

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, February 24th, 1967

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I would like to direct the attention of the members to the gallery, where on my right we have 60 students of Grade 12 standing, from the Garden Valley Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Siemens, Mr. Ritze and Mr. Brown. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. On my left we have 20 students taking the Post High Course at Tech Voc School under the direction of Miss Kelly. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 21. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, might I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 25. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, in his absence, may we have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 54. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I had an occasion to speak on the Bill that was presented by the Honourable the Attorney-General on the Liquor Act and at that time I indicated that I had requested that this Bill before you now be drawn up. This request was made before we heard the Speech from the Throne. Now that I've had an opportunity to see the Bill presented by the Honourable the Attorney-General I find that it fully covers what I had had in mind in relation to permitting the serving of liquor in restaurants on Sundays, and I therefore ask permission to withdraw this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave to withdraw this Bill? (Agreed). The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, as you know, when we closed I was in debate on my proposal to have the Roads to Resources program extended so that we could develop more of the wilderness areas of Manitoba. I would like to point out at this time that this is really just not for northern Manitoba alone, it covers many areas in the province, and I think that as we move into the programs of developing wilderness and park areas we will find more and more use for roads under this particular type of a program. Generally speaking, roads to resources are built in probably what should be called the most expensive road building areas in almost the world today, and I sympathize when we call for these roads with the Minister of Highways who also sits on our treasury bench, and I'm sure that he at times must have a great deal of difficulty in justifying the large expenses that are required in the construction of these type of roads. But road programs in the north are essential in many many areas covering many many millions of dollars, and if we took the original Roads to Resources program which we shared with Ottawa, we'd find that they had contributed I believe somewhere around seven to seven and a half million dollars, which on a cost-sharing program develops 15 millions of dollars of road. In the north alone we have roads of a great deal of importance, and particularly, as brought to our attention a short time ago, the road developing that area which lies between Grand Rapids and Ponton. And then we have a proposed road to extend from Ponton to Lynn Lake, and this particularly is a very important road for northern development because in developing the road first of all we take Lynn Lake out of isolation, we provide roads for our fishing industry, we would assist in the future Churchill Forest Industry Products' potential and then we would open up that vast area at the heart of the Province of Manitoba which at present lies dormant; dormant because no one can get in there cheap enough to develop that area, and as I pointed out the other day certainly the development of highways can prove to be very profitable to both governments when we look at the Thompson area where three new mines were found within a half a mile of the highway. I don't say that this will happen on the road to Lynn Lake but I am sure that it will open up and make available exploration areas which would be economically possible for the mining companies to develop.

In looking at the roads, then we should consider roads to Churchill. Churchill Townsite is over 300 years old, one of the oldest towns in Western Canada. Still it lies in isolation. And only today I have a letter from the Chamber of Commerce at Churchill in which they submit a resolution -- they advised that they're submitting a resolution to the annual meeting of the

(MR. BEARD cont'd). . . . Chambers of Commerce, wording such as: "As Churchill is not presently served by any road, and as it is vitally important to the economy of Manitoba as a whole to make available the facilities of Manitoba and the prairie provinces' only port, and as the prominent persons in all prairie provinces have expressed their support of the port, and as the province in the past has had great financial benefits from mineral exploration taking place after the development of any road, and as the influx of tourists would benefit the whole of the province, Be It Resolved that before any alternative roads be built to service any Manitoba community, the Government of the Province of Manitoba be solicited to build a primary road to Churchill."

These are the types of requests that we're getting from many of our areas of the north both modern and semi-modern.

I think too that we must consider the road from Thompson to Gillam. Kettle Rapids should undoubtedly become in the future one of our greatest tourist attractions in the province. It is a man-made venture and if we even look to our people in the south you will note others taking advantage of the great economic developments of this type to make it a tourist attraction. I think a giant Hydro-Electric program is one all Manitobans can be proud of and can make use of in many ways. Also, in following our debates this morning it was suggested that the further north the tourists can be attracted the longer they will stay in the province and the more money they will spend. I think that more roads in the north would probably encourage the Minister of Highways to consider putting the rest of northern Manitoba on the map, which I believe is very important. It is sometimes said in many cases -- I've heard it said that the biggest problem that northern Canada has today is the thinking of southern Canadians, and I think that this as well probably of western Canada was the thinking of eastern Canadians. I do personally feel that perhaps this is not entirely right and I would hope that Ottawa would relent at this time and give us that assistance that is necessary to develop the last of our frontiers, and we would hope that this plea would be supported by members of the Assembly and that we can carry on with opening up the north and allowing us to participate in the modern amenities and also to give you returns that would justify the development and the money that is being invested in northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I move, seconded by the Member for Wellington, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Russell, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to speak on a subject that I think is of real importance to not only the people in agriculture but possibly to the people of Manitoba and the nation as a whole. As I see the amendment to this resolution, I have given it considerable thought and I think we have before us two situations, namely, the two-price system of wheat versus an increase on the International Wheat Agreement. Insofar as the amendment is concerned I think that we're all generally agreed in this House that an increase in price of wheat to the farmer is essential. However, I'm afraid I am not able to agree with this method that the amendment suggests. It does say also that the farm organizations negotiate with the Federal Government in coming to this decision but it doesn't elaborate how it's to be done. I have wondered at the feeling of the Member for Brokenhead and his colleagues when he brought up this amendment, and so considering the fact that we have listened to the consuming public as to their protests in regard to the high cost of food. This is one of the reasons that I am wondering whether this is a valid and a reasonable approach for us to take.

I was also interested in the remarks from the Honourable Member for Gladstone who elaborated at quite considerable length on the matter of the two-price system of wheat. He also gave figures which were of interest to me, and in so doing he stated that it would be approximately three cents as an increased cost of a loaf of bread, but you know, and I think it has been in past experience, whenever things have gone up of that nature we can readily consider that the cost price of that article would not only be three cents as he referred to a loaf of bread, but probably another three cents added to that would be a more realistic price insofar as the increased cost is concerned.

(MR. EINARSON cont'd)...

Another thing that is of worthy consideration here is the fact that we are concerned about the small farmer as the Honourable Member for Gladstone suggests - and I certainly agree with him in that respect - and as he figured it out, he felt that the farmer, the small farmer, probably realized about \$250.00 as an increase to his income insofar as this two-price system of wheat was concerned. And I have been wondering just exactly how far that is going to go to solve his economic problems. I would venture another avenue to tackle this problem insofar as the Honourable Member for Gladstone is concerned, and say that if he proposes that \$1.00 per bushel, say for the first 1,000 bushels the farmer delivers, would bring out of the federal treasury some \$50 million, and I would suggest that with the population of 20 million people in this country, and possibly with an average of four members per family, it would be a cost of about \$10.00 per family insofar as the subsidization of this program would be concerned.

I would like to also add that it's about two years ago when the Americans were putting considerable pressure on dumping a good deal of their surplus wheat. All the governments of Canada and farmers alike were very disturbed over this matter and protested quite considerably, to no avail. I might say to this House that the price was reduced in Canada and last year, when we received our final payment, that reduction was approximately 13 cents a bushel to the farmers of Western Canada. Now in the light of the fact that we ourselves made a protest to the American government about two years ago on this - and I would say that it was in regards to the two-price system that they have over there - it makes me wonder, if we are to approach the Federal Government whether we are fighting on good solid ground. So therefore I would suggest very strongly that we work on the basis of an increased price on our International Wheat Agreement. It so happens today that the conference is going on in Geneva where all members of exporting nations of wheat are in negotiation. Unfortunately, it would be a real pleasure for me to be able to announce what the outcome of that meeting would be but this is not the case. However it was gratifying to me to listen to the news the night before last where some of our members of our Federal Government had hopes of increasing the price on our IWA arrangement. I would suggest very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that if this could be arranged it would be much more economically sound, and I believe a better form of business, to be able to get this \$50 million that the honourable member was talking about from Gladstone from other countries of the world rather than taking it from the taxpayers of Canada. This is a matter that we've had to grapple with for a long time. I know farm organizations have made trips to Ottawa to try to come to some arrangement whereby we could get our more fair share of the national revenue in the way of such things as parity prices and so on. I think it would be reasonable for me to sort of compare the amendment to this resolution on the two-price system has been requested in the way of parity prices in the years go by.

And so, Mr. Chairman, in view of these few remarks in regards to the two-price system of wheat and what I think that we could probably better accomplish on the world markets, it would appear to me that a most reasonable and acceptable policy to adopt at the present time would be to support the idea of a higher minimum and a maximum price bracket under a new IWA arrangement which is presently being negotiated in Geneva. In other words, I think we should attempt to strive for higher prices from the importing countries and also to continue to press for a national conference whereby we may find some solution to solving the over-all farm problems.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the honourable member a question. I would agree wholeheartedly with what he says but supposing the outcome of this world price does not increase. Would you still disagree with the two-price system?

MR. EINARSON: In view of what I said, Mr. Speaker, I think that we must understand one thing here; that this is a political situation that we farmers face in Western Canada. And I can take you back, probably - and maybe give an answer in this way - when, in '61 I believe it was, when the government of that day brought out the acreage payment, while we didn't think it was very much, it was a help. But there's one thing we must remember: that political-wise we are outnumbered, and when we go down to Ottawa, as the Honourable Member for Brokenhead suggested we do, we must convince the members who are in other provinces who have a much greater representation, and I think that this is where we are in difficulty. And so, if we don't get higher in the next wheat agreement I'm afraid I would still have to go along with what we have, but I still have hopes of an increase in international prices.

MR. CLEMENT: I should say, Mr. Chairman, with an answer like that he shouldn't be sitting in the back row.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that the debate be adjourned, but if any other member wishes to speak I would withhold my adjournment until that time is passed.

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

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

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I would like to have this stand for the time being.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, WHEREAS the protection of the individual is one of the prime responsibilities of government; and WHEREAS it has been demonstrated in the Scandinavian countries and in New Zealand that the institution known as the "Ombudsman" or "Grievance Man" is practical in protecting citizens; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House recommend the establishment of a Public Protector of Ombudsman for Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: In reference to the resolution of the Leader of the Opposition dealing with the establishment of a Public Protector or Umbudsman for Manitoba, I would like to refer to the Throne Speech where reference is made to a Citizens' Protection Bureau and a Legislative Commissioner for Administration. In the light of this declaration, in my opinion the proposed resolution anticipates government legislation in this direction. Accordingly, under Rule 31 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings for the Legislative Assembly in Manitoba, the proposed resolution is out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may - before you officially rule - speak on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I must confess that when I turned in my resolution, which was before the Session opened, I assumed that I would be able to proceed with it. When the Throne Speech announced that something would be done I felt then that it would be anticipating. However, when I saw the action that the government proposes, and I refer you to the resolution on the Order Paper on Page 2 which is simply that we will refer the White Paper to a Committee of the House, then, Mr. Speaker, the government is not proposing legislation; it is merely proposing that it be referred to a Committee; and so I don't believe that there is here anticipation. That was one of the reasons that I waited and left the matter on the Order Paper. I might point out as well, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday on discussing the Liquor Act I specifically asked the Attorney-General, because I wanted to make this point very clear. The amendments to the Liquor Act were mentioned in the Throne Speech and yet yesterday the Minister said that it was not government policy; it's a free vote. Well now, if we're faced with that sort of a situation then I frankly don't see how members on this side can be expected to have any such rule of anticipation if things that are in the Throne Speech are later found out not to be government policy and in this particular case where the government is not proposing to do something but is merely referring it to a Committee. What my proposal is, Mr. Chairman, is one that provides a decision by the House, and I submit that it is not anticipation because it is a different proposition altogether than the one that the government proposes.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if I could be of any assistance to you, perhaps in responding to one or two of the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition on this point of order, I would refer you, Sir, if you have not already looked at it, to Citation 131 of Beauchesne, Fourth Edition, where you will find a definition of the rule of anticipation which I'm afraid is somewhat different from my honourable friend's view of it. I'll just read it: "In determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by Mr. Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time. The anticipation rule which forbids discussion of a matter standing on the Order Paper being forestalled, is dependent on the same principle as that which forbids the same question being twice raised in the same Session. In applying the anticipation rule, preference is given to the discussions which lead to the most effective result." And this has established a descending scale of values for discussion; that is, bills, motions, amendments, etc. But the bill must not be anticipated by or more sharply block discussion of the motion, amendment or subject raised by another motion. Any substantive motion standing on the Paper blocks the discussion of an amendment. An amendment on the Paper blocks the raising of a subject in debate. The abuse of blocking motions is obviated by the direction given to the Speaker to have regard to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time.

(MR. LYON cont'd).....

Well now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the Throne Speech of course, there is the resolution on the Order Paper at the present time standing in the name of my colleague the Provincial Secretary, which calls for the reference of the White Paper which contains the matters referred to in the White Paper relative to ombudsman or parliamentary commissioner being referred to a Committee of the House for further discussion and debate. It's rather clear, I think, that it would not be in the best interests of the House to have two motions on the Order Paper at the same time dealing essentially with the same thing. It's not a question of whose order is going to have preference in terms of one side getting the better of the other, it's a question of the orderly operation of the House. An opportunity is afforded, in other words, by the Throne Speech announcement and subsequently by the White Paper, to discuss the whole topic of a parliamentary commissioner or ombudsman. There is therefore no need to have that subject discussed under the Leader of the Opposition's private resolution, which I suggest in any case is not..... effective way of dealing with it, and I therefore suggest that the resolution is out of order on the ground of anticipation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I don't intend to have a general debate on this subject. I want to assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that I gave very, very serious thought to this matter and this is my opinion. This is not an opinion from anything that may have gone on but rather my opinion that it is indicated in the Throne Speech and as such I have made that ruling and I declare the motion out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I regret I must challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. Order, please. Order please. Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Harris, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbès and Morrison.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 36; Nays, 13.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the sustaining of the Chair carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. George, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Highways in amendment thereto. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I would ask the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand. I have no objection if anyone else wishes to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to say a brief word at the time the amendment was under discussion, to indicate that while I had some sympathy with the amendment and the resolution that was before us at the time, that I felt it might be possible to improve them in some respects, and gave an intimation that while I intended to vote for the amendment that when it came to discuss the main motion as amended, that I might have something more to say. It would normally be the case to deal with the matter when the amendment was before us, particularly as I wished to make a further change in the matter that is before us, but on looking over the terms of my resolution it was obvious that it would not be in order to propose it on the amendment and that it had better be done on the main motion as amended, so I want briefly to explain to members of the House who might have wondered just why I reserved myself for this particular opportunity to deal with the matter in question.

I would like to say that, although I have not always held this opinion, that in my opinion the question of the voting age in provincial elections and in other elections is now a matter that is ripe for serious consideration and study. I would point out, however, that I'd like to consider this matter in a wider aspect, because while the age of voting is a specific subject and can, I believe, be dealt with on its own merits in respect of the specific item itself, I am going to take the opportunity to discuss a wider aspect of the question because I believe that it bears very largely on the whole status of youth in the circumstances of the second half of the Twentieth Century, and that if members of the House consider that it is wise to review the voting age, it seems to me to be reasonable and logical that as well as doing that matter - and

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd). . . . I want to at once set at rest the mind of any who may think that we will not be dealing with the age matter in itself specifically - I think it's wise to consider the wider implications of the question, because it is appropriate, I think, that we should give some consideration to that as well as to the specific matter that is before us.

My contention is, therefore, that the main motion and indeed the speech of the mover, which we have heard on a number of different occasions, really is only part of this involved and far-reaching subject to which I would like to make some reference in the course of these remarks. The age of voting in the provincial elections is in my view only a portion of a much broader and perhaps socially just as important a question, and that is, the status of youth in society today, and while I suggest that we can deal with the matter of the voting age separately, and I propose to do so, I would like to extend the range of our discussion to this broader subject.

I must say that I thought the amendment was a considerable improvement over the main motion because it brought in the further idea that while we were dealing with this matter it would be advisable to consider the voting age for other jurisdictions, namely at the local government level and at the federal level, and it seemed to me this is an entirely reasonable extension of the original proposition that was put before us. I confess, however, that I was even more interested in the discussion that followed about strengthening public school education, strengthening the grounding that we give our young people in the structure, in the function, in the operation of government, what a well-informed citizen ought to know, and certainly what a voter ought to know in this field, because I think that in this particular respect a very important matter indeed has been broached, and one to which I think all of us here might give some attention.

In the original motion and in some of the speeches that followed, emphasis was put on the magic figure of 18 as being the age to which we should reduce the voting requirement. I would like to observe that in my view there is nothing particularly magical about the age of 18, and as has already been pointed out, the voting age does vary. In British Columbia and in Alberta, and in Newfoundland, we find that the voting age is 19; in Saskatchewan and in Quebec it is 18; and in the rest of Canada it is 21; and I think, therefore, that one could give some consideration to varying this age from 18 to some other age, depending on what under all the circumstances might be thought desirable. I say this because I don't think it's necessary for us to nail our colours to the mast of 18 years, when we might find that it was easier and more practical to secure agreement, particularly when we're dealing with other governments, as I hope we shall, on an age such as 19. This might very well become a factor in our discussions of this matter.

I like what the amendment says about a uniform Canadian franchise. This is an eminently sound idea. I recognize that we may have some problems in connection with local votes in which money by-laws are involved - I'm not sure whether we would or not - but the idea of a uniform age, a uniform franchise, as far as can be arranged in all the three levels of our government in this country, is certainly an idea with which I find myself in agreement. I might say apropos of this that the Government of Manitoba some time ago opened negotiations with the Federal Government on the question of the voting, and the particular matter which was the main subject discussed was the possibility of the province and the Federal Government co-operating in the preparation of a common, permanent electoral roll. It has been suggested in this House before now that it might be advantageous for us to have a permanent electoral roll, like a municipality such as the City of Winnipeg have. As matters stand at the present, we do take an enumeration in the time between the calling of a vote and election day, and while that works with reasonable satisfaction I'm not altogether certain that it would not be better if we could have a permanent electoral roll. The thing that has stopped us from doing this in the past has been the very considerable expense attached, and it is considerable. So I suggested to the Prime Minister of Canada that perhaps the provinces and the Federal Government could agree to run a common permanent electoral roll, and the Prime Minister, I might say, was quite intrigued with this idea, and following our conversation I wrote to him repeating the suggestion, and I am pleased to say - and I think I may give this information without breaching any confidence - that I got an encouraging reply, and I am very hopeful that this province at least and the Federal Government may be able to come to some arrangement about a common, permanent electoral roll. On the grounds of economy and efficiency it has much to be said for it if we can share this particular activity or responsibility, whereas up to the present we have always considered it a little too expensive to be done on our own.

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd)....

Now, if we are to have a common, permanent electoral roll, which I think most people would agree with, there is some merit in trying to get a common franchise on which that roll is based, and I believe that there is no problem in connection with a common franchise at the present time, because the federal and provincial arrangements are so nearly alike in this respect as to be, I think, easily capable of being assimilated the one to the other. But I would hope that this common, permanent electoral roll would take into account the question of the age of voting that is being discussed in this House today. Now, there may be some that will think that I am leading up to some proposal which will postpone indefinitely the consideration of the age limit here in this province. I really wouldn't like that impression to be accepted as representing my view. I do recall, however, that we've just had our provincial election and it would appear unlikely that it would be essential to deal with this matter at the time of this session, for example. If --(Interjection)-- Well, one never knows, but I'm willing to bet my friend even money. I'd go further than that if I were a gambling man, but I'm not; I like to bet on a sure thing; and a sure thing is that we're really not going to have an election that soon. --(Interjection)-- Well, you may not be worried but it wouldn't do you any good if we did, so we might just as well stay where we are. I don't think I would worry about it. The people -- my honourable friends are entitled to their little jokes, but that's all they are -- little jokes. I'm going to treat them like little jokes.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I'll give you odds.

MR. PAULLEY: Any time you like, Dufferin.

MR. ROBLIN: If my attentive hearers, Mr. Speaker, are content to allow me to proceed with what I have to say I'll be glad to go on, but if they want to continue to interject, well that's fine with me. I never really mind these interjections because they are usually so far from any realistic consideration of the fact that one can afford to joke, so I joke with my honourable friends. I just wish that in their interjections they had some constructive suggestions to offer on this subject or the others, but usually their interjections, either in this form or in the Committee of Supply, are those which urge the government to undertake some large new expenditure which they are very anxious to endorse but they don't seem to be quite so keen to face the music when it comes to finding the money. However, I suppose one might say that is one of the advantages, one of the privileges of being....

MR. SPEAKER: I would remind the First Minister he is leaving the subject again.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I have to admit, Mr. Speaker, I left the subject a few minutes ago with the encouragement of the gentlemen opposite. I think I'll get back to the subject. So I would like to suggest that the House can adopt the suggestion that it would be advantageous to see if we cannot secure the agreement of the Federal Government with respect to the voting age before we unilaterally act upon it ourselves, in the hope that we will be able to find a basis for a common, permanent electoral role, and in view of the discussions which were initiated some months ago with the Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada, and knowing his views on this matter, indeed knowing that the Liberal Party of Canada is pledged to something in this respect if my recollection of the circumstances is correct, then I think we have a very good opportunity and a good expectation that we can get an agreement with them in respect of this matter. So I think the question of a uniform franchise is well worth following up, and it is something that I am certainly going to propose we do and I think we should have some reasonable expectation within the next few months of being able to move in this direction.

Now the second point that I want to make a comment or two about has to do with the question of education, and I think that those who hope that we will be able to improve and enlarge the educational arrangements we make so that these young voters when they get the franchise, as I believe they will, are fitted as best as may be possible to discharge their function as electors, I think that is an excellent idea. I should point out to the House that there has been a continuous effort recently to improve this question of civics and citizenship in the public school system. Committees are presently revising the elementary social studies programs and they are aware of the need for civics and the need to build these elements into the new program. Grades 1 and 2 programs are ready for introduction and Grades 4 to 8 are still in the process of revision. What they have done with Grade 3 I really don't know, but it seems to be missing from this report that was given me. Grades 5 and 6 will have a well-structured program based upon Canadian history and geography, and Grades 7 to 10 programs are based on a heritage theme, while in the new Grade 9 program the history course, which is a British history course, stressed the development of the democratic idea in the Canadian environment,

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd). . . . and I think that the text in the General Course, Grade 11 history text now in use, is a good one and can well be examined as a hopeful model, but the Minister of Education absolutely refuses to tell me that he is satisfied with what we are doing in respect of education in this particular field, and I think that we should encourage him; and frankly, I know that he would be glad to receive any suggestions that members might have either formally or informally as to the way in which we could strengthen this question of education for citizenship. I think that we must pay more and more attention to this very important aspect of education and reducing the voting age certainly brings the whole problem into focus. We are trying to build into the new courses the things that we have learned in studying it over the past few years and which are incorporated in the Grade 11 history course, which I think is quite a good course indeed. We have to avoid - this is one of the troublesome things - we have to avoid partisanship in this matter and indeed in the treatment of it in the school system. We do have the problems in partiality but I think they can be overcome.

I also wonder whether there is not a considerable field for adult education in this whole question of citizenship in our society, and it seems to me that this is a theme that might well be pursued at the adult level of education and I certainly hope that those who have the direct responsibility for it may be able to give us some new ideas on this subject in the future.

Now there we have the franchise and there we have education. I think, however, that we might just as well take a look at the wider field while we are at it, because the voting age opens up the implications, social and economic, of the age of 21 as being the age at which we recognize adulthood. There are contractual sanctions embedded in the law that have come down to us over the centuries, which are sanctioned by custom and generally part of our social structure, but there is really no reason to maintain that the age of 21 is the Law of the Medes and the Persians in respect of other matters, and certainly not in respect of the voting age, and this is a matter which I think ought to receive some consideration.

The ones that are under 21 and the ones that are over 21, provided they are not too much under or not too much over, are human beings that are living in the same world. They marry, whether they are over 21 or under; they have children and all the family responsibilities that that implies.

A MEMBER: sometimes 14.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, that's a little too young for me. --(Interjection)-- Well it's biologically possible but I don't recommend it. They borrow money; they go into business; they lease apartment blocks; and Mr. Speaker, to the surprise of absolutely no one except perhaps the Honourable Member for Gladstone, they drink beer, and we have to deal I think with the question of liquor laws in respect of those who are under 21. It seems a bit odd that a person can exercise the full franchise of citizenship but not drink beer when he wants to.

MR. DOERN: They drink more than beer.

MR. ROBLIN: Well I'm afraid that's the case. I do not wish to be put in the position today of saying what I think about these things, because it is not a subject on which any offhand comment would be suitable, because it involves a wide range of social postures, social activities and social responsibilities which really have to be examined with some care before one could, I think, decide, and we find that people under 21 are self-supporting in some instances as people over 21 may be, and some of the people under 21 behave responsibly and some of them behave irresponsibly, just like the people who are over 21 behave responsibly and irresponsibly, and some of those who are under 21 think of themselves not as infants, as they are in law, but as adults, and some of them conduct themselves as adults. It must be also admitted that there are some over 21 who conduct themselves as infants, so it may be that we should consider the relationship between the law as it stands and the social practices that we actually find, and we must ask ourselves whether there is any risk of the law being brought into contempt in a way that, all things considered, would be undesirable by the present system that we have. We are asking those, when they reach 21, to live within laws, some of which they have learned to avoid during the previous two or three years. This presents a question of some magnitude which might, I think, benefit from study.

It could be argued, on the other hand, that the lengthening educational cycle, the fact that young people stay longer in school and the period of dependency is increasing in many cases, not decreasing, might give you the opportunity of arguing on the other side of the question, and it might equally be well argued that most of the things I am saying may be true no matter what the legal age is, whether it is 21, 19, 20 or 18. Those are all points that I think are worthy of some consideration, but I think that one thing is sure, at least as I recall my childhood and

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd). . . . youth, that there are changing trends in modern life, and I'll risk the opinion that in contemporary society young people are really, in my view, more responsible than I remember myself being at the same stage in life. Now it's always dangerous to argue from the particular to the general and I may be such a particular as to be completely ruled out of court when you apply my recollections to the general, but however that may be, I'm impressed with that and as I visit with some of our young people who are in this general age sector I can't help but share with the House my feelings of joy - they can be nothing less than that - with the kind of young people I am meeting with. There are plenty of bad hats, to be sure, but on the whole, who can help but be optimistic and buoyant about the future of our country when we meet the young people that we find in various circles today?

Young people are maturing faster, I believe, than they were and a larger number than formerly I would suggest may well be ready and able to accept greater responsibilities than is now the case. In this province I think 40-45% are under 21. I don't know how many are under 18 or between the years of 18 and 21 but the number is considerable, so I say that this question of the condition of youth in contemporary society is an important matter which we might do well to know more about. Heaven forbid that I should stand here as an expert on this subject; I can merely share with you casual reflections. But it may be that in the legal field, in the social environment and the economic situation, in the attitudes of youth itself, in their effective status in society generally, that we have a question that it would do us well to look into.

I therefore propose to ensure that the Youth and Manpower Agency, which the members are aware, makes a special effort through a study group or other suitable method that might commend itself, to look into this question and particularly to examine and review the concept of adulthood in all its ramifications with respect to the year 21, apart from the matter of voting which I think we can perhaps deal with in another way. I hope that this investigation would seek the advice and assistance of other government areas, both provincial and local governments, especially the school system. I'd like to hear what the colleges and universities have got to say. I'm sure that the social agencies and the Welfare Council could help us with this problem, the YMCA and other youth movements and the churches could certainly have a contribution to make, and private people and private groups, particularly young folk themselves, might perhaps be able to help us with this question. And if the review proves to be a fruitful and useful exercise, we might consider whether it should not be the subject of a White Paper which might be more widely considered in the Legislature, in the House, as the matter develops. In any case I believe that some thoughtful and imaginative consideration of the condition of youth in modern society as we see it today is a worthy and a useful project. In order to bring these various views into focus, I am going to propose an amendment which I hope the House will consider to be practical and I hope that the House will not consider as an attempt to dodge the principal issue that is involved here, because that is certainly not my intention, an amendment which will propose a joint federal-provincial approach that will leave open the exact age under 21 so that we can have an option if we find that our partners are interested in an option with respect to 18 or 19, that moves to improve public education and instruction in the province and which also touches on the wider, and I suggest equally important, aspect of the whole condition of youth in modern life to which I have referred.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I propose that the amended main motion be further amended in which I am joined by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer:

In the Preamble delete all the words after the first WHEREAS in the Resolution and substitute the following:

the status of youth in modern society is a matter of concern to this House; and
WHEREAS the legal voting age at the provincial, federal and local level should be reviewed before the next provincial election; and

WHEREAS a common electoral franchise is desirable; and

WHEREAS an improvement in education for democracy should be sought;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking the agreement of the Government of Canada to reduce the legal voting age to 18 years, or such other age under 21 as may be deemed appropriate; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking such improvements in education for democracy through the public school system as will better prepare youth for the franchise; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd), . . . of instructing the Youth and Manpower Agency to undertake a wide-ranging study of the status of youth in Manitoba, with particular reference to legal rights and responsibilities.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think we have listened to a very interesting discourse this afternoon by the Honourable the Premier of the Province of Manitoba, and I respect very much the able manner in which the Honourable the First Minister of this province presented his arguments of procrastination and delay, for I recall, not so many years ago, that when my honourable friend was on this side of the House either he or one of his colleagues presented a resolution dealing with the question of extending the privilege of voting in Manitoba to those of 18 years of age and over. And I suggest that it's all very well for my friend to say today that he wants to refer this to a commission of which he has control, namely the Youth and Manpower Agency within the Province of Manitoba, to consider something that he objected to when he was sitting just over here when I first entered into this House back in 1954.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has misinterpreted the motion. The question of the voting age is not going to be referred to anybody. It's going to be discussed between the Federal and Provincial Governments.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend in his resolution in his last "Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of instructing the Youth and Manpower Agency to undertake a wide-ranging study of the status of youth in Manitoba," and may I respectfully suggest that my honourable friend interpret what he means by that. My interpretation of the status of youth in Manitoba includes as to whether or not they should have the right to vote in respect of elections in the Province of Manitoba.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, that when my honourable friend was on this side of the House that the then First Minister of this House suggested through a member of the then governing party, the Liberal Party in Manitoba, suggested an amendment to that resolution that this matter should be taken under consideration at the next federal-provincial conference. And I recall my honourable friend's party, the Conservative Party, at that particular time objected to this because it was procrastination and delay. And what have we got now, 13 years later? Exactly the same thing from the Leader of the government, a Conservative Government, in the Province of Manitoba. Yes, my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, who was the Premier at that time, now says that the present Premier is coming to his position. Our position at that time as the CCF party, now as the New Democratic Party, was opposed to both of these viewpoints because we were of the opinion despite the present position of the Leader of the House at the present time, that our young people - our young men and our young women in the Province of Manitoba - at the age of 18 were fully qualified to take part in the affairs of state in this province. But what is my honourable friend suggesting today? Back 13 years ago; let's start the ball all over again despite his objections of that time.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while my honourable friend the First Minister pleads with us and asks us to be reasonable, to not rush in, in 1966 where he wanted to rush in in 1954, that he has no substances, no foundation in his argument as presented here this afternoon. My honourable friend in his remarks this afternoon said there is nothing imaginable about the age of 18; it should possibly be 19 or 20 or some other age insofar as voting rights are concerned, and I respect him for this and he might be perfectly correct, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing imaginable about his proposition that we should further delay action in respect of granting to the young men and women of the Province of Manitoba an opportunity at the age of 18, or 19 if the government desires it, because they have a majority, giving to them the privilege and the opportunity of voting in provincial and municipal elections. And what does my honourable friend say about the question of voting on by-laws at the municipal elections? He says he wonders whether or not we should extend the privilege of voting at the municipal level to 18 year olds or under.

Mr. Speaker, in the Province of Saskatchewan, in the Province of Alberta, in the Province of British Columbia people who are of lesser age than 21 have the right to vote at the present time insofar as provincial elections are concerned. And I -- and Quebec. I think it would be a very good thing, Mr. Speaker, that our young men and women in the Province of Manitoba should be entitled to this privilege - and surely, when here in the Province of Manitoba we have a Provincial Treasurer and a Provincial Government who imposes a five percent sales tax on all the people of Manitoba including the 18 years of age, surely they should have the right to say who should be the government of the Province of Manitoba because they're paying the bill.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . My honourable friend dismisses this at the municipal level; he questions it. I say, Mr. Speaker, these young men and women are paying large contributions into the conduct of the affairs of a province both at the municipal and the provincial level, and we have it under our authority and under our jurisdiction here in this Assembly to extend that right, and I suggest to my honourable friend the First Minister that he should not procrastinate, he should not slough off, as he does by his resolution, to any other jurisdiction what we can well do ourselves within this jurisdiction. What a change. What a change, Mr. Speaker, from one side of the House to the other.

My honourable friend the First Minister raises many problems that might occur insofar as legal status of individuals under the age of 21, may arise as the result of the changing of the voting age. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that in the other jurisdictions, which at the present time grant to electors under the age of 21, that they must have had these problems; they may still be prevalent in those areas but this didn't set aside their consideration of this. My honourable friend mentioned the question of the liquor law here in the Province of Manitoba, that because of the fact that generally speaking the Liquor Act of the Province of Manitoba has a cut-off age of 21 years. I wonder if my honourable friend the First Minister is aware of the fact that under the Liquor Act in the Province of Manitoba 18-year-olds can legally drink liquor in our province. It's a stupid law, I admit. Because if my daughter who may be under 21 years of age wants a drink in my house and if I say it's okay for her to have it, it's legal, and if her parents' viewpoint is that it's legal for his daughter under 21 to have it in their house, well my daughter can have it in my house, his daughter can watch, and then when they go over to my friend's house under 18 years of age, the parent there can -- under 21 -- then over at that particular house my daughter can't drink but my friend's daughter can. So we've got ridiculous laws but the basic fact that I'm trying to raise, Mr. Speaker, is that under the liquor laws of the Province of Manitoba at the present time it is legal for 18 years, under the age of 21, to legally drink liquor. Yet my friend raises the question of the complications of age. He raised the question of the rights of others insofar as being able to marry and other factors, and I suggested as an interjection that physically it's possible for people far under that to give birth to children, to get married and the likes of that -- and legally. That's perfectly correct, and we know these factors, Mr. Speaker, and yet my honourable friend just as he did in respect of another resolution the other day. Mr. Speaker, he's so prepared to evade responsibility that he's prepared to slough off to commissions and other jurisdictions what is the responsibility of the Province of Manitoba. He did it in respect of day nurseries the other day, and today he's doing it insofar as the right of our individuals, our young people, to vote in provincial and municipal elections. I agree with my honourable friend. . . .

MR. ROBLIN: You're just off the target. That isn't so.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm off the target and I want to say to my honourable friend, and I hope the young people here don't take this as gospel, he's off the beam. Because this is the proposition that we have from the First Minister of this province which I hope, one of these days, will start its rightful advance in the federation of Canada, but it is being cast aside, it is being side-tracked in its rightful progress by such innocuous willy-nilly resolutions as proposed by my honourable friend the First Minister this afternoon.

My honourable friend talked this afternoon about a common electors roll of a permanent basis, and he suggests that before we can actually get down to a basis of uniformity of elections in Canada or among the provinces, that one of the things we should consider is a common electors roll. What poppycock! What poppycock, Mr. Speaker. There's no necessity at all. We have the rights; we have legal authority within the Province of Manitoba to adopt the resolution and the amendment as suggested by one of my colleagues. And I want my honourable friend the First Minister, please, please, Sir, go back over the journals at least for the time that I've been in this House, and read what the then opposition Conservative Party proposed in respect of votes for people under the age of 21. I want to ask my honourable friend the First Minister in respect of the education facilities in the Province of Manitoba, will he not please consider that in the department of government of which he is one of the major guidances, they have within their department the facilities for the education of the young men and women insofar as the democratic process is concerned in the Province of Manitoba. He doesn't have to slough this off to any outside agency beyond the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba. Let him instruct the Minister of Education and the Department of Education to expand the facilities under the social studies, the curriculum under social studies in the Province of Manitoba.

On a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, I've had the privilege in my own City of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd),.... Transcona to address the Assembly insofar as the function and operation of government is concerned. These weren't eighteen year olds so they weren't entitled to vote but I got elected nonetheless. But I suggest to my honourable friend that this can be done, an expansion within the Department of Education to lay the basis of the functions of our democratic process in our studies here in the Province of Manitoba. I say to my honourable friend the First Minister there is no need for any further procrastination and delay. We don't have to adopt a resolution which, as my honourable friend suggests here, "Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking the agreement of the Government of Canada to reduce the legal voting age to eighteen." In his discourse, Mr. Speaker, he suggests maybe it's not eighteen and then his resolution -- after a while he goes on further. But I say to my honourable friend he's taking exactly the same position as the Liberal Government back in 1954 took to which he opposed, and I think it's no longer good enough. And then he goes on to say: "Further resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of seeking such improvements in education for democracy through the public school system as will better prepare youth for the franchise." This is what we suggested. And we suggested in our amendment, Mr. Speaker, because that government was negligent in its responsibility to the people and particularly the young people of the Province of Manitoba. Then finally what does my honourable friend say? "Be it further resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of instructing the Youth and Manpower Agency to undertake a wide-ranging study of the status of youth in Manitoba with particular reference to legal responsibilities and rights." May I respectfully suggest to the First Minister of the Province of Manitoba that if he will give leadership together with all of his Cabinet Ministers and those who comprise the members opposite, if he will give to our young people in the Province of Manitoba at least some encouragement to accept their responsibilities insofar as youth is concerned in the Province of Manitoba, we don't require such innocuous resolutions as proposed by my honourable friend. I say to him, as we've said on many occasions, let's get off our backs and let's get on with making this province the type of province that we are desirous for our young people, and this type of resolution which turns the clock back over the years to what it was previously, will not achieve what we desire here in the Province of Manitoba in 1966.

..... continued on next page

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the words of the Leader of the NDP. I don't think it's a laughing matter, I think either it is a shame to see how political ambition or maybe political uncertainty can change a man's backbone into putty. It's pathetic to see what somebody in such a predicament won't do to evade responsibility - his responsibility. Now we've had this Session already -- I think that this is being used by certain people as a platform maybe for political, for federal aspirations. We've already had part of the platform of the Leader of this House -- what he will do when he leads the Federal Conservatives; we have a study on the right of women; now we're going to have a study on the right of the younger generation. These last few Sessions, whenever there was something controversial, something that the First Minister was not too sure what he should do, he was absent from the House. Now it's a little more difficult with the situation not quite as safe, so we're getting examples of how he chooses to evade his responsibility.

The motion was quite clear. My original motion, Mr. Speaker, was quite clear. It asked that the voting age be 18 years old. If I had to do it over again I would not change a word of it. I did not feel that we needed the amendment of the NDP, but I only found out just a few minutes ago when the Leader of the NDP spoke why they asked for this amendment, because they felt that the government was not doing its duty. I feel that you shouldn't have to put in a resolution that you should give this type of education to the youth of our province, but I accept the reason and I certainly am in favour of the amendment also.

The First Minister said that we had a pledge, that the Federal Government gave a pledge. Well what is he waiting for then if he wants to be uniform. I think that it's true that we have a pledge -- the Federal Government said that they agreed with the age at 18 - well why not have it now? He read also the voting ages in the different provinces. Why do we always have to be behind? Why do we have to wait at 21? In his speech he tried to show that he was in favour; that he had doubts; that he was against. He probably covered the waterfront; he wanted to make sure that everybody would find something, at least that he could leave this House and say, "Well I'm with you. We have to be careful but I'm with you, I think you should vote at 18." He said why the sacred number 18 - why 18? Well I ask him why 19? But I know why 19 because we chose 18. I think that it's fairly clear why the age of 18 - we can debate this on any age - the age of 18 because this is the age that these people have certain obligations, and it could be 19 like the member of the NDP said. If they wanted to make an amendment they had something concrete to offer. We could have had something, an amendment such as changing the age to 19, but this wasn't done at all.

It is very clear, Mr. Speaker, there is one reason and one reason alone for this amendment, and this is to stall to at least after a certain meeting that will be held in Toronto probably in September. This is the only reason, because the First Minister should take his responsibility seriously. I said this last year and I say it again, if he wants to go to Ottawa, why make the people of Manitoba suffer? He pretends that he's very brave, to say that he's not afraid of an election, but I double dare him to call one because he knows where he would be going, and every day he would lose in popular support for reasons - for the type of amendments that we have in front of us today.

Oh, it's going to look good to see that he's the man that's interested in the right of women, that is interested in the right of youth. I think that he let it slip - he's a little afraid - he said that 45 percent of the people are below this age and I think this is what worries him. He wants to be on the right side of them. But then he starts talking about liquor because there are some people that feel that 18 is too young. But we have to take responsibility. It's not his motion, if he doesn't want -- why block it? Why not stand like a man and vote for or against this resolution? He can change. He can tell the Minister of Education that he wants to make sure we improve certain type of teaching. That doesn't change anything. That has nothing to do with this vote. He can study the question of liquor and so on, but this doesn't change this at all.

Sir, if we have elections in the provincial field - we have an election every four or five years - maybe three - most of the time an average of four years - you have a state now where somebody that's twenty, twenty and a half or twenty and three quarters, will have to wait maybe five years. They will not have a chance to vote, to take an active part in deciding who's going to run and how the province will be run until they're 25 years old or so.

I say that the First Minister did not worry about the other provinces; we didn't run to Ottawa when he wanted to bring in this Colombo Plan. That sounds like a good idea, something that the Province of Manitoba had no business in at all, something that was a duplication,

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) something that is a purely federal matter, but we brought the Colombo Plan. You don't hear too much about it now mind you, but it seemed like a good idea at the time. The Minister is not afraid to say that because he started this question of Medicare a few years ago—and I admire him for that, I agree with him on that, that we should not have a compulsory Medicare plan — but he doesn't say this is what the other provinces do.

And then, Sir, how many times did you hear me say on a certain subject that other provinces were treating their people with a little more justice — in the way they treat students at separate schools. What is being done in here? They're not saying that the other nine provinces want this. They're not going to ask Ottawa.

The First Minister a few years ago said when this B. and B. Commission — and I could prove this because I have an extract of certain speeches that he made — he welcomed this B. and B. Commission a few years ago. It's not so popular now. A few years ago it was no good. He went to Three Rivers and he talked about education. He talked about this was the right of province. He comes here — he doesn't want to make decisions. We'll wait till we see what is done in Ottawa. I think that he should make up his mind. If he wants everything to be done in Ottawa or if he feels that we should take our responsibility — do you realize, Sir, how little responsibility we have left here? We have boards and commissions for everything — boards and commissions for everything — and whenever there's something touchy coming up, another board. Between this and using this rule as we saw today of anticipation to block things, this government is not accepting its responsibility. I don't care if you are in favor or against a certain resolution, it is our right here to bring certain resolutions.

A few years ago I brought in such a resolution asking that the members stand up and be counted on a principle. They used the Throne Speech at the time and they never mentioned a thing about principle — they never mentioned a thing about this at all. They used these very vague words to establish a committee that would study something — nothing for or against certain principles.

So between all their little tricks that they're using to go against the intent of these laws, they are using the Throne Speech — a sentence here and there to cover something when they're afraid — and answer they are using

MR. SPEAKER: In those remarks, you were not suggesting that the Chair is being influenced by the government insofar as that resolution is concerned, or insofar as the matter I dealt with a short while ago.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm simply suggesting, Sir, that this government will try anything — I wasn't saying anything about the Chair, the point that I was mentioning — you were not the Speaker at the time, Sir, so this is nothing to do with the present Speaker. I'm talking about the government, the government that will try anything to evade its responsibility, and as I say, they've done this in the past in the Throne Speech; they're trying to do it now; and they are also doing this with these types of amendments. If the member wants to call a conference on youth — and this is being studied now. What did he say? What did he say? I wish we had Hansard. "I want to wait until I hear from the colleges, the universities, the young people, the old people, the middleaged people." In other words, he wants 100 percent of the people to tell him this is what we want, and then he'll show leadership — he'll be right in the front showing leadership — but he hasn't got the courage to stand up, not only to vote but to leave the House and let the rest of the people vote. If he wants to go to Ottawa, why doesn't he pack and go now and let us get along with the question of Manitoba

MR. LYON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: What is the point of order?

MR. LYON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think we've been fairly generous in not raising this point before because it's quite clear from the rules that honourable members on whatever side of the House cannot cast imputations or talk about the motivation of a person with respect to any speech that he makes in this House. That applies to all honourable members of the House. If the rule is not observed, I suggest, Sir, with some regularity and with some reasonableness by all of us, this House becomes nothing better than a bear pit, and I suggest with the greatest of respect that it's fast becoming that during this speech and I suggest to my honourable friend that he's out of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, there's nothing

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, might I speak on the point of order. I recognize what my honourable friend the Attorney-General has pointed out with regard to imputing motives, but on the other hand it's only imputing motives that are considered to be dishonourable or

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) unfair. Surely there is no suggestion that ...

MR. LYON: ... become the leader of that Party.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, Well, I'm not suggesting that. Surely there's nothing wrong with suggesting that someone is wanting to move into Federal affairs or that someone is wanting to become the leader of a Party. That may impute a motive, but surely not an unworthy one.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I think the motive that was imputed by the honourable member that I particularly heard was the one of lack of courage, and I don't think anybody should have that motive imputed against him in this House by anybody.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I don't think that that is imputing. I think that the resolution is clear. I think the resolution is clear, that you are not facing your responsibility.

MR. LYON: I am not interested in my honourable friend's opinion, Sir, and

MR. DESJARDINS: And I'm not interested in you either.

MR. SPEAKER: This is fast becoming possibly an argument between two or three individuals. I wonder if the honourable member would continue and keep it within the . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I'd like to.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I just wonder if I might on the point of order, was my honourable friend the Prince of Wales speaking on a matter of personal interest when he was referring to someone leaving for Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no longer a Prince of Wales that I can recall ...

MR. LYON: On the point of order, my honourable friend obviously missed the point, as he does most of the debate in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I appeal to the honourable member to . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much, Sir, I will listen to your appeal because I respect your decision - not some of other people - and besides that I think this is getting quite ticklish because it is quite clear the Attorney-General would love to see the present Leader of the House go to Ottawa, so maybe we should talk about something else.

MR. LYON: I'd like to see you go.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't doubt that. I don't doubt that.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly if one of the honourable gentlemen went for coffee, we'd make progress.

MR. DESJARDINS: He acts just like somebody below 18 so it would have to be coffee. You know, it's funny that every time I try to bring in a speech the Attorney-General has to butt in. I don't butt in when he speaks. I'd like to play the rules the way he does. You know this business of looking towards Heaven, putting your hands up like this and then implore the people to obey the rules, with the kind of example that we get across - and he insists that they're not insinuating - this is what they do all the time.

But I'm just saying, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to end there, that I think this is not a responsible amendment. I certainly will vote against this and I agree with everything that the Leader of the NDP said. I think that if the First Minister is sincere, why doesn't he bring in another resolution? This is something different altogether. The resolution for instance could say, let's ask, or we'll talk with Ottawa to try to get uniformity in certain things. For instance, how should we treat the pupils in separate schools - you know, things like that that all Canada might be interested in - but not single out something because we are trying to say that they should vote at 18 years old. Vote for or against, take a chance, flip a coin, but vote or let us vote. This is all I am asking the members of the House and the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I must say to my honourable friend that I usually listen to him with a good --(Interjection)-- I'm raising a point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, let's follow the rules for everybody.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend says I'm not sincere, I think that should be retracted. I usually don't object because his knowledge of English may not be perfect, although I think it's pretty good, but he's always accusing me of not being sincere. He might not like what I say, but he shouldn't say that I'm not sincere when I say it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Prove it. Take your responsibility.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned -- I don't want to go back to that again. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of speaking on this resolution at no time, but I'm afraid that the attitude of the honourable member - I am sorry that he isn't in his seat at this time -- took --(Interjection)-- the member for Inkster, Mr. Speaker - and I feel that I must add a few words, and I do agree though that the honourable member had a perfect right to give his views on this subject and I'm not holding it against him on such a basis as that. When the honourable member was speaking so forcibly and so eloquently for such a long time, I was beginning to wonder if I was still, or all of us were still able and had an opportunity to possibly still make up our own mind or had this opportunity -- this right was still there in this country. But he did finally say - and I give him credit for this - he did finally say later on in his speech that his was only an opinion. I was very happy to hear that and to accept his kindness to allow other people also to form their own opinion and ideas, whether they be businessmen or whether they be farmers or laborers or lawyers for that matter, I appreciate that he gives us this opportunity.

When I listened to the honourable member, I was actually beginning to feel sorry for him and I was wondering if he really believed what he was saying or probably had he been prodded or told that things are that gloomy with labor conditions in Manitoba, and especially referring to different instances that he did. I wonder if the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, would allow himself a breath of fresh air and possibly allow himself to look at some of the actual facts and stress the point that my friend - the honourable friend I should say - can keep on talking on this subject as far as I'm concerned till the cows come home, but all the books and all the theories and all the eloquent words that my honourable friend suggested will not change the facts, and I suggest the facts - a lot of them are different.

If, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- Yes, this is on minimum wage. If, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member possibly had more employees in his own employ, I believe that he would understand the practical end of it a little bit more. I agree with him and with others that a decent minimum wage is correct, and our Party, or our group here did not suggest the \$1.25 per hour because the group on this side had suggested \$1.00 or \$1.10 or any other figure for that matter. We feel the \$1.25 is a reasonable amount, but I must certainly agree with the Honourable Minister of Labour when he mentioned the other day that this minimum figure is a suggested lowest figure, or lowest price figure, and surely any member in this House or anybody elsewhere has the right to pay whatever he wishes to and most of the time does, and the employee deservedly so receives more.

But we have so many factors to take into consideration. Take, for example, you employ somebody possibly on a trial basis. If he is really the type of man or woman that you feel that you want to employ, well you're not going to pay possibly more than \$1.25 to start with, this is a trial period, and surely you can go on increasing these wages as you wish.

I wonder if the people suggesting the minimum fee of \$1.50, I wonder if they really considered the consequences of such a large raise - being \$1.00 now to \$1.50 - I think it's quite a gap when you consider the consequences of a raise like that. For example, 70 percent of a hospital's operating cost is made up of salaries and wages - I do agree that the rate increase here is possibly larger than in a lot of cases as far as industrial work or other employ is concerned - but there for example if our old schedule of our hospital employees were upset by this large increase. Therefore, I think we should consider a reasonable amount of an increase at a time.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, we must be careful in all respects whatever we do. I believe it has to be done with reasoning and with balance. It's all well and good to stand up here and say that all employees should have higher and higher wages. This is fine, and this is especially much easier to say when we don't employ anybody, but let's be reasonable. I think this thing can go too far. I don't know - maybe I don't understand some of the conditions of labour that exist in certain other places that I have seen. I should perhaps mention that I think I have seen quite a few, but it seems to me that in so many parts of the country, and even in many places in the city, we do get along. Labour and management do get along very decently and very reasonably, and I believe that especially in the country, I sometimes wonder if the labour force themselves are not much more happy. I say much more happy and content than actually the politicians, then the politicians who are trying to get themselves elected - and too often I say this can be the case - try to get themselves elected for simply trying to make labour more dissatisfied.

So let's take things on an over-all basis. I beg that free enterprise - and I include employers and employees for that matter alike - to be sensible in their deliberations in solving

(MR. BARKMAN, cont'd) . . . the solutions that naturally will come up when they discuss wages. But, Mr. Speaker, I also beg that all politicians - and I'm referring not just to the ones to the left of me here but to any politician for that matter in this House - that we stop using this, and I hope that instead of continually aggravating the situation that we try to do something about it from a different angle.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, listening to the applause with which the last speaker's words were received, I now assume that there are substantial numbers of members of each of the Liberal and the Conservative parties that agree with what he said. He spoke of bringing in a breath of fresh air into the debate, then he proceeded to impute motives of politicians in general and one member in particular, questioning whether that member did really believe what he was saying and whether or not he was speaking for the purpose of acquiring votes, and he ended by saying, "trying to get themselves elected". I think the honourable member and I have been in this House long enough - the same length of time - to know that this was not only improper from the parliamentary sense but improper for an intelligent debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that he addressed himself to was on a resolution presented by his own Party which suggested a minimum wage of \$1.25, but aside from the fact that it came from his own Party, I think that what he said would have well been said by somebody in opposition to the resolution itself at \$1.25, because he did not apply himself at all in regard to amount but rather indicated, as he has done in the past, that he would much rather have labour happy and content at the wage which is a bare subsistence wage - and I think that is pretty well recognized by all parties - than to be stirred up and made discontent. Well he is then suggesting that members of our Party are busily trying to point out to labour which subsists at this minimum level that it should be unhappy - and was it somebody who said, "Let them eat cake as long as they do not know how badly off they are; they should not be told that because that will make them unhappy, not contented."

Well, I don't think that that is the case at all. When one addresses oneself to the question of minimum wage, largely one speaks about unorganized labour, and the Minister of Labour probably has right at his fingertips the numbers of people who are employed, especially at this wage level, who are not represented by a bargaining agent and who are therefore at the mercy of the free enterprise system at its worst, which I believe is so heartily endorsed and extolled by the honourable member who just spoke.

Actually, what he should have been discussing was the amount, and the amount of \$1.25 is still an amount which is less than what is considered to be the minimum that a family requires to manage in this province and at this time. It is based apparently on what is the least that a single man needs in order to exist in this province. The amount is something with which the honourable member did not address himself at all. He pointed out the difficulty that may occur in the hospitals, and I would like to draw the conclusion - not that I like it, but I am forced to draw the conclusion from what he said - that because it is necessary to maintain our hospitals, we must take advantage of the people who are working at a depressed wage there and not disrupt the hospital situation as long as we can compel people to work at that depressed wage. To me, this is completely unrealistic and is one which would come poorly from him, even if he were speaking on the resolution at \$1.25.

I think it has been pointed out that the \$1.25 is a very low amount. I think it has been pointed out that there are a great many people whose wage is at the minimum wage level, and in spite of what the Honourable Minister has said, the fact is that the minimum wage is the starting wage in many factors of the economy of this country even where there is organized labour involved. There are many people who enter into industry which is organized and start at the minimum wage level, and to bargain oneself up above it is not an easy thing in certain of the industries, and of course I think he knows that this applies to the soft goods industry more than any other.

Even in that industry, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of people who are earning less than the minimum wage, and this applies in the situation where there is not an hourly rate but there is a piecework rate, what is called an incentive work basis, and apparently if four-fifths of employees are earning the minimum wage then the one-fifth that is not earning the minimum wage is considered to be inadequate for that purpose and there is no protection for that person, so that conceivably 20 percent of a workforce can be earning less than the minimum wage when put on piecework. Although the principle itself might be acceptable, I suggest that it requires looking into by the department because of the fact that if they were to set this formula to apply

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) on a departmental basis, so that within the department there must be at least 80 percent of the workers earning the minimum wage on a piecework basis, that would be understandable because there may be some people who are physically incapable of producing sufficient to keep them at work, but when it is applied on the plant basis - the total plant operation - you then find people in the higher earning skills who are earning so much more that their average will be used to level up the general average of the workers in that plant. I am wondering whether the Honourable Minister is in a position to acquaint us with the extent to which his department looks into these questions, whether it actually makes a survey on the basis of departments of a one line of work rather than looking at it on the total plant operation.

I would have liked if the Minister when he spoke would have given us some statistics which no doubt he has control of - or if he doesn't have them would recognize the need to acquire them - of the number of people that are actually working at the minimum wage, both in organized and unorganized plants, and the number of people who are actually earning less than the minimum wage - and I'm now speaking of the minimum wage of \$1.00 - and that would then give us a pretty clearcut explanation of what it is that we are discussing. It is our contention that it affects a large number of people, and people who are not in a position to bargain realistically for a higher wage - which I think even the First Minister a number of months ago spoke of as being inadequate - and here we are in this House still debating a minimum wage of \$1.00 because the Minister of Labour is happy to say that he has passed on this responsibility to a board, that he is sitting and waiting and we are all sitting and waiting and the people of Manitoba are sitting and waiting for this board to bring its recommendations to him, so that he may then decide whether or not he will go along with the recommendation of the board.

It's all very well, Mr. Speaker, for him to speak of a balanced board when the fact is, as was indicated by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the board is not balanced. In effect its deciding factor is the chairman, who really is there to make the final decision. So here we are waiting for the Minister of Labour, and indeed for this government, to accept the responsibility which is theirs, to do what everybody admits has to be done - and I shouldn't say everybody, I will not include the honourable member who last spoke in that group because I don't know if he belongs in it - but almost everybody has admitted is an inadequate wage, and we are all waiting for that to happen and the Minister has the comfortable position of saying, "Well, I don't think I should make the decision; I think it should be investigated, reviewed and recommended, and if it is dealt with and if there is a recommendation, then I will decide whether or not to accept it."

That's why it was necessary for the opposition, and in the first case the Liberal Party, to say let's not wait any longer; let's go ahead and decide now. We people who are given the responsibility of fixing the minimum wage, let's get busy and do it, but the Minister of Labour is still not prepared to move and indeed the government is not prepared to move, and this in spite of the fact that a spokesman of the government - and I mention specifically the First Minister - admitted on television that the minimum wage of \$1.00 appeared inadequate. What we should be debating here is the question of how high it should go and for that we could get statistics, I presume, but we do know that this government in making its presentation at Ottawa referred to \$3,000 a year as being a minimum amount which is required.

Now it's all very well to talk about contented labour and happy labour and waiting for others to make decisions which are properly ours. I suggest we deal with that, and I assume now that the honourable member who spoke for the Liberal Party last spoke along the lines of the policy which they feel is correct, and that is that they will not support a minimum of \$1.50. As far as the government is concerned, I'm assuming they will not support a minimum of \$1.25. They have not come with any other suggestion; they are still sitting back and waiting, and while they are waiting, sitting in the bush - yes, they are sitting in the bush - but the bush is not so thick that we can't see them and see the red that appears on their faces when something like this is mentioned. I don't include the Minister of Labour in that description because he is quite calm about it all. He is least exercised of all I think, although need I remind him that this is really his responsibility. And I presume I should not include the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, because of course he is concerned about the industry and commerce of this province developing. He is looking for more labour to come in, he's looking for more help to come in in order to staff the industry which is so necessary; and I suggest to him that one of the greatest helps he might have is to come up with a minimum wage which is

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) attractive to people to come into this province, to make them feel that they can live a full life in this province, to make them feel that it is not necessary to come here in order to subsist on what I believe is generally accepted as a minimal amount.

So I urge honourable members of the Liberal Party who feel that they want to recognize the needs in this province that they support this amendment. I presume it is futile to urge any member of the Conservative Party that it should either publicly approve of the amendment or even of the resolution, but at least I would hope that in caucus they are able to do some more effective persuasion on the Minister of Labour to get him to move and to get him to do and to get him to accept his responsibility and to get him to announce that now is the time and the time is already passed when the minimum needs of the labour force, of many of the labour force of this province, are recognized and looked after by this government.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, we brought in a resolution; we felt that this is something that should be acted upon immediately. Now the important thing, as the last member said, we're dealing with a certain amount, but I think that we're dealing with more than that. I think that there is a lot of things that have to be taken into consideration. There is no doubt that if we would have suggested \$1.50, a certain party to my left would have suggested \$1.75. --(Interjection)-- All right, I'm very sorry I said this, and I will also - I'm sorry I imputed your motive - and I would like to read this also to help the Honourable Member of St. John's who did not like certain remarks of my honourable friend from Steinbach.

Now I refer you to Hansard Page 1165, March 22, 1966, the then member of Elmwood who moved the motion, Mr. Peters. "Madam Speaker, I would say a few words on the amendment brought in by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. I would like to say at the offset, Madam Speaker, that when I brought in this resolution I made it \$1.50 hoping that the people across the way there would have amended it themselves because they're always amending it and I didn't leave them a bunch of whereases and everything else to - as I said before, emasculate around - and to me getting my friends on my right here to come up to \$1.25 after just a few short years ago all of them voting against us when we brought in our minimum wage." If you can understand what this means, the Member mentioned this, that he was interested, he was very satisfied with \$1.25, but he was using \$1.50 maybe to force somebody to bring it to this. This is exactly what I said and this what my honourable friend said, and I for one will not support this amendment. Mind you, this could change - it might come away more than this - but I say that we took a decision we felt that it was right for \$1.25. This is debatable. We can have the same thing - if we don't try to be responsible and to at least hold on to what we think is right - we can have the same thing that might happen in the Federal field in anything. You'll have this in baby bonuses and old age pensions and so on. It becomes a political issue, and there is no doubt about that, between all the parties. I think that probably the Liberals lost an election when they got this name - the \$22 buck boys or something like that, or 6 buck boys - it could have been 7 or 22 - that was a good slogan. So let's not kid ourselves that this is not unfortunately too often used as a political issue.

I don't quite agree - maybe he could substantiate his statement - but I don't quite agree with a lot of the remarks of the last speaker. I think that it is important to realize that this is not the average wage, this is a minimum wage, and I don't think that there are that many people - I don't know of too many, there might be some, I don't know - that work here in Manitoba, but I don't think that there are too many that are really receiving this minimum wage --(Interjection)-- I don't see the connection. Should we give \$1.50 for the murderers or what? I didn't see that last connection. I'll sleep on it tonight, but in the meantime I want to say this, that what concerns me personally - I'm not talking for my Party, I'm talking about myself on this minimum wage - I know that there are certain cases which makes it very difficult to even pay this minimum wage, and until we deal with this, until we straighten this - and I mentioned this in the past - there are many people who are backward in certain instances, that are handicapped, that there are sick people, and they are not worth what they are getting. I shouldn't say they are not worth - I'm talking about their work - they are not working for this amount. They are given --(Interjection)-- Just a minute now. If you want to talk about welfare I'll go along with you. I'm not talking about our responsibility, I'm not saying to shoot these people or drown them, I'm not saying that we have no responsibility - this is something else under the Department of Welfare - but I'm talking about people and I know this to be a fact, that when I hire a certain person, maybe to push a broom, make him feel that he has got a job and he is getting this minimum wage, make him feel that he is getting a job and this employer - and this happens - is giving this man a job to let him keep a

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) bit of his dignity and so on. He feels he's not going on welfare, or he might need a little more to help him out. I'm not saying that this is every case, but this is the case and until we come to this, until we can settle this, it's not fair. You would deprive this man of getting a chance to have this job because the employer will not be able to pay \$1.50 or \$1.75.

Now I'm not saying that this - this might not happen too often but this is a case - and there's many cases that you have that people - maybe students studying while minding a store, maybe in a rural point - but those kids would not have a chance to make this spending money and it would be impossible for the store owner to pay that much more because there might not be a customer that would come in, and until all those little details are settled, I would be a little afraid. I think that we have a responsibility; we have to take care of the handicapped - and I want to make this very clear - this is under a different department, this is under the department of welfare.

Now we are ready and we would just be playing politics, the Liberal Party would be playing politics if we went for this amendment. I'm not saying the amendment is wrong. We try to be realistic. We try to do what was right and we felt that, all right, this will be a start, maybe it's not enough but this will be a start, and we will ask for \$1.25. We thought about this. We didn't need an amendment. We knew you were going to bring in an amendment, if you must know, and this is why I said if we would have started with \$1.50 I'm practically certain that we would have seen an amendment for \$1.75.

MR. PAULLEY: Were you at the Convention when they didn't agree with anything?

MR. DESJARDINS: What Convention?

MR. PAULLEY: The Liberal Convention in Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: What about it?

MR. PAULLEY: When they rejected even \$1.00.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well you can see we're free thinkers. In this caucus we do what we think is right and sometimes you have to change certain things, and maybe in four years it might \$2.25, conditions change.

MR. PAULLEY: Psychology remains.

MR. DESJARDINS: Psychology, but what about the factor of how can you pay all these things. Money doesn't grow on trees. You have got to live within your means. It doesn't matter how difficult it is, or it's impossible. It would be utter chaos. We agree to have this \$1.25 and this is what we will support this year. There is a lot of questions that we want answered and I think that what the honourable member of the NDP has said - I think it is very clear what the member, the former member from Elmwood was saying - we were just trying to goad you into something, to force you to do something, and what we wanted all along was \$1.25. So what proof, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the NDP, why should we doubt your sincerity? I say if you wanted that last year, we feel this is what you want this year.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I was drawn into this debate here because I feel that it's rather important and that we get different views brought forward. I just wish that the mover of the amendment would also provide the wherewithal to increase the salaries or the wages of workers because this is what it depends on. If we had the prosperity, no doubt we would have higher wages, I am quite sure of this, but certainly we cannot up the minimum wage to the point where we are going to bankrupt business in this province and individuals. And this is what can happen, because we have heard repeatedly here on the resolution of wheat prices about the condition of farmers and that their prices for the product hasn't increased for the last 20 years or so and yet the other prices are going up, or at least they haven't increased any and are just stationary. I think it's timely that we consider this because we also have agricultural industries.

I know of one in particular, more than one in my area, that employs well over 100 people during the canning season, and here the young high school students, the elderly people, and probably those that are partially disabled, are able to earn some money, but if the minimum wage was increased to a certain point they would not get a job. I think this is a thing that we have to remember, that these people would just be on our welfare rolls, so that it's either one or the other. I don't think we should choose to increase the minimum wage to that point where these people will be unable to earn some additional money. Surely the young students can appreciate working and earning some money during this period of time as well as some of our senior citizens who help out in this way, and this should definitely not be denied

(MR. FROESE, cont'd)these people. They very often can't do a full man's job and draw a full wage, and therefore they are well satisfied to take a minor amount and at least they will have some earning power. Surely we should not be in the position to deprive these people of that.

We already have a situation presently where people who are taking the upgrading courses are earning more going to school than they do on their regular jobs, and that people are leaving their regular jobs and going on and taking the upgrading courses. Also, the farming industry is in this position too, where they cannot afford to meet this competition. So here we have I think a matter which falls right into this category and that has to be considered from all the various angles. I certainly am not one that would deny a person a good wage, not by any means, and the more they can make the better and they are welcome to it. I am sure in favour of having more purchasing power for the people of this province so that they can buy the goods, the essential goods as well as luxuries, if the purchasing power is there. We are also not speaking of an average wage or a fair wage, the resolution speaks of a minimum wage, and therefore many people no doubt are receiving much higher wages and well and good, but let's not increase the minimum wage to the point where we will be denying certain people employment.

I for one feel that we need much greater prosperity in this province. Other provinces have greater prosperity. We just need to look at the weekly salary incomes in the Canadian statistics and you will find that other provinces are paying higher wages and are enjoying greater prosperity. I sure would appreciate if we could in some way bring about a greater prosperity. I think we need better prices for agricultural products for one and there are other industries which fall into the same category, and I'm sure these matters would correct themselves on their own. Just by raising the minimum wage certainly does not give us greater prosperity in this province, and therefore I will not support the amendment. I feel that people today are free to pay more and if they have the wherewithal they will do so.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I would say on this amendment coming up here now, they're talking about \$1.25 and \$1.50 an hour. I've listened here now to the last speaker talking about these various people working. Doesn't he know that this is all casual labour and these people will be earning very small monies through the year? In these canning factories they go for a month then the people are off. They have nothing to go back to anymore. So when you hear all of these arguments coming in like that, let's get down to fact. I've heard of people coming out of these areas and they've come up to me and they've said, "You sit in the House and you support the minimum wage that my people down in that country can't possibly live on." I say I speak in this House and I want something in here for you people to be able to live in a decent manner. A lot of our people are lucky that they are able to go along and say, "I've got something behind me to substantiate what I got. If I went into that factory tomorrow and if I got laid off, I could fall back on what I've got behind me." But we are not all in that fortunate position.

I say we've got to have a minimum wage in here. I just picked up a piece of paper there the other day and you can see the trend across the world. "Washington - Minimum Wage Up. The federal minimum wage in the United States went up to \$1.40 an hour today and affected 32,300,000 workers covered by the old \$1.25 minimum." So you can see. We stand back here and bicker; we send it back and forth to boards. I've said this before and I'll say it again. We're not man enough to stand on our feet in this Chamber and say let's put it up to \$1.50 an hour and see that these people have the purchasing power in this province of ours, because we haven't got, I would say the "guts." Thank you.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member from Selkirk, that

WHEREAS, with the rapid increase in government expenditure in this province, it has become increasingly difficult for members of the Executive Council to scrutinize and administer in an efficient manner the money voted by the Legislature; and

WHEREAS the appointment of an Auditor-General in other jurisdictions has proved of great benefit in controlling waste in government and has provided savings to the taxpayer,

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House continue to press for the establishment of an officer known as the Auditor-General of Manitoba, that he be empowered to make independent spot inspections and running audits of all government departments, boards, commissions and utilities, and to report to the Legislature,

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Auditor-General should be appointed by the Legislature, be responsible only to the Legislature, be removed from office only by a two-thirds majority of votes in the Legislature.

There is a grammatical mistake here, Mr. Speaker, it reads "to" where it should read "by" in the second last line.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I will not make a very long speech at this time. I have spoken on this motion now I suppose probably six times, as I think it is the sixth time I have introduced it. I commend it again very much to the government, Mr. Speaker. I know that my honourable friend the Member for Winnipeg Centre will probably be speaking in opposition to it. He has I think in every year. I suspect in fact that I have a clipping in my file, Mr. Speaker, where I found you in opposition to the motion. I recall my honourable friend the Member for Souris Lansdowne was once given the job by his colleagues to speak in opposition to it. I would like to repeat briefly the arguments for it.

Mr. Speaker, every year we see the same reports come from Ottawa on the work of the Auditor-General there. I want to point out that the proposition that I make and the sole purpose of recommending an Auditor-General is to increase the efficiency of the operations of government in the Province of Manitoba. That is the sole purpose of this particular job, to increase the efficiency and thereby save money for the taxpayers. Before my honourable friend the Member for Winnipeg Centre gets up as he already has once during this House and says that I am asking for an item of expense, I want to make that point very clear, and I commend to the members the readings of the various reports over the years of the Federal Auditor-General. It makes very interesting reading.

I am not going to read them for all the years back, but I have a few clippings here for some years. I'll read the headlines and some selected items. These go back over a period of time. Here is one in 1956. The heading is, "Auditor Raps Government Money Managing. One instance of apparent crookedness and the usual long roster of unorthodox government practices in handling Parliament's money came under criticism Friday from Auditor-General Watson Seller in his annual report." In 1957 the headline was, "Pay for No Work. Auditor-General Watson Seller has uncovered another crop of irregularities in government accounts." In 1959, "Was Pension a Blunder." It goes on. "This is one of some one hundred cases of irregularities uncovered by Parliament's financial watchdog in his audit of the government accounts."

Now to show that this isn't a partisan resolution, Mr. Chairman, I can report to you that these particular ones I was quoting from were in the time of the Liberal administration. And then in 1959 the headline is "Now It's the Conservatives Turn", and carried on then for 1959. Here's one from 1960, "One Slip Cost Taxpayer \$1500"; 1960, "Repair Already Sold"; 1961, "Officer's House Cost \$79,631", and this was one of 44 irregularities in government financial operation. That was in his first annual report because there was a change. Previously it was Watson Seller, I believe, and now we have a Mr. Maxwell Henderson.

Then in 1961 the new Auditor-General said that he wanted the government to streamline accounting help and practices and the story says, "Canada's new Auditor-General wants the government to adopt some methods of private business in accounting for the billions of taxpayers' dollars it spends, otherwise, says Maxwell Henderson, it's impossible to know whether the government is being efficient and to assure Canadians they are getting value for the money spent."

Now that, Mr. Speaker, to me, is the key of the resolution that I have and of the purpose of having an Auditor-General. Well I could carry on: 1962 "Points out Goofs"; 1963, "Devil Take the Cost at Our Expense"; 1964, "Millions Lost on Surplus Sales" - they state then that "Multi-million dollar losses on the sale of surplus military equipment"; 1964, "Huge Government Waste Unfolds in Ottawa" - and this was referring I would admit to the time when my honourable friends across the way, at least their Party was in office, but it carried on after. In 1965, "Bumper Crops of Bloopers and Blunders"; 1966, "Further Digging Planned";

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) 1965, "Report Criticizes PFAA Procedure"; 1965, "Report Shows Two Using \$55,000 Road" - shades of Thelma's bridge, Mr. Chairman; 1967, the report has just come out a couple of days ago and the same thing, he has found waste, "50 descriptions of how tax money went down the drain last year are recounted by Auditor-General Maxwell Henderson." Mr. Chairman, I go over those only to point out that it isn't a partisan question, that government today has grown so big and involved in so many things that it is quite obvious that it requires close financial supervision.

Well, my honourable friends across the way when they oppose my resolution are going to say, but that's being done in the Province of Manitoba. We have a Comptroller-General. Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat again that it's not being done in the Province of Manitoba. I am not in any way criticizing the Comptroller-General of this province, either the individual or the job, but I am saying that the responsibility that we give our Comptroller-General is not the same as the responsibility given to the Auditor-General. The facts are that here the Comptroller-General is an internal auditor, and I presume he does that job well. We don't get a report here in the House of his findings and that isn't his responsibility, but in Ottawa there is a Comptroller of the Treasury who is the internal auditor and there is then the external auditor who is the Auditor-General. The Comptroller of the Treasury does the internal audit in the same way as the Comptroller-General does here, then the Auditor-General has the further responsibility and a greater one in other areas because he looks not just at whether or not the money is being spent on the appropriation but whether there has been waste in the expenditure, which is not the responsibility of the Comptroller-General, and so the Ottawa structure is a double one, and internal audit and an external audit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the normal practice in business. I know of no large business - take the banks for example - they have their internal audit staff and they are doing constant internal audits. They send out to the various branches their auditors, unannounced, and they do their audit, but they still have in addition to that an outside firm of auditors who prepare the final financial statement and who investigate insofar as the Bank wants them to investigate. They are responsible to the shareholders. Well this is what I want to see done in the Province of Manitoba. The Comptroller-General - fine - he has his responsibilities, but we need this other individual in the same way as they do in Ottawa, and this, Mr. Speaker, would go a long way to produce more efficient government here.

Now my honourable friends may be very hesitant because they are afraid there will be headlines saying such and such has happened, but, Mr. Speaker, much better that there be those headlines and that we take the measures necessary to protect the interests of the tax-payers. Here my honourable friends are proposing to add another tax on Manitobans, a five percent tax this year. This has been going on, year by year, we are adding taxes. Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to see to it that we watch the expenditure of that money carefully. We have not got the right to waste a single penny. When we go out and tax people the way we are doing right down to the lowest income people - and let's not forget that we are asking people who barely have enough to eat, we are asking them to pay taxes - then we have to see to it that we spend that money properly.

Well is it only Ottawa that has this practice? Is it only private business? What about Great Britain? They have exactly the same structure, Mr. Chairman, as the one I proposed. I quote from a memo here that I had prepared for myself on the British practice. In Britain, the office of Auditor-General was established in 1866 - 100 years ago. The officer is appointed by letters patent and is responsible only to the House of Commons. He enjoys an independent status similar to that of the High Court Judges. His salary is charged on the Consolidated Fund and he cannot be removed from office except on the address of both Houses of Parliament. And here is a comment by Professor Beer who wrote on the subject of treasury control. That was the title of his book and he says the following about the English Auditor-General, "The Auditor-General, however, looks not only for any legal irregularity, but also for evidence of inefficiency and extravagance. So long as the question of government policy is not raised, and in the normal course, it is with this kind that his reports are mainly concerned."

So, Mr. Speaker, the purpose is to save money. I think I have shown clearly from the Ottawa reports that there is waste and extravagance uncovered by the Auditor-General there. I'm satisfied from watching the operations of this government that there's substantial waste and extravagance here, Mr. Chairman. I've shown that the function is not being performed

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) here, although my honourable friends across the way insist every year that it is. The practice in other jurisdictions, not just the Ottawa one, is one that has been established for some years.

It seems, Mr. Chairman, that there's a wide body of opinion outside this House in favor of such a move. I quote for example from an editorial in the Winnipeg Tribune, February of 1964. "Auditor's report" is the story. It says: "As the watchdog of public accounts, the Auditor-General performs a service of great value." Mr. Chairman, every year we hear on this side of the House the speeches from across the way - particularly from the front bench - "Oh, you fellows over there, all you do is criticize. You never have a constructive idea. You spend your time criticizing." This is the chorus we hear from the front bench opposite.

Surprisingly enough, Mr. Speaker, we frequently find things that we've recommended in next year's Throne Speech - never the first year - sometimes the second year - it takes a lot longer in other cases. The public protector is an example. I started promoting that one back in 1961 when we had it introduced at our leadership convention. I introduced the resolution in 1962 and it was turned down flat by my friends opposite. Now in 1967 I find that I can't even have my resolution discussed because my honourable friends have taken the whole thing up completely in their hands and they want their own resolution only. Well, I don't mind that too much as long as we have some progress, but I'd like to say to my friends, here is a constructive proposition; here is one that's going to save money for the taxpayers of Manitoba. You're being pretty hard on the taxpayers of Manitoba so far, and I don't anticipate from the way you're going that you're going to be any easier in the future. Well then, let's make sure that we take the steps to guarantee the taxpayers that we are taking proper care of their money.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): May I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: May I have this matter stand, please? If anyone wishes to speak, they may go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: I adjourned the debate for my colleague the Honourable Member for Burrows, so I'll turn it over to the Honourable Member for Burrows now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, there are two or three observations that I'd like to make in connection with this resolution. Firstly, I think that we all accept the fact that people have been enjoined from the peaceful use of public streets for the purpose of communicating information; people have been enjoined from the use of free speech for the purpose of communicating information. Our court records show it.

Now at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make one point clear, and that is this, that in dealing with this resolution we ought not to confuse it with the question of the legality or illegality of strikes as so frequently happens. I've just been reading a judgment in one of the reports that we received from the government wherein the learned judge goes to great lengths in dealing with the question of whether or not the strike that was called prior to the setting up of the picket line, was it or was it not legal. This I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, what we're dealing with here is something quite separate and apart from the legality or the illegality of any strike. It's an issue that should be and can be decided on its own merits, and the resolution calls for a declaration of our position on this matter apart from the matter of strikes.

This resolution does not call for any special concessions for any one or another group of a community. What this resolution calls for is for the same privilege for all sectors of our community, regardless of who they may be. What it calls for is a reassurance, a reassurance from this House that the people of Manitoba do enjoy the right of free speech, do enjoy the privilege of exercising the right of the peaceful use of the public streets for the purpose of

(MR. HANUSCHAK, cont'd) communicating information, for the purpose of persuasion. After all, Mr. Speaker, there are two functions of speech; one may be for the communicating of fact, information, opinion, the other is persuasion, and invariably the first does lead to the second, and all we need do is take a look at any newspaper, read any magazine, whatever word there may be or written it is for the purpose of persuading someone else to adopt your line of reasoning, to adopt your line of thinking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that if this resolution were defeated, then it would indeed put us in a very very awkward, in a very awkward position, because then in fact we would be denying the people the right of the peaceful use of streets, we would be denying people the right to exercise free speech. What we in effect would be saying is that what thousands of people are doing right today, right this very moment, on the streets of the City of Winnipeg, on the streets and highways throughout the Province of Manitoba, is illegal. All one need do, Mr. Speaker, is stand on any street corner in the City of Winnipeg and you will find thousands of motor vehicles going by carrying a certain message, a certain message designed to persuade those reading it to behave in some particular manner, be it to buy a certain product, shop, buy at a certain place, or whatever it may be. Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no difference between attempting to convey one's message in that manner with a sign on a truck or an automobile or even on a publicly-owned transit vehicle - our Metro buses are covered with signs - or an individual carrying a sign printed on a placard which he himself carries. The purpose is the same regardless of the means used to convey that message, and certainly Mr. Speaker, we cannot draw a line of distinction between those two, but it's quite proper to have a sign painted on a motor vehicle for the purpose of communicating information, for the purpose of persuasion and to use a public street for that purpose, but it's not proper, it's not lawful to carry a sign printed on a placard which a person carries in his hands.

..... continued on next page

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

I recall, Mr. Speaker, that when the mover of this resolution, the Honourable the Member for Inkster, dealt with the second part of his resolution when he commented on the matter that even though such persuasion may result in the loss of trade or the termination of employment relationships, there seemed to be an expression from some that certainly we should draw the line at this point. But here again I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the examples that I've given you a moment ago of what's being done in our community right today, it does result in loss of trade to someone. If I see a sign on a motor vehicle that advertises a certain shop, and I'm in the market for the commodity that that shop sells, and I go to buy at that shop, I have need for that commodity, I go to buy at that shop, then obviously my act of choosing Shop A is going to cause a loss of trade to Shop B, because otherwise I may have gone to Shop B, and --

MR. HILLHOUSE: Isn't that the essence of competition?

MR. HANUSCHAK: That's the essence of competition, that is quite true, and therefore I suggest that this privilege, which is really basically all that it is, should be extended and should not be denied to anyone, and the same thing is true when the mover of the resolution makes mention of the fact that even though this may result in termination of employment relationships. Last night or the night before I noticed reported in the paper that a representative from the superintendent's department of a Calgary schoolboard came down to Winnipeg to interview prospective teachers. Apparently he's interested in about 35 of them, 35 teachers from Manitoba, to go to teach in Calgary. True, he did not walk up and down the street with a sign. He published his notice in a newspaper which was there for all to read, and apparently some people were moved by what they read to see him, to make application for the job, and who apparently were hired and who have accepted this new form of employment. Obviously here, this act of theirs caused the termination of their present employment relationship.

Now, the only restriction, the only restriction that should be imposed, Mr. Speaker, is as is quite clear in the resolution, and that is that the information that is communicated in this manner be neither slanderous nor defamatory, and here again, as the mover of the resolution had mentioned, there is a possibility that the information may be incorrect and the question may arise should one be allowed to communicate incorrect information in this manner. Well, who's to judge, Mr. Speaker, whether the information is correct or incorrect? Who is to judge whether the advertiser or whether the manufacturer of a product in advertising it, claims that his product is the best, who is to judge that it is the best? And suppose it were proven that it isn't the best, then are we going to say that he ought to discontinue advertising his product, whether he ought not be permitted to advertise it in that manner because the information that he conveys is incorrect.

It's very interesting, Mr. Speaker, the attitude that we take towards this matter of communicating information. Not too long ago in this House there were distributed little stickers that some of us wore, designed to promote attendance at amateur hockey, minor hockey I believe it was. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, if people were persuaded to attend hockey games by this device it's quite conceivable that the promoters of some other athletic function would suffer thereby, because if those people did not go to hockey maybe they'd go to a curling game or whatever else is available. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, we're not going to say that the promoters of a curling game should have a legitimate cause of action against the promoters of the hockey game and restrain them from distributing stickers designed to promote attendance at hockey games. But it's strange though, Mr. Speaker, that when you enlarge that sign in length and in breadth, and you have a person carry that sign up and down the street, then it becomes something that we frown upon, and not only that, it has to go one step farther. It would be interesting to note what would happen if somebody, if the promoters of a minor hockey were to picket a curling rink and were to march up and down in front of a curling rink wherein a bonspiel was held, telling the passers-by, telling those desiring to attend the bonspiel, "Attend our hockey games," whether the operators of the curling rink or of the bonspiel would be able to get an injunction to restrain them from communicating that information to the public.

But strangely enough, Mr. Speaker, when the people who are in the process of communicating information to the public in this manner become members of a labor union, when their message is one dealing with working conditions, then it becomes something, then it becomes an issue wherein the courts do not hesitate, do not hesitate granting an injunction restraining these people from communicating their message, their complaints to the public in this manner which they find to be most effective. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we do take a

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) commonsense realistic approach to this matter, and after all, if we do accept and believe in the principle of free speech, and as the resolution states, it makes reference to the lawful and peaceful use of the public streets, it makes reference to the peaceful use of free speech, then certainly, Mr. Speaker, we ought to make our position clear, make our position clear in a manner that would put an end to the misuse of this principle which we hold so dearly and which has been misused so frequently in the courts to the detriment of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully when the Honourable Member from Inkster introduced his resolution dealing with this very important problem. Now, the Honourable Ivan C. Rand is heading up a commission in Ontario to study this same problem at the present time, and also at this particular time Labour itself is not unanimous what the solution should be in respect to the problem that the honourable member has introduced, the Honourable Member from Inkster.

I would like to just quote from the Globe and Mail, just the other day this week, about injunctions and picketing and what the labour leaders themselves are saying: "Labour leaders were divided on whether the union movement should give priority to a campaign to abolish injunctions in labour disputes or to seek a ban on use of strike breakers. Royal commissioner Ivan C. Rand, who is inquiring into labour disputes in Ontario, has tested the idea of banning both the employment of strike breakers as replacements for strikers, and picketing." This is what's happening in this respect. --(Interjection)-- That's right. Well, I think we should relate it to something. I would have been much happier if the honourable member would have related this resolution to the people that it does affect, and it does affect labour. --(Interjection)-- Well, let's relate it to labour. I think that this is who it does affect and where we should deal with it, or it's easier to deal with it in that particular phase. The resolution says "the peaceful use of public streets for the purpose of persuasion," which really means to picket, to march up and down holding signs and stating a picketer's position. For instance: "This store employs non union labour."

The resolution also says that picketing is okay even if it means that as a result a trade or business will be lost; or, to look at it in another way, all picketing, as long as there is no violence, is okay. This is my understanding of what the resolution has to say. Whether there is a strike in progress, whether the picketing is for the purpose of organizing, or whether the picketing is known to be as secondary picketing. To me, all these are pretty strong statements, Mr. Speaker. I think that picketing when there is no legal strike in progress would be illegal. What is needed is not to throw the whole thing wide open as the resolution would have it at the present time, and I would suggest just to point out the terms of reference of the Honourable Ivan C. Rand, what he's doing on picketing in Ontario right now, and his terms of reference are: What are the purposes of picketing, and which is the most significant? Does the law adequately recognize these purposes? Does the law represent a suitable balance between labour and management. And his terms of reference covers about 20 different points. There's much money being spent on this commission at the present time, and I think it'd be worthwhile to see what the studies and results would be.

We must remember that in the last analysis what we are doing is making a social decision; that is, the easier we make picketing we give more strength to labour. The harder we make picketing, the more strength we give to Management. In the last report of the Woods Committee on Page 12, it said that the immediate undertaking is to review ex parte injunctions as it relates to industrial disputes. And, as I say, the committee has been dealing with this problem for the last year, and in view of the committee that's studying in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment, and the proposed amendment is: that all after the word 'that' in the first line of the operative part be struck out and the following be substituted:

1. Picketing is a legitimate bargaining weapon.
2. Legislation on picketing should clearly set out the manner in which picketing may legally be done.
3. The Woods Committee be requested to make its report on picketing and injunctions during this session of the Legislature.
4. If the Woods Committee is unable to report, this matter to be referred to the Industrial Relations Committee of the Legislature to hear representations and report to the session of this Legislature. Secunder, the Member for Carillon.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): I would move, seconded by the member for Logan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if we can get anything done in the time that's left. Mind you, if there's a disposition on the part of everyone to sit for another three minutes, why --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of --

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until Monday, the 6th of March, at 2:30 in the afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until Monday, March 6th, at 2:30 p. m.