this. I was reading from this -- associate -- and not from the other. I'm just quoting what the Tribune said. This is in quotation marks and once again I suggest that the papers be a little more careful when they are quoting the members opposite. I don't mind them misquoting me occasionally, but they seem to have a habit of misquoting the members opposite, much to their disgust.

I can understand that my honourable friends opposite are at a loss to know what should be done in regard to lowering the voting age, and when my honourable friend the Member for Hamiota said that he had attracted a Liberal to a Conservative convention, I wonder if it was the Thinkers.....

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, the word I used was invited, not attracted.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well that's fine, fine with me, Madam Speaker. I wonder if the convention that he was at was "The Thinkers Conference" in Ottawa. Was that the one, or was he referring.....

MR. STRICKLAND:Conservative Convention in Manitoba.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Oh. Well, there probably was some dissension there too but there certainly was at The Thinkers Conference and I have before me, I have before me the Tribune again, and this is the one that is inclined to go along with my friends opposite there but it says that "a dwindling group" -- Madam Speaker, I'm quoting, "A dwindling group of Tory die-hards worked Wednesday to complete a slightly odd-ball platform for their party while most of their fellow Conservative delegates packed it up and went home." I'm quoting from the Tribune and I don't know whether it's a misquote or not but -- "the whole thing is

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) subject to change later this year when the first Conservative Thinkers Conference in 22 years will try to work out a comprehensive policy for the Party." One of the things that they couldn't make up their mind on was this 18 year old vote, it says. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that it is time that they had another Thinkers Conference. They've had one in 22 years and couldn't decide on anything then. Well I say let's have another one and let's get some uniformity on this one because they have suggested that they could go along with some uniformity. So I hope that they will support the amendment and this will be the first step in this direction.

MR. CAMPBELL: waiting, hoping that the Leader of the New Democratic Party would be in his seat when I made my very few remarks in this debate because the honourable gentleman when he spoke on this amendment had some rather caustic remarks to make about the stand that the former government of this province and the Liberal Party as such had taken with regard to the 18 year old vote and I guess that he, I gather at least, that he was rather charging me with lack of principle in this matter and perhaps I have not stood very strongly for principle because the position that I took as he correctly mentioned, was that as far as I was concerned personally, that I would go along with any age from 18 to 21 that the Federal Government would agree to. Now in case either the Honourable Member for Hamiota or the Honourable Member for Emerson should charge me with being the last in that and taking my cue from somebody else, I think there again that this is a matter where uniformity is of advantage because I don't think it makes anything like as much difference to us, the voting age that they have in any of the other western provinces or in the other provinces of Canada because with the exception of the few people who change their residence once in a while they do not vote in those elections, but it does make a difference so far as the provincial and the federal elections are concerned, and in my opinion municipal ones too, because there are so -- it's amazing how many people are confused about voting procedures -- and I thought there was some advantage in having both the federal government and the provincial government having similar action on this matter. I never thought it was so important the fact that at one time we had four different voting ages in the four western provinces and still have three different voting ages, as one of the honourable members mentioned a little while ago. But to have the province and the federal government have the same voting age and other election procedures as nearly uniform as possible to me always seemed to be important. And so I did take the position that the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party mentioned and I did undertake that at an ensuing conference, Federal-Provincial, that I would raise the matter, and I am sure I reported since that time to the House on the matter but I have not been able to find any record of that report. But if I failed to do so I report now that I took the matter up at a Federal-Provincial conference, one being a Federal-Provincial conference on financial arrangements, and I also took it up at one of the constitutional conferences because it seemed to me that it came quite properly within the scope of a constitutional conference. I made exactly that suggestion to the various Premiers who were there and the representatives of the Federal Government that as I understood the feeling then of the Manitoba Government and the people of Manitoba, that they would be quite prepared to accept any age from 18 to 21 that the Federal Government itself would go along with. And I made a suggestion to the conference that we should consider, all of us, reducing the voting age to some extent. Now I did not try to encourage the other Premiers who were there to change their procedure but I certainly made it plain that Manitoba would be inclined to go along with the Federal Government if they decided to do so. I think that is still the proper approach but if -- I don't know what the Federal Government will do in the matter. I understand that no change has been made yet but I also understand that there's a good deal of favourable opinion to the 18 year age -- and if they make that change then I certainly would argue that we should go along and I would be inclined to say that we should also encourage the municipal people to give thought to the same matter, or that we should give thought to amending their legislation in that regard. So I speak now only to report that I did carry out the commitment that I made because my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party seemed to think that there was some doubt about that matter and that perhaps we had been just shelving the suggestions that had come at that time.

Now people can charge me with having no principle in that matter. I was in favour, I'm still in favour of a gradual lowering of the age whether it be to 20, to 19 or to 18. On that matter, if it's one of principle, I had no firm view. But I did feel that we should try first to get the uniformity with the one government that we are on all fours with so far as our citizens

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)..... voting in both elections. And I hope that regardless of what happens to this particular amendment now, which I intend to support, that if we find that there is a change made in the federal sphere and regardless of what government is in office here in Manitoba, that that government will then of its own volition give serious consideration in the interests of uniformity, to going along with the action that the Federal Government takes, because to me the age limit itself is not any more important than the question of giving that little bit of extra uniformity to election procedures, because I believe that the more uniform they can be made in the different voting areas, the better it is for the people who take part in the elections.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure, and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; Nays, 34.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

..... continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney General.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, if you are prepared to give your ruling with respect to the Committee on Ways and Means, I would be prepared to move that now, or suggest that you call that item now.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister. Dealing with this debate which I have had under consideration, concerning the sub-judice matter raised in the House by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition with respect to reference to the Grand Rapids Water Haulage Commission.

In seeking guidance from our Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, I find that in the 1951 edition Rule 41 read as follows: "No member shall refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending nor make reference to judges and courts of justice and to personages of high official station of a nature of a personal attack or censure." On April 5, 1957, the words "In a court of law" were added after the word "pending" where it appears in the rule. Our rules of 1960, which we are presently using, make no reference to Rule 41 as it appeared in 1951. Thus I must rely on other Parliamentary authorities and give consideration to the practice followed by the Federal House.

Sir Erskine May's 16th Edition on page 359 refers to a court of law under examples of inadmissible questions. Section (6) reads: "Reflecting on the decision of a court of law -- or being likely to prejudice a case which is under trial."

Also, on Page 400 May's referred to "Matters pending Judicial Decision" and reads in part as follows: "A matter whilst under adjudication by a court of law, should not be brought before the House by a motion or otherwise."

And on Page 457 May's reads as follows: "Matters awaiting the adjudication of a court of law should not be brought forward in debate."

This authority seems to be consistent that a matter can be sub-judice only when it is before a court of law.

The commission we are referring to, namely "The Grand Rapids Water Haulage Inquiry Commission" is a commission appointed under The Evidence Act, Part V. Honourable Members will appreciate and note this is an Inquiry Commission, An Inquiry Commission and one which is still sitting.

The Honourable Members of this Assembly are aware that in the Federal Jurisdiction, there is at the present time a Royal Commission, a Royal Commission -- an Inquiry Commission appointed under The Evidence Act -- inquiring into a subject well known to all Members. I am informed by reliable sources that in this Federal Jurisdiction Members are requested to refrain from any discussion which may prejudice the work of that commission.

In giving this review to the Honourable Members, Members will appreciate that I have sought our own Rules, which give no guidance. Our Parliamentary Authority, Sir Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, as I have previously stated, seems consistent that a matter can be sub-judice only when it is before a court of law. Beauchesne's 4th Edition gives little or no guidance. Our Federal Jurisdiction are following the practice of refraining from discussion which may prejudice the work of a sitting commission.

The Grand Rapids Water Haulage Inquiry Commission presently sitting was requested to inquire into and report upon the circumstances relating the decision of Manitoba Hydro to arrange water haulage service, Selkirk to Grand Rapids, in connection with the construction of the Grand Rapids Hydro Electric project.

In my opinion the Inquiry is a commission or a court and must be considered in this light. In my view, we owe respect and a duty to it in considering our judgment of whether we should or should not allow any discussion which may prejudice the work of that body. Therefore, in my opinion, to permit discussion of the same subject matter in this House would amount to two different bodies inquiring at the same time on the same subject matter. Accordingly I must rule that the Members of this House refrain from discussing this subject matter, and, with regard to the document the Honourable Leader of the Opposition proposed to lay on the Table of the House, in order to comply with Parliamentary Procedure I would refer the Honourable Member to May's Parliamentary Practice on Page 460, where it reads: "It has also been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid on the Table of the House." In my view, in order to lay a document on the Table of the House, the Honourable

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd) Member must have referred to it and informed the House as to the nature of the document. Accordingly, I must instruct the Clerk to return the document to the Honourable Member.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I realize that your ruling is not one that is debatable. I wonder if I might ask a question. Is Madam Speaker aware -- well then, Madam Speaker, I must regretfully challenge your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion before the House: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas -- 41, Nays -- 12.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, under your ruling I am prevented from discussing certain matters that I had wished to bring forward. I shall abide by your ruling as best I can.

I find it extremely difficult, however, to understand how I as an elected representative of the people of my constituency, sitting in this free Assembly, am prevented from discussing certain matters when newspapers are permitted to discuss those very matters not only in their news pages but in editorials, as has been done by the Winnipeg Tribune on the 22nd of March. I fail completely to understand the rules of a democratic system which permits this sort of affair, which means that an elected member sent here to represent the people of his constituency and the people of this province, is prevented by this Assembly from discussing matters that are discussed openly, commented upon, on which editorial comment is made elsewhere, and members of this House are prevented.

Madam Speaker, I would like to go on to other subjects. We owe a great deal in this country in our democratic system to the mother country and to the English system, to the British parliamentary structure. They have different views, apparently, than those that we have here as to what is proper and what is not proper. I'd like to read to the House a news story that appeared in the New York Times, the 28th of July, 1964; the date line is London. The story says: "A leading defence contractor has offered to refund to the government 4.3 million pounds, that is 11.8 million dollars, of excess profits from missile contracts, Julian Amory, Aviation Minister, announced today in the House of Commons. The statement came as a report was published placing contractors' profits at 5,772,964 pounds or 15,164,000 dollars. The report published after a six-month inquiry by Mr. J. Lang, a former permanent secretary to the Admiralty, said the profits represented 82 percent of cost and 45 percent of selling prices. The Company is Ferranti Limited, an electronics manufacturer with operations centred in the Manchester area. In the 1950's it became prime contractor for the Bloodhound Ground-to-Air missile, the main element in British defences. The company has maintained that a big profit is justified because of low profit on past defence work. The Lang report calls the company to submit bids that it knew were not likely to yield profits that could not be regarded as fair and reasonable. It also charged that the Air Ministry lacked co-ordination in accounting branches and placed undue reliance on technical cost estimates."

A further story in the New York Times on July 30, 1964, again from London: "A political dispute was threatened today over the 82 percent profit that a British electronics company made on a government missile contract. There was nothing illegal about the profit, but a special committee indicated it was based on an improper cost estimate. The Company, Ferranti Limited, paid back four-fifths of its profits yesterday while protesting that it deserved credit for its 'undoubted efficiency'. A special non-partisan committee reported that the Aviation Ministry showed a lack of direction and lack of drive in awarding the contract in the first place, and that the civil servants concerned lived in 'an ivory tower'. The opposition Labour Party filed a motion of censure. It was expected to demand the resignation of one or more cabinet ministers. Ferranti made a profit of \$16 million or 82 percent though the special

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) report showed that the government believed it was allowing for only seven percent. Ferranti announced yesterday that it was paying back \$12 million. The missile was the Bloodhound Mark I, which was withdrawn from service earlier this year." Madam Speaker, I submit that in the interests of the Province of Manitoba we would be well advised to follow a little more closely the example given to us by the Mother of Parliament.

Madam Speaker, I fail completely to understand the logic, the philosophy, or the basis for a government that appoints a commission called the Tallin Commission. What does the Tallin Commission do, Madam Speaker? The Tallin Commission is instructed to inquire into government affairs? Not in the least! Into private contracts entered into by private companies with private individuals, and the Tallin Commission goes up and down this province inquiring into private affairs in which the government has no direct responsibility. And people agree that this is right and I agree that it is right. I approve of what was done in that regard. But Madam Speaker, on what sort of logic, on what sort of philosophy are we operating, when the government proceeds to do that and turns around and says, "You cannot inquire into contracts where someone is dealing with the government."

MR. ROBLIN: I must protest. The government at no time has made any stipulations about what could be inquired into and what could not. That is completely false and untrue.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if the First Minister will go back to the Committee of Inquiry that was held by this Legislature, if he will go back to what went on in this very Legislature, he will know that he presented it, he and his majority. No one else. Let him not for one moment say it was anyone else, because we specifically insisted at that time that it be a vote of the committee when we asked to bring the cost and operating factors forward, and the government objected; the government voted against it; and you were there and don't go skulking away and hiding behind it. You were there.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Chairman, my honourable friend was talking about the commissions that were appointed, not what happened last year, and --

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I am prevented by your ruling from speaking about a certain commission that's been appointed. I'm not allowed to speak about that in this House. Newspapers can talk about it elsewhere -- I can't here.

MR. ROBLIN: Stick to the truth.

MR. MOLGAT: My honourable friend knows full well the situation. He doesn't need to try and pretend otherwise now. He doesn't want the information to come out; he prevented the information from coming out, in the Inquiry that was held by this House; he will not permit me to bring it out now. Well, I can say, Madam Speaker, that my honourable friend should pay more attention to what goes on elsewhere, and I can see no logic in setting up a commission to investigate private affairs and then to turn around and do otherwise when it comes to public affairs.

MR. ROBLIN: That is not true. That is not true, and I am entitled to say that it's not true when the statement is made.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Member from St. Boniface please come to order. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I am raising a point of order. Would you ask the Honourable the First Minister to come to order, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable -- order please.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition conceded the floor when he sat down, to the Honourable the First Minister. The floor belongs to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, what I was saying was that this government appointed the Tallin Commission, and this commission was specifically instructed to investigate purely private matters -- purely private matters; matters between certain corporations and other private individuals. This commission travelled through Manitoba; heard anyone who was prepared to come forward and present a case. It wasn't a question of prosecution or defence; it was an inquiry to find out the facts. I say to my honourable friends, as I said before, they would be well advised to pay more attention to what goes on in the Old Country. The front benchers of this government would be well advised to find out what British cabinet ministers do and how they operate. My honourable friends would find that there's a vast difference between the way the mother country operates its parliament and the way this government operates

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) in the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I'm afraid that if I went further I would be transgressing your rule, and I do not wish to do so, but I say, Madam Speaker, that this is indeed a black day for democracy in this province when members of this House are prevented from discussing issues which are openly discussed outside this House; prevented from making comments on matters which a Commission has obviously and specifically ruled are outside of its competence and outside of its jurisdiction; when newspaper editors can proceed to comment on what they think is right and wrong about certain statements made by a commissioner, and members of this House are told by the majority in this House, "You cannot say anything." That is the situation that faces us, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I return now to the general theme of my budget speech which I gave the other day. Madam Speaker, when one looks at what is happening in the Province of Manitoba, the fact that our population is not growing, the fact that our economy is not moving at the pace that all of us would like to see, not moving at the pace that other provinces are moving, and those, Madam Speaker, from the statements of the government itself -- not our statements, but the statements of the First Minister when he says that we're standing still.

When we look at the facts and figures, for example the corporation income tax which I mentioned the other day showing no progress, we have great reason to be concerned in this province, and when we compare that, Madam Speaker, to the actions of this government in proceeding to load on further taxes and further debt on our people, is it any wonder that the people of Manitoba are saying, "Where are we going? Where is this going to end?" If we could see that the investment that is being made was really creating progress in the province, if we could see that there was an upsurge comparable to the investment in population, in economic activity, Manitobans would be quite pleased to proceed. But Manitobans right now are concerned at the fact that they are asked every year to put up new taxes, and worse than that, the debt is growing even faster, which means that eventually it will have to be repaid through further taxes, and they don't see the progress. The result is that the same group of people, the same population is carrying an ever and ever growing load.

If we were showing the results that we should in the Province of Manitoba, the incomes of our peoples would be moving up, our population would be growing; our economic base would be expanding; we would not need to be constantly increasing both debt and taxes because the upsurge would in itself create new income. This is what is happening in Canada today. This is what the Federal Government has found, that with no need to increase the rate of taxation the total taxes coming in have increased very substantially, permitting the government to enter into new programs because the economy is buoyant, because Canada is moving ahead, so that the same rate of taxation is providing a much larger amount of money. But that isn't so in the Province of Manitoba. In the Province of Manitoba, on the contrary, we have to be adding constantly to the load. This, Madam Speaker, can become, in fact it is, but it will be an even greater hindrance to our development in this province because we are becoming one of the provinces that people will be afraid to come to.

We have to face the facts, Madam Speaker. From a climate standpoint we are not the most attractive area in Canada. We do not have some of the natural advantages of certain other provinces. We don't have the built-in economy that the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec, for example, have. We probably have to fight harder here to accomplish what we want to see done, but if we keep on raising the load we are making it that much more difficult, Madam Speaker, for those who are here to progress, and we are discouraging others from coming here. And Madam Speaker, my main criticism of the administration of this government insofar as the finances are concerned, is that we have been adding on to the costs without getting results for them. This government has failed in its programs and the result is that the people of Manitoba have to pay far beyond what they should and that the future indeed looks bleak as long as this process will continue.

So Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after "that" in line one, and substituting the following: "This House regrets that despite steady and alarming increases in debt and taxes, this Government has failed to promote adequate economic growth in Manitoba."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on Resolution No. 28, Item 2(b) (1) -- passed?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, what are we on now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on Item No. 2(b) (1) University of Manitoba, General Grants.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): If I recall correctly, before we rose the other evening there were a number of questions that had been directed to the Minister of Education dealing with the question of general grants to the University of Manitoba. An observation was made that while there was an increase of \$1.1 million in the general grants, that when we took out of that figure the amount of money that is going to be used in addition to the previous grants for the placing of the Manitoba Teachers College at the University, that it really doesn't amount to a great deal of money in view of the fact of a continuous expansion on the campus in respect of student increases and the like. In addition to this, Mr. Chairman, the other day, reading on the basis of the grants and the transferring of the Teachers College, an item -- and I presume that this actually does come into the question of grants at the University level, that whereas at the Manitoba Teachers Training College at Tuxedo there were certain items of expenditure, board and room, that was previously subsidized in respect of the teachers at Tuxedo, according to the report as I understand it, and the estimates for the department and the remarks of the Minister, that no longer, no longer will this be so, and that the teachers in training that are going to go to the University will not any longer have a sort of a subsidized board and room treatment as they did at Tuxedo. Now I would imagine that this also, unless there is some -- if there is a subsidy insofar as the grant structure to University to the eating facilities on the campus there, that the teachers are going to be prejudiced against by the move in this respect, by the move over to the campus. I wonder if the Minister might care to comment on that.

Then also, dealing with the general grants the other day -- we were discussing the question of the grants insofar as the affiliated colleges were concerned -- I understood the Minister to say that he believed that it was \$79.00 of a grant toward the affiliated colleges per student, whereas in the other area it was \$1,130 or something to that effect, so we really didn't get the complete answer from our friend the Minister of Education, and I wonder if it might be possible for him now to go over these items that I have mentioned, and which were mentioned the other day, in order that we may have a clarification of the picture.

Also, I would like at this time, and I think it would be proper for me at this time, we did the other day discuss the question of the increased fees for University students, for which the students of course protested most vigorously. I had an opportunity since that time to read over some of the remarks of the Minister of Education on a comparative basis of fees with other universities, and appears, as he stated, that our fees here are somewhat less than they are in some jurisdictions. However, Mr. Chairman, I was intrigued with the general cost of the fees for our students in the field of Medicine. Why I raise this particular point at this time, Mr. Chairman, is because I have been conducting a survey into Medicine, and also the remarks of the Minister of Education that he made while he was the Minister of Health, and his presentation before the Royal Commission on Health Services by Mr. Justice Hall and among other statements in that and also in the Hall Commission Report -- and I'm not discussing Medicare, Mr. Chairman, in case there's any confusion, I'm not discussing Medicare but rather the provision of personnel, medical personnel, and it is indicated that more and more emphasis is going to have to be placed on the provision of medical students.

Now I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister that one of the necessities for the provision of students is the lowering of the fees in the medical school and at University respecting students who are going to take Medicine as a career for the future. It does seem to me that this is a field of endeavour where it is readily admitted from coast to coast that more emphasis has to be laid upon, that more appeals -- may I use that expression -- more appeals of necessity would have to be made, more incentives for young men and young

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) women to take up the field of medicine, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that one of these fields would be a sort of reversing, a sort of reversing of the student fees that we have not only here in Manitoba but other universities as well. It is my understanding, in all due respect to them, that the lawyers' fees are considerably less than those in the field of Medicine, and Jiminy Crickets, haven't we got enough lawyers to reduce fees, and maybe -- I would suggest that it might be a good time, in all due respect, Mr. Chairman, to you and the rest of the law fraternity in this House, if we placed the premium on the other end of the stick. If it's a question of getting necessary revenues, let's turn it upside down like Tommy Douglas suggested he's going to do in Canada with the number of members we anticipate in the forthcoming election, let's turn the table upside down for a change, for after all, we have one doctor in this House who is doing an admirable job as the Minister of Education and far be it from me to attempt to butter up the other side, but I do like them as individuals. But I suggest that the ratio even in this House is not sufficiently level enough. We've got one doctor and goodness knows how many lawyers we've got in here. Now I would say in proportion to their contribution, at least from the other side, and all due respect to them as personal individuals, that if we had just as much activity and interest on the legal basis as we have from our friend the doctor, we'd have a better balance.

The main point though, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that we do need to set up greater incentives to aid young men and women to pursue a career in the field of Medicine. As I say, if it's a question of revenue and we can't upset the balance, I would suggest insofar as income to the University is concerned, I'd suggest let's start charging the \$550.00 or whatever it is per year in the field of Law, and then make some substantial reductions in the field of Medicine so that it would be an incentive to more individuals like my honourable friend the Member for Gimli to pursue his career. I note, if memory serves me correctly, that something along this line is going to be done in the Province of Newfoundland. I believe the Prime Minister there, Joey Smallwood, has taken this under consideration and is going to give added incentives to students taking Medicine in order that their medical requirements will be filled.

MR. EVANS: I hate to interrupt my honourable friend's ten minute question, but I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, I wish to report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. The House will now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Hansard No. 36, Page 889, March 23, 1965.

MR. DESJARDINS: "All of Canada is my home. I was born in Manitoba, but I am at home not only on the banks of the Red River but also on the banks of the St. Lawrence. The dual culture of which we speak so often is in one degree or another my culture. But you cannot divide me. I am a Canadian.

"Part of my inheritance is here in the province of Quebec and it is French. I know who rejected the armies of the 13 colonies of the United States before the walls of Quebec in 1775. I know in what language they shouted "victory" at Châteauguay during the war of 1812. I know who struggled for responsible government in Canada in 1837. I know also that there were as many "tuques" as Scottish tams at the foundation of my own province in 1870. I know the value of that unique and distinctive idea, the concept of a country based on union without uniformity which is the distinctive trademark of Canada and the Canadian personality. And that is why, in spite of current fashions and in spite of current moods I do not conceive . . . I cannot conceive . . . I cannot resign myself to conceive of Canada without Quebec nor of Quebec without Canada."

And a little further:

"We owe it not only to ourselves but to the world to show how two cultures can flourish within the bosom of a single state and to their mutual advantage and growth. And what we French and English speaking Canadians must now do is to rediscover and to restore the hard won fraternity that united us and the Fathers of Confederation in 1867."