

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 24, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

I'd like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 75 students of Grade 11 standing of the West Kildonan Collegiate School. These students are under the direction of Mr. A. Penner. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, this morning I directed a question to the Honourable Attorney-General in respect to a 35-cent increase in the permissive charges for a case of 12 beers in the Province of Manitoba, and asked him -- (Interjection) -- it's beer, it doesn't matter whether it's in a can or in a bottle, it's still beer. I asked him under whose authority this increase is apparently granted and as to whether or not it should have been approved by the Public Utility Board which is the agency responsible for authorizing increased payments to brewers in the price of beer. My honourable friend this morning has suggested that he would look into the matter. I wonder if my honourable friend had the opportunity of looking into the matter and what the reply is now.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I don't have the information yet for my honourable friend. I hope to have it for him as soon as I can get out of the House to make the enquiry.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplemental question. I hope what my honourable friend meant by when he gets out of the House it's after adjournment, because I'd like to know inside of the House before we adjourn.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: I take it we carry on where we left off.

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if we could just carry on with the third reading of Bills where we had left off at adjournment.

BILLS NOS. 57, 68, 69, 77, 78, 83, 85, 88, 89, 90, 91, 99 and 54 were each read a third time and passed.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge) presented Bill No. 65, an Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and to authorize the Borrowing of the same, for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will not oppose the third reading of this Bill, I merely rise in my seat to protest the fact that apparently -- protest the fact that the Manitoba Telephone System has not seen fit to extend the telephone services on an equitable basis within the metropolitan area to all areas within Metropolitan Winnipeg; namely, the extension of the services at the same cost to the residents in Headingley, Manitoba. These people are considered as being part and parcel of Metropolitan Winnipeg for all taxation purposes; they are not receiving the equal services of the Manitoba Telephone System with others within the area; and I regret very much that this is the case. I appreciate and realize that at the present time, as I understand it, the matter has been referred to the Utility Board for a hearing by the residents of the Headingley area. However, had the government and its agency adopted the principle of equity within the Greater Winnipeg area, that would not have been necessary and the people of Headingley would be able to enjoy similar services to the rest of Greater Winnipeg.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I think what the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party has said ought not to go without some comment. As he has pointed out, the Manitoba Telephone System has agreed to

(MR. McLEAN cont'd) appear before the Public Utility Board for a hearing in this matter and that will be held at an early date, and I'm certain that all parties concerned will be given a full opportunity of stating their case.

May I also say, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of the record, that there are 51 communities in Manitoba where the people concerned live within the same or shorter distance and who, if one is speaking about equity, would have to be considered if the request that the people from Headingley are making - and supported by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party - if their request were considered, there are no less than 51 other communities in Manitoba in a similar position, and equity is equity for all the citizens of Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: May I direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities. Is it not a fact that the only municipality or area within the Greater Winnipeg orbit that hasn't equity is that of the area of Headingley?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, answering the question - no.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplemental question. Could my honourable friend then indicate what other municipality or area within the Greater Winnipeg, as defined under the Metropolitan Corporation Act, is in a similar position?

MR. McLEAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, if there was any suggestion that my answer was with relation to the metropolitan area. I would have to say that I didn't intend to answer with respect to that only. I was speaking of the Province of Manitoba. Your Honour will be well acquainted with one in your own constituency and there are 51 altogether.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further question to my honourable friend. I was speaking of equity within the Greater Winnipeg or Metropolitan area.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I wonder if the honourable gentleman has not exhausted his privilege, having . . .

MR. PAULLEY: No, I have not, Mr. Speaker. I am entitled to two supplementary questions.

MR. SPEAKER: But you've had two.

MR. PAULLEY: I've had one.

MR. SPEAKER: You've had two.

MR. PAULLEY: I asked one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. In my hearing the honourable gentleman asked his question and asked two supplementary questions. That was the way I heard it.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, if you want to stifle me, Mr. Speaker, it is your privilege as the presiding officer of this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It's not a question of stifling, it's a matter of staying within the rules of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right and I'm doing it.

MR. SPEAKER: And I have ruled. Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear what you said last. Did you say that you rule?

MR. SPEAKER: I said that I felt that the honourable gentleman had exhausted his privilege in that direction, that he had had two supplementary questions.

MR. PAULLEY: I have to accept your ruling that I had . . .

MR. SPEAKER: That is my opinion.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . had two, in my count it was only one.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 57. I beg your pardon. Are you ready for the question on Bill No. 65? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I object or oppose the bills on capital. I think I've indicated so on second reading on principle, on the government's policy in connection with borrowing. While the interest rate is very high at the present time, I feel that there should be a change in this policy of long-term borrowing and cut it down to a shorter term so that the people of the province would not necessarily be held on to this high interest rate for all the years to come. I understand that borrowings are made for the term of 24 years and I feel that this is definitely something that should be changed, at least now while we are in the era where money is of such a high cost.

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

BILL NO. 40 was read a third time and passed.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 55, an Act to amend

(MR. COWAN cont'd): . . . The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 19389, 19466 and 19494, for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I don't want to unduly delay this Bill; on the other hand, I think I would like to make it clear how we feel about the half percent increase on unpaid taxes. We're not opposed to the increase from six percent to nine percent per annum. We do feel, however, that consideration should have been shown to owner-occupied premises where the arrears, if there are arrears, is due to their inability to meet their tax bill and not for any other reason, and it seems to me that by not taking these people into account and ignoring their plight, we are simply making the problem that much more severe for them.

I think a method could have been achieved whereby the City of Winnipeg's problem with regard to unpaid taxes could have been partially met or resolved, and at the same time the needs of people in lower income and fixed income brackets, who are particularly hurt by this type of legislation, could have been avoided. I just want this understood, that we could not simply stand by and let the Bill pass in its present form and we wanted to go on record to that extent.

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

BILLS NOS. 59, 93 and 94 were each read a third time and passed.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas) presented Bill No. 97, An Act to amend The Social Allowances Act, for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to say I appreciate very much that the Honourable the Minister and the government has at long last listened to some of the wisdom that emanates from this side of the House, that they have removed the stigma that has been history in this province of charging those who may be less fortunate than ourselves insofar as being able to look after ourselves, the stigma of course being that previously those who required assistance were called "indigents", a word that had a sinister connotation, and I appreciate very much that the Minister or the government or whoever is responsible for the Social Allowances Act has at long last agreed to changing the terminology. For this, I appreciate very much the fact that they have listened to the words of wisdom from this quarter particularly, at this stage.

However, as we have before us an amendment to The Social Allowances Act, I implore and plead with the Honourable the Minister of Welfare and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to remove many other stigmas still attached to The Social Allowances Act, particularly insofar as the regulations are concerned whereby under the present cruel and oppressive regulations, people who may have a prepaid funeral plan in excess of \$300.00 have to go to their embalming agency or their undertaker and plead with them to take it back and give them a cheaper deal, and I want to say to the Honourable the Minister that if he can't appreciate how this thought affects the mental attitude of people who are put in a position where they have to rely, or have to come to society generally to help them out, the people concerned certainly do. I've had, since I first spoke in this House this year on the question of prepaid funeral plans, a dozen or more similar illustrations of the attitude of the Minister and the Department of Welfare respecting the well-being of the people and the cruel, oppressive regulations under The Social Assistance Act.

I'm not going to oppose the third reading of this Bill. As I said at the outset, I appreciate there have been some changes made, and I want to - plead, I guess is the proper word - plead with the Minister and the government to realize that we're living in the 20th Century and not back in the dark, dark ages, and the regulations, I'm sure, that we have under The Social Allowances Act today, may have been reasonable back in the days of the Black Hole of Calcutta but they're certainly out of line today when we're all talking about a just society, a meaningful society.

The Minister of Welfare and the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council have the right, under legislation, to change the regulations and I implore them to be a little more humane than they have been and to make more adequate and up-to-date provisions for those people who cannot plead for themselves. I say those people who cannot plead for themselves, because as the Minister of Welfare indicated a few weeks ago, that if there is any appeal from the decisions of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the Minister under the regulations, it is back to him, himself, and that while there is an Appeal Board, that Appeal Board is an agency of government, and in the final analysis, as is recorded in Hansard, the Minister says, in effect, "I am the Appeal Board," and can overrule it.

MR. CARROLL: No.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend shakes his head and well he might shake it in shame for the treatment that is afforded to many of the unfortunate people of Manitoba who find themselves in a position . . .

MR. CARROLL: You're all wet.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . where they must receive help from the state. My honourable friend says I am all wet. I want to say to him, maybe it would be a good idea if he would become a little "wet" so that he understood the problem; come out of his ivory tower and look after the well-being of our less fortunate citizens in the Province of Manitoba who do not plead for aid but only reasonableness, which they are not receiving at the present time from the Minister of Welfare or the Government of Manitoba.

MR. CARROLL: You're wrong again.

MR. PAULLEY: I beg your pardon?

MR. CARROLL: You're wrong again.

MR. PAULLEY: Was that a question you were directing?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): . . . Mr. Speaker, ask the honourable member, what was the record of his party when they were in power in Saskatchewan in the field of welfare services?

MR. PAULLEY: The answer to that question is that I recall the Honourable Member, the Minister of Education, who has just asked that question, sit up in this House back in 1958 and said that we are processing and proposing the most meaningful and generous system of social welfare in Manitoba which at that time was modelled on that in Saskatchewan, but Mr. Speaker, there's been a tremendous change since that time; and my honourable friend the Minister of Education who asked that question, at that time was full of exuberance in the desire to process the well-being of the people of Manitoba. He fell by the wayside back last November but the Honourable the Minister of Welfare adopted the general policies of retrenchment and retreat under the new leader.

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

BILLS NOS. 39 and 66 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Provincial Treasurer, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bills No. 28 to 114 as they appear on the supplement to our Order Paper.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee proceed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, mention was made of a supplemental list. I don't seem to have one here.

MR. JOHNSON: Some of your pals must have stolen it.

MR. PAULLEY: Better my pals pinch it than yours.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed, I've been asked to make an announcement that may be of some interest to the honourable members. In the event that we find tonight, that the House finds tonight that it wishes to sit tomorrow, apparently the lunchroom facilities will be open for the honourable members in the event that they wish to make plans to use them.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask my honourable friend since when did this House, as a House, decide how late they would sit, when they would sit? My honourable friend is the individual that decides how we sit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the committee to proceed as we did this morning, with bills page by page? Agreed?

BILL NO. 28, Page 1 -- passed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, on Bill 28, I have an amendment to propose: That the proposed section 21 (a) of The Devolution of Estates Act as set out in Section 2 of Bill 28, be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof the following subsection: "subsection (4): Nothing

(MR. LYON cont'd) in this section requires the consent of any person or the approval of a judge to a grant of a mining lease by a personal representative which the personal representative is empowered under The Trustee Act to grant without such consent or approval."

I should just say by way of brief explanation that this amendment has been recommended by counsel who were involved with this Bill and with the Trustee Act, to prevent a conflict between The Devolution of Estates Act and The Trustee Act amendments. There could possibly be such a conflict unless this curative amendment were put in. It's really not of a substantive nature; it merely obviates possible conflict that might arise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 1 -- passed. . .

MR. LYON: I moved the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of procedure, I would suggest that where there are amendments, every section should be read -- at least on any page on which those amendments take place, because quite frequently there are sections that lead up to the proposed amendment.

MR. LYON: That's the only amendment I have.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I would suggest then -- the Attorney-General mentioned that's the only one, so I would suggest then that on Page 1, where there is an amendment, all sections be read because they may have some bearing on some other sections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, is the honourable member suggesting on that particular page, because we'll run into bills that would have a lot of -- you know, might have 50 pages.

MR. PAULLEY: What I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is that where there are amendments, that the sections be read on that page, but where there aren't any, that they be taken page by page.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, probably I'll just run through this Bill. (Bills 28, 49 and 53 were each read section by section and passed.) Bill No. 60. Page 1 . . .

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Chairman, I know that there's considerable interest in this bill and I know that there will likely be some comments on it. I had an amendment that I would propose to make in the second last section of the bill and I thought maybe if I could explain the principle of the bill -- or the principle of the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . is to proceed with the bill and then . . .

MR. WEIR: Yes, but I'm wondering -- there may be an amendment earlier that might hinge on it and that if I explained the principle now of what we were planning, it might help us get through the rest of the bill and save some discussion.

As a result of some of the discussions that there have been in the House and some that were held in committee, I have had a look at what would be subsection (11) (2) of Section 3 of the bill, which has to do with the variation, the allowable variation by the Commission, and the point made by the Member for Lakeside and the point made by Mr. McCormack in committee has been considered, and the whole principle of the Bill is to provide for impartiality and flexibility with instructions to the Commission to look at the circumstances as they exist within the Province of Manitoba - and they do vary widely.

There was a look taken at whether something should have been done in the northern areas, as suggested by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and we felt that about the only way that could happen was if we almost drew the boundaries ourselves as a Legislature, which we didn't think was a good idea, which allows -- the percentage going both ways allows the complete flexibility, I think, of the Commission. So that really, essentially what the amendment that I propose to make would do in this Section would be to remove the reference to densely populated areas and sparsely populated areas to allow the scope of 25 percent either way from the quotient and would allow the Commission to establish the population that they felt was required within that range for every individual constituency within the province. The point that the Member for Lakeside made about the definition of "dense" and "sparse," using it in this context I came to the same opinion that he did, that it might be necessary. You try to define it and it becomes very difficult to define here. Earlier in the subsection the Commission is instructed to consider the density and the sparsity of the population and come to their own conclusions, so when we reach that point of the bill, Mr. Chairman, I propose to make that amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, as the Honourable the First Minister indicated, I had raised the question as to the possibility of taking out of the bill of the northern constituencies and was considering that because of their peculiar circumstance insofar as density of population and transportation and the other aspects, that it may be worthwhile to make provision for their

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) representation directly and not necessarily under a quotient established under the Act. And if you recall, Mr. Chairman, last evening or early this morning, I just forget at which stage we were at when we reached this bill, I made the suggestion of taking general area which is now represented by name of Churchill and the name of Rupertsland from the general provisions of the bill and the quotient would be arrived at by a divisor of 55 rather than 57. However, apparently such will not be done. The Legislative Counsel was kind enough to suggest an amendment to me that I might propose in the committee; however, at this particular stage in the process of the bill, on reconsideration, possibly this can be considered some time in the future in view of the possible developments even in these areas.

I'm glad that the Minister has suggested that the area of tolerance should be up and down. I'm not sure that I'm going to agree with him on the tolerance of 25 percent up or 25 percent down, but I think the general principle that he enunciated that he is going to move, by way of amendment to the bill, of this fluctuation up and down in regard to all constituencies, is a step in the right direction and may overcome some of the difficulties that were contained in the bill as we have it at the present time.

So it's my opinion at the present time, Mr. Chairman, that we will not proceed with the differentiations between the two constituencies in the north. I trust and hope, however - and I'm sure that they will - the Commission will agree with the general principle that I've attempted to establish in this House, namely, that in the areas served at the present time by the present constituencies of Churchill and of Rupertsland, there are peculiar circumstances prevailing insofar as representation is concerned and the availability of the inhabitants of this area to their local representative. So, as I say, the suggestion of the Honourable the First Minister is a step in the right direction and we reserve our rights, of course, to change the tolerance from 25 - 25 to some other percentage figure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . proceed? (Bill No. 60, Sections 1 to Section 2 of 10A were read and passed.)

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move, seconded by the Attorney-General, that the proposed new subsection (2) of Section 11 of The Electoral Divisions Act, as set out in Section 3 of Bill 60, be amended by striking out clauses (c) and (b) thereof and adding thereto immediately after the word "than" in the fourteenth line thereof, the words: "25 percent more or 25 percent less."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose an amendment to that amendment, that the figure 25 percent be struck out and replaced with seven and one-half percent - to read "seven and a half percent more and seven and a half percent less."

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, we'll have to vote against the seven and a half percent because it would reduce the tolerance for the type of constituency we have in the Province of Manitoba that would remove the flexibility that we believe is required for the Commission to be able to establish reasonable constituency boundaries within the Province of Manitoba and adequate representation for all of the people in the province.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly on this. The position of the New Democratic Party has already been outlined by our Leader and by other speakers, namely, that we are concerned about the question of representation by population, and that although this bill, on first reading or by superficial study, would indicate that it provides representation by population, it does not in fact; and that the tolerance of 25 percent really is a figure that should be doubled and consequently shows a range of some 50 percent between constituencies. This does not in fact bring about representation by population. We made suggestions to the government that there were other ways and other manners of attacking the problem, if the problem is communication; that there could be other considerations other than the size of the constituency in terms of population. We're not living in a Manitoba of 10, 20, 30, 40 or 50 years ago; we have a modern communication system; and we made suggestions that members might be given extra privileges in terms of franking or telephones or telegrams, or perhaps expense allowances, to enable them to communicate with their constituents.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we're fixing this now for the next decade and I regard this as a very serious bill, one of the most serious of the Session, so I think that if members consider this carefully and they consider the problems that were once perhaps necessary and made necessary - different sized constituencies, because of roads and difficulty of meeting with your people - that some of them in fact no longer exist. If we want representation by population,

(MR. DOERN cont'd) then you need a minimal deviation and this is not the case in the government's bill. Therefore, we're proposing a seven and a half tolerance, which I think is more in keeping with a true representation by population.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the sub-amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. DOERN: Ayes and nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

The Committee will come to order. In order that members who were out of the House understand what they will be voting on, I have before me a motion by the First Minister that the proposed new subsection (2) of Section 11 of The Electoral Divisions Act as set out in Section 3 of Bill 60, be amended by striking out clauses (c) and (d) thereof and adding thereto, immediately after the word "than" in the fourteenth line thereof the words: "25 percent more or 25 percent less." The question before the committee is now a sub-amendment that the words "25 percent" be struck out and replaced by "seven and a half". Is that correct?

A STANDING COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 8; Nays 38.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

On the main motion, are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I fail to see essentially the difference between the original amendment and what we're proposing in the amendment that is before us. I wonder if we could have a more precise explanation.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member can't understand from what I've said and what the amendment in the Bill contained, I'm afraid there's nothing further I can do to enlighten him. I've been as explicit as I feel I can, under the circumstances. I believe it's quite clear.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 60 was read section by section and passed.) Committee ready to proceed?

Bill 61. (Bill 61, pages 1 to 3 was read and passed.)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest a change in Section 12 of the bill, which appears on Page 4. Section 12 deals with the question of enumerators in the Act. The purport of my suggested amendment would be to bring our Act, Election Act, insofar as enumerators are concerned more in line with that of the federal authority, namely the provision of two enumerators in each polling subdivision representing two different and opposing political interests, instead of the procedure that we have at the present time. As you know, at the present time, Mr. Chairman, there is just one person. We are suggesting that we should adopt in this Act the same principle as applying in the urban areas under the Federal Act whereby the Act would be changed and the present legislation would be repealed, and that instruction would go to the returning officer basically as follows: that upon making the subdivision, the returning officer shall appoint, in writing, in Form 7, two competent and reliable persons, neither of whom is a candidate in the election, and shall deliver to each enumerator a copy of the instructions and the election material required by him, and that the returning officer shall, as far as possible, select and appoint two enumerators for each polling subdivision as hereinafter set out, so that they shall represent two different and opposing political parties. Now I have, Mr. Chairman, -- this is quite an involved amendment, but I think that possibly the House or the Committee may agree to deal with the principle involved rather than the formal submission of the proposed amendments which were done some time earlier this morning. So if the House would on that basis understand the point that I'm getting at is the substitution of the one enumerator for that of two, one of which, if we followed the federal plan, would be chosen by the party having the majority in the division and the second one by the party who was the runner-up to the successful candidate. I make this proposition to the House, Mr. Chairman. I have got a copy of the post-amendment before me which I can submit. Again I suggest that possibly the principle involved is the important feature of my suggestion on behalf of my party, and if you would accept it on that basis, Mr. Chairman, on the principle rather than the technical amendment, providing the House is in agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask a question on this. As I recall the Federal Act, this applies purely to urban areas. Is it the intention here that this be purely for urban, or is it the intention that it be rural as

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) well?

MR. PAULLEY: Basically, Mr. Chairman, we've suggested it should be applicable to all constituencies who are principally concerned, and we appreciate the regulations under the Federal Act because it's applicable to the urban, that at least it would suffice and help out particularly in those constituencies where one street is in one constituency and another in another, so as far as we're concerned it doesn't necessarily have to apply right across the board; it would be satisfactory in the urban areas.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on that basis, having it in agreement with the Federal Act, I would be in complete accord with the proposed amendment and I'm prepared to have it discussed purely on principle - I don't need the wording at this stage. The wording can be left up to the counsel.

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

MR. PAULLEY: A division please, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Members. Order please. We're now dealing with Section 12 of Bill 61. The Leader of the New Democratic proposed an amendment to Clause 12 which would - it's a lengthy -- along the lines of the Federal bill.

A STANDING COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 20; Nays 27.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost. Bill 61. Page 4 -- passed; Page 5 -- passed; Page 6 --

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on Page 6 I wish to propose an amendment which I am sure will reach with the unanimous favour of all members of the committee. The motion that I propose is: that Clause (b) of the proposed new subsection (1) of Section 17 of The Election Act, as set out in Section 16 of Bill 61, be amended by striking out the word "twenty-one" in the first line thereof and substituting therefor the word "eighteen." This, Mr. Chairman, is the section in The Election Act that sets up the age of 21 as the age of voting in the Province of Manitoba. There have been numerous debates in the House on this particular subject and we propose that the age should be reduced to that of 18 years of age. The Conservative Party of Manitoba have adopted this in principle on a number of occasions and have voted for it in this House on a number of occasions, by inference at least, and have suggested that they would be prepared to accept it if others accepted it as well.

Now since the last debate we had here on the question of votes to the 18-year-olds, there have been one or two other provinces of this great Dominion of ours who have adopted the principle of votes to the 18-year-old, and the example that I think primarily of at the present time is in that great province of Quebec, and in the last election in Quebec for the first time 18-year-olds were granted the privilege of voting - and that of course helped, may I suggest, in the election of the present Premier who is considered in many instances sort of being an ally or an affiliate indirectly of the Conservative Party of Canada, in some areas at least.

I've also heard of discussions within the ranks of the Conservative Party here, as I indicated previously in Manitoba, that they are looking with more favour now than ever on extending to the 18-year-olds in our province the right to vote. My honourable friend the Minister of Education is directing, I understand, some of his social studies toward the trying to engender in our younger generations more interest in the field of politics and more concern with the destiny of Manitoba, and I suggest that now is the opportune time for the Minister of Education to lead his colleagues into really practising what he's preaching and accept this resolution which I am proposing, to allow the 18-year-olds to vote.

As a matter of fact, you know, Mr. Chairman, recently there has been a new trend in politics in Canada with both of the two old-line parties, in that at their nominating conventions they're allowing 16-year-olds to decide who will be their candidates in the respective constituencies. Now surely to goodness, if 16-year-olds can select as the Leader of the Conservative Party of Canada Robert Stanfield, and 16-year-olds can select Trudeau as the Leader of the Liberal Party, surely we can go at least partially along the way and give to the 18-year-old the right to vote and be full participant in the voting process here in the Province of Manitoba.

By this resolution or amendment I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, it is not our idea, at least for the present, that 18-year-olds would be entitled to be candidates, but we feel that they should be entitled to vote for the candidates of their choice. So I ask the House to unanimously accept this principle. I know that the Liberal Party in Manitoba, by resolution, have adopted the principle; I know that the Conservative Party in Manitoba are very, very favourable to it except when they come to the brink of deciding, up until this moment, as to whether

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) or not they accept, but they sort of fall by the wayside. I ask them now to join with all the other members of this House in giving full endorsement to this principle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to propose, and I move the following amendment: That the amendment be amended by deleting the last word of the amendment, the word "eighteen" and replace it with the word "nineteen."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question on the sub-amendment?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister of Education wants an explanation. I think I can give it to him quite simply, that instead of having the voting age of eighteen as it's proposed in the amendment, that it now should read nineteen. Mr. Chairman, we have two of the provinces in Western Canada that have a voting age of 19 and I think it would be only fitting that we should have ours set at the same figure so that we would have more uniformity in Western Canada in connection with the voting age, and I think most members on this side of the House are in favour of lowering the age. However, I feel that 18 is probably a little low and that we should set it at 19.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the sub-amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question on the main motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: A recorded division please, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A STANDING COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 19; Nays 25.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost. (Pages 6 to 10 of Bill 61 were each read and passed.) Page 11 . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest an amendment dealing with the subject matter which starts at the bottom of Page 11, which is Section 34 of Bill No. 61. This is the section that deals with the necessity of the posting of a deposit by a candidate who's seeking to represent the people of Manitoba in a constituency. As you know, at the present time, Mr. Chairman, it is necessary for anyone who runs for office to place a deposit of \$200.00 before the Returning Officer can accept his nomination, and it is my intention at the present time to propose that in the Election Act all references to the requirements of a deposit be eliminated. I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that this is also one of those very, or somewhat complicated amendments in that it would deal with a number of sections within the Act. I wonder whether the Committee would agree to deal with the principle that I'm proposing at the present time, rather than the technicality of the amendments to the Bill. That principle would be to eliminate references to the necessity of a deposit on filing nomination papers, and if the Committee would adopt the principle, as I'm sure they will, then I would propose the technical amendments in order to give effect to the proposition.

MR. FROESE: Could we not have the amendment as being proposed inserted in Hansard though - in full? Could the amendment that you propose not be inserted in Hansard though, so that we could have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Honourable Member for Rhineland speak into his microphone. I can't hear what he's saying.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, my question is whether the amendment as it is being proposed in the sheet before us could not be inserted in full in Hansard, though? I think it should be printed in Hansard.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, if my honourable friend is desirous of having all of the clauses listed in Hansard, I've no objection to the two or three sections but -- I can go over them, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I could read into the record the amendment that I have here before me.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, you have that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well the amendment -- Section 34. Section 37 of the Act is amended (a) by adding thereto at the end of Clause (b) of Section (2) thereof, the word "and"; (b) by striking out the word "and" in the third line of clause (c) of subsection (2) thereof. (c) by striking out clause (b) of subsection (2) thereof; and (d) by striking out the word "one" in the second line of subsection (3) thereof and substituting therefor the figure "2". Is that clear?

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

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry to disturb the members, Mr. Chairman, that are out. May I have a recorded division?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A STANDING COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 10; Nays 37.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost. (Bill No. 61. Pages 9 to 13 were read section by section and passed.)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make another proposition to the Committee for its consideration and I'm sure that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce will accept this one, as will most of the members opposite, because it's one that is proposed by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce. It isn't too often that I have the opportunity as the Leader of the New Democratic Party to make propositions in this House on behalf of the Chambers of Commerce. On this particular occasion I'm happy to do so because we have similar views. The purport of the amendment that I propose is to have on the ballot paper the designation of the political affiliation of the candidate so that if you, Mr. Chairman, in your constituency run as a Progressive Conservative, everybody knows that you are a Progressive Conservative - and I'm sure you're proud of it, and well you might be. I'm sure too, Mr. Chairman, that you're so proud of it that you holler it to the rooftops, and the suggestion that I will be making will be to the effect that this be imprinted on the ballot paper so that people will be able to know of your pride in your particular party affiliation.

I'm sure, too, that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce is proud of his association with the Conservative Party and wants also to give that information, he being so charged with the responsibility of the dissemination of information throughout the province that he would give to his own constituents the knowledge that he is a Progressive Conservative. I'm sure that the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party in his constituency of Ste. Rose has no hesitation in declaring that he is a Liberal, so therefore it would be only fitting and proper that that should be on the ballot paper. And then, of course, we have my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland who is a Social Creditor, and in his constituency there's no bones about it, he is a Social Creditor, and he is proud of that particular fact, and I'm sure that he would agree with me that he would love everybody to know on election day that he is a Social Creditor. I'm proud of my own Party and I have no objection to telling all and sundry that I belong to the New Democratic Party; I'm very proud of it; and I would like to share that pride with all of those that go into the ballot box on election day to cast their ballot for the candidate of their choice.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the following: That the proposed subsection (6) of Section 63 of The Election Act as set out in Section 45 of Bill 61 be amended:

(a) By striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (d) thereof.

(b) By adding thereto at the end of clause (c) thereof the word "and".

(c) By adding thereto immediately after clause (c) thereof, the following clause (d): the name of a recognized political party with which he is affiliated and the Secretary of the Central Committee which acknowledged him as a candidate, or if he is not so affiliated with a political party, the word "independent".

The purport of this, of course, is if the candidate is a member of a recognized political party, and there is provision for that within our Elections Act, that party be so designated, and if he is an independent candidate, then the word "independent" would be placed on the ballot. I recommend this on behalf of the Chambers of Commerce and the New Democratic Party for once forming a union for the consideration of the members of this Committee.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record as supporting the Leader of the New Democratic Party and the amendment that has just been proposed, namely that the party label go on the ballot. I feel that people should have the right to know what the candidate stands for, or at least to what party he is affiliated and belongs to, so that when they come to the poll that if they want to vote on the party label that they can do so, and I certainly will support the amendment.

I note that we've just defeated the previous amendment which is my opinion places a penalty on democracy, namely the \$200.00 deposit which is still required under the Act, and I do hope that we will not do the same thing on this amendment and leave the penalty there.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development & Municipal Affairs)(Cypress):
 . . . to say that I listened with some interest to what the Honourable Leader of the New

(MRS. FORBES cont'd) Democratic Party had to say, but somehow I can't help but say that, as cute as he is, he's not a swinger but he may be a switcher if he gets himself into a spot like Thatcher and Hazen Argue.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I would appreciate a division, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A STANDING COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 11; Nays 36.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost. (Bill No. 61, pages 13 to 16 were read section by section and passed.)

MR. PAULLEY: Have you got it?

MR. LYON: I've got . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Can I win this one? Is this the same one? I've lost every other one.

MR. LYON: I've got some good wordings. I was proposing to move an amendment, Mr. Chairman, on Page 16 which would give effect to the general agreement that was reached in Law Amendments Committee concerning the right of persons to vouch for people in a poll. Is that the same one as . . . Well perhaps my honourable friend would . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Ah go ahead. Don't give me the privilege of at least . . .

MR. LYON: Permit me to associate with the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . suggesting one amendment that is going to be passed. No I defer an honour to my honourable friend, of course. The suggested amendment was proposed by my colleague from St. John's but possibly it would be fitting for the government to win this vote. I'll support the government or the government support us. Or possibly we should toss up.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would move, and even though we don't require a seconder I suppose mythically seconded by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, that the proposed subsection (2) of Section 77 of The Election Act as set out in Section 58 of Bill 61 be amended by striking out the words "polling subdivision and whose name is on the list as originally delivered to the Deputy Returning Officer" in the second, third and fourth lines thereof and substituting therefore the words "electoral division and whose name is on the list of electors for the electoral division."

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my honourable friend for accepting the proposition of my colleague from St. John's who proposed this some time -- I believe it was last night that this was proposed, not this morning. The amendment proposed by my colleague wasn't worded quite correctly. Since that time of course due to the efficiency of our Legislative Counsel it's been whipped into shape and it meets with our approval and I'm happy that my honourable friend and I at least see eye to eye on one matter today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I wonder if there is a copy available of the amendment.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I thought they were distributed. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I'm sorry. The effect of it is of course to permit any registered voter in an electoral division to vouch for any other person whose name is not on the list and who is entitled to vote in that division.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think it's a very good amendment and I certainly intend to support it.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 61, Pages 16 to 26 were read section by section and passed.) The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. What page?

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Page 27.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed.

MR. DOW: Section 104, Form 37 of the Act is amended by striking out the illustration of a ballot paper set out therein and substituting the following illustration. Mr. Chairman, this particular ballot is the one that hangs in a polling booth and in my opinion it's more or less suggesting that you shall mark your ballot in a certain place. We talk about and pride ourselves on the fact that we have secrecy of ballot and all the rest of it in the voting procedure but here's something sitting in a polling booth that's looking straight at a voter and they take a look at it, this is what it says to do. So the individual sitting in the third spot of this illustration I maintain has a preference. I can look and see that the objective of this can be handled very well and I've drafted out an amendment, Mr. Chairman, "that Section 104, Form 37 of the Act be further amended by striking out the illustration of a ballot paper set out therein and substituting

May 24, 1968

(MR. DOW cont'd) the following illustration." And the illustration is just a ballot and on the bottom of it "that the ballot paper will be marked with an "X"." Or in other words you don't have the "X" on the ballot paper as such and on the bottom it just says "the ballot paper shall be marked with an "X"." And I'll move that as an amendment to that Page 27, Mr.

Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've all heard the motion ?

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 61 was read section by section and passed.) Bill No. 62, Pages 1 and 2 were read section by section and passed.)

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Page 62, Section 5 which is an amendment whereby the Metro Act or the Metropolitan Corporation - the rewording of the present 1964 statute whereby Metro can pick up 20 percent of the costs toward hospital construction. I've been looking at this and frankly I feel that something seems to have gone astray in the financing of the capital costs in Manitoba. Because it's been generally accepted and has been stated, to the public generally it's felt that the province picks up 40 percent of the capital costs, the Federal Government picks up 40 percent of the capital costs, between them they pick up 80 percent, with the 20 percent to be picked up by the local authority, whether that local authority be a municipality or Metro or in those cases where perhaps privately run hospitals still exist, they would be picked up by an organization, but the basis was 40-40 and 20.

Now my concern is this: the way the present Act reads Metro will pick up 20 percent of the actual cost. Now when the Federal Government and the Provincial Government talk in terms of 40 percent of the cost to be paid by each, in other words 80 percent by the two senior governments, they're not referring to the actual costs at all; they're referring to an authorized cost, a cost established by them by statute. An example is this: a \$10 million hospital, if we built it today, the provincial Government would pay towards that hospital \$700,000. That represents 40 percent of the cost of a bed. The Federal Government to pick up an equal amount of \$700,000. But because costs have increased over and above this theoretical \$5,000 ceiling, to closer to \$27,000 per bed, Metro will, or any municipal authority, would be required to pick up \$2 million. In other words, the province is putting up \$700,000; the Federal Government \$700,000, Metro would have to pick up \$2 million. Now this \$2 million is 20 percent of the actual cost. The 40 percent the province picks up is 40 percent, not of the actual cost, but a stipulated cost, an authorized cost as prescribed in the statutes; and the same amount is picked up by the Federal Government.

Now it can be argued that the balance which is amortized by debentures payable over 35 years, that that is being picked up by the senior governments and it's being picked up by the fact that it's part of the built in per diem cost of running the hospital, and so since the per diem cost is paid for by the Manitoba Hospital Commission and the Manitoba Hospital Commission get part of its revenues from the senior governments, that they in a sense are picking up their 80 percent in the long run, of the full cost. But when you consider that in Manitoba, a great part of the premiums which Manitoba Hospital Commission collects, and this is money that they earn, a great part of their money comes again from the payment of premiums which are taxpayer monies, so that you end up really with the local taxpayer paying far more in the initial payment towards the construction of a hospital than either the province or the Federal Government and then on top of that continues to pay through his hospital premium towards the amortization of the total balance.

Now I think this is a departure from the principle established years ago, and not that long ago. I think we're entering into a new concept of cost-sharing and I would like to suggest to the government that they look at this very closely, because it seems wrong to me that when we talk in terms of a 40-40-20 split that the 40 percent provincial should be \$700,000, the Federal should be \$700,000 and the 20 percent, which should be half of either the provincial or federal, the 20 percent would represent \$2 million; in other words, more than both provincial and federal grants combined. And although I'm not going to bring in an amendment on this, because I wasn't quite prepared for it, but I would ask the government to look at this very closely and to see whether in fact something hasn't been developed over the years in Manitoba which is contrary to the concept of paying for the capital cost of hospitals in Manitoba. If the \$5,000 per bed figure is unrealistic, and I don't doubt it is, then perhaps the province should increase their percentage or the authorized cost per bed that they'll pay; and in turn of course the province should get after the Federal Government to do the same. But I don't think it's right that

(MR. MILLER cont'd) the municipalities are the only ones who have to face up to the increased costs while the province is still limiting itself to an unrealistic level established, I don't know, 10, 15 years ago, and costs of the hospitals, as I say, which has risen from \$5,000 per bed to close to \$28,000 per bed. I think this is an unfair load on the municipal taxpayer; it has to be paid outright through his local taxing authority, either Metro or the municipality and he can't even amortize that portion. A far fairer arrangement would be for the - if we're going to stick to the \$5,000 cost per bed, that it be 40 provincial, 40 Federal, 20 municipal and the entire balance outstanding be then amortized over 35 years and let it be paid for through the per diem collections paid to the hospitals by the Manitoba Hospital Commission. But I don't think it's right that the great increase in cost of construction should suddenly be loaded on the municipal taxpayer and the province stands by and doesn't increase its initial capital contribution by any greater amount than it did 15 years ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 2 -- passed.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, are we on Bill 62?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 62, Page 2. Are you speaking now on 2 or 3?

MR. FROESE: Bill 62, I'm interested in the Section 1 (4) (c). We've heard a lot of criticism in connection - where speculators came into the scene and bought up property and then were trying to sell it for a large profit to other companies or even to the government, in many cases where land was acquired, and we now give this same power to the Metropolitan Corporation. Under 4 (c) they will have the right to purchase land and also to sell land and I'm just wondering whether we will not have just this type of speculation going on in Metro, that they will acquire land unnecessarily and then sell it for a profit at time. So that I'm not in accord with the principle set out in 4 (c).

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Pages 2 to 4 of Bill 62 were each read and passed.)

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, in connection with Page 5, in Committee last night I read an amendment to Section 23 and it was agreed in committee that I would have copies of that amendment made and discuss the amendment with the solicitor for the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. I have since discussed the matter with the solicitor for the said corporation and in conscience I could not present the amendment which I did read to the committee last night. I find that the Metropolitan Corporation in the interest of public safety, requires this legislation and if my amendment were carried by the Committee it would destroy the powers which they should have to enforce public safety. So therefore I do not intend to move the amendment which I intimated last night that I would move today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The balance of Bill 62 was read page by page as amended, and passed).

BILL 63. Committee ready to proceed? Page 1 -- passed, Page 2 . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on Page 2, I would like to offer an amendment. I move that Section 8, subsection (5) be amended by deleting the words "commercial or business" in the second line thereof. What this essentially means is that demand loans will be able to be made by credit unions, not only for commercial purposes but also for other purposes and that using the demand note will not be completely tied down. This will enlarge the purposes whereby demand notes can be used and that is why I am moving this particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that we need this type of legislation in the credit union movement in order to have closer checks on loans of a personal nature where we can take the matter in hand when it's necessary. Also it then gives us the privileges of changing the interest rate on short notice once you have a considerable amount of your paper supported by a demand note and this is what we need because the credit union movement is getting into a squeeze more and more all the time. The competition that we have from the banks are of a nature that we cannot compete with if we do not have powers of this type and therefore I am moving this amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 2 -- passed; Page 3 . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to propose. I move that Section 9 of the Bill be deleted. Mr. Chairman, what this will mean is that we're deleting the whole section dealing with the Stabilization Fund. We still have legislation on the books in connection with the Stabilization Fund. If this is removed the other legislation would still be in existence. The legislation that is presently on the books is of a voluntary nature; this one is compulsory. In my opinion, as has already been pointed out by other speakers who spoke to the Law Amendments Committee we're conferring too large powers on the central organizations

(MR. FROESE cont'd) and giving them complete control of this Stabilization Fund. This is no doubt restricting the autonomy of the credit unions themselves in that they will have no say in the management of that fund. It would also mean a loss of revenue which would further bring about stricter competition than we have at the present time and as I've already pointed out the credit unions are out-manoeuvred at the present time because of certain restrictions in the Act. It has been pointed out that the amount of interest that can be paid on share capital is limited under the Act whereas banks and other financial institutions do not have this limitation and are increasing the amount that they pay on their deposits and shares. In this way credit unions are really being penalized now and therefore are suffering.

It also seems that we are treating the credit union organized movement as though these are babies. I feel that they have definitely come of age. We have had them in Manitoba since 1937 and they are well prepared to run the show themselves and not have unnecessary restrictions placed on their operations.

Just the other day, and I think this morning, we passed a Companies Act and I think we've had one other Bill whereby mortgage and loan companies, trust companies are allowed to borrow 15 times over the amount that they have in share capital in reserves. Credit Unions are limited to 50 percent of what they possess in their own funds so that we only are able to borrow 1/30 of what finance or trust and mortgage loan companies can do.

Then, too, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the way the fund is set up under Section 9, will provide a slush fund for the Director of the Co-operative and Credit Union Services Branch. He will no longer be called on to do a good job because he can cover his mistakes with this particular fund; and yet they are charged with the auditing of the credit unions in this province. He will be the one that both performs the audit and also is in charge now of the Stabilization Fund which will cover any mistakes that he may make or any laxness on his part he can cover it up now. I feel this is wrong in principle, that he should have this power and he should be the one to govern, so to say.

There is also no provision for an Annual Meeting or a meeting whereby the credit unions that are contributors of this Fund can meet and decide on future programs or on any policy matters of the Stabilization Fund. This is entirely out of their hands and I feel this is wrong in principle too. The trustees of the Stabilization Fund are not answerable to the credit unions. They will be appointed by the central and the department of Agriculture or the Director of the Credit Unions will be making the appointment.

All the Stab Fund will do is report to Mr. Chase and we, even as an Assembly here will not necessarily get any reports because the report from the Agricultural Department might give us a summary of the activities of the credit union's operation but we've had no report of the Stabilization Fund in the last report that we got; and if this is followed up we, as members here, will not get any information on this Stab Fund either.

I feel that the Stabilization Fund legislation should receive much more consideration and especially by the officers of the credit unions of this province, that they might have a greater say and give consideration to a more practical way of setting the fund up so that it can function better and will be of greater use, and too, that it need not be compulsory.

Then too, I just wonder, up until the present time the amounts of the moneys that are in our reserve funds are part of our liquidity. Now 25 percent of that will go to the Stab Fund and I'm afraid this will no longer be considered part of the liquidity of a credit union because they have no access to it. Therefore this will mean that credit unions will have to keep still more of their funds liquid and funds that will not be able to produce any earnings. This fund as it presently is set up, some of the larger credit unions will have to put up \$25,000 a year and in no time we will have a Stab Fund of a couple of million dollars. There is also no limit to the amount that the Stabilization Fund can have; it can go on and on, there is no limitation. Under the previous fund I think we had a limitation that was I think around 200,000 or something like that. Now we have no limitation at all. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that this should not be accepted at this time, that this should be deferred for a further year, that the credit unions themselves could give consideration to it, have meetings and discuss it and improve on it. And that is, Mr. Speaker, why I do oppose the legislation as it is before us.

I received a letter in the mail from the Steinbach Credit Union which also purports their position and they certainly do not like it the way it is set up in the legislation before us. The Steinbach Credit Union is not a member of the league, although they are members of the Credit

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) Society and therefore they do not get the circulars or any material that might stem from the Credit Union League. They too, feel very strongly that they should have a voice in the operations of the fund and in determining the policies of the fund. They also feel that there should be a budget set out every year for their operations so that we know what they intend to spend and how they propose spending it and in this way there would be some regulating body. They feel very strongly on electing their own members, members of credit unions to the Stabilization Fund and not have these appointed by the central body.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that if my honourable friend's motion were accepted by the committee that all of the Bill from the third of the way down Page 2 to the end, would be thrown out? That's correct? In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Rhineland feels that the vast majority of this Bill is not in the interests of the credit union movement.

I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister, Mr. Chairman, recognizing that whatever we may think of some of the views of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I think the most of us are prepared to admit that he is quite an authority where credit unions are concerned, and I think his position has been to a considerable extent supported by at least I would say the majority of those who have either made representations at the Committee of Law Amendments or to members of the House individually so far as I have been able to ascertain. In view of that, is there not merit in the suggestion that has been made, that it might be well to hold this Bill over for a year. I gather from representations that were made both at Law Amendments and those that have been made privately to me that it is assumed to be public knowledge by those people who are closely acquainted with the credit union situation that the department is planning on a major revision of the Act for next year. If that is true, would it not be worthwhile to delay passage of this Bill? I simply cannot give any worthwhile opinion on the matter myself. I just am not well enough informed on the merits to feel that my advice would be very helpful. But I certainly have formed the opinion that the preponderance of the representations that I have heard have been in favour of delaying the Bill. And now my honourable friend from Rhineland comes along with the suggestion that we should delete the major part of the Bill. I think it would be worthwhile for the Minister to consider holding it over; not killing the Bill but rather asking for it to stand indefinitely.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member for Lakeside will afford me the privilege of being able to say that I like to consider myself a reasonable man and not overly obstinate with respect to accepting or not accepting amendments. I've accepted quite a few on some of the legislation that I've put forward to the House for consideration, amendments that I felt were constructive and helpful. I find myself, however, on this occasion not able to support the amendment as introduced by the Member for Rhineland, nor indeed accept the suggestion as offered in good faith I'm sure by the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

I don't want to take up any time of the committee at this point other than to ask the committee to examine once again -- he mentioned something with regard to the Member for Rhineland as speaking perhaps for the majority or being well versed in the credit union movement, and of course I'm well aware of that. There has been some reference made at different stages of this discussion with respect to the League, the Credit Union League not representing all credit unions. I am of course aware of this. But of the some 200 English-speaking credit unions the League does represent in the area of 180. It's also true that some of the larger credit unions because of their greater sophistication didn't feel there was any particular advantage for them to be involved with the League. But again I would suggest if this legislation that was put before you in any material way worked to their disadvantage then surely, Mr. Chairman -- particularly I'm thinking of the one major credit union here within the city, I think a short two, three minute walk from this building as a matter of fact on Donald Avenue, of which I am a member -- would have taken the time to come and speak to us at Law Amendments or indeed make some further representations to us.

Let's examine some of the representation that was made to us at Law Amendments Committee, and I grant you the only representation that was made was along the lines of the argument as those represented here by the Member for Rhineland. Mr. Forrest spoke to us. I understand he is a member, I'm not sure whether he is on the executive of the Caisse Populaire -- he was part of a group of ten or twelve of that executive that met with me several months ago on this matter. He spoke not as a member of the executive of the Caisse Populaire,

(MR. ENNS cont'd.): he spoke as the President of a single credit union to us which is of course his right but I am left with the obvious question: why wasn't he speaking for the Caisse Populaire if in effect they had some basic reservations about the amendments that I propose or indeed were worthy - you know the representations from them.

During the greater course of the representations at the Law Amendments Mr. Martin representing the Credit Union League was also present. He offered to make a positive representation to the Bill. I had some words with him to the effect that certainly it was his right to do so, but I indicated that I had reasonably good feeling that I was on the right course on this Bill and it would perhaps only add to the heavy load of the committee before us. But I point out only that these people were there or were present or could have easily come to us to make, you know -- or take full advantage of that unique situation that we have here in Manitoba at Law Amendments to make their views known to us.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that while I agree with the Honourable Member for Rhineland that certainly the credit union movement has come to age, I also think that he is perhaps confusing somewhat the principle of working within a broader framework of responsibility to their investors, to their shareholders, that I myself think we in this Legislature should be moving into. I really don't think that we should be overly concerned with the management or the self-governing of this particular body. If they have reservations about how and which way this fund will be operated -- which took up a great deal of the debate at Law Amendments -- if they think that there is a top-heaviness in the representation either by one group or faction within the movement or not, well then surely they can change this. They meet annually I understand. I would suggest that these members who are outside, you don't change organizations from the outside -- you know it's like the suggestion that I often like to make to my honourable friends in that corner, you know. -- I don't think they will change the world from working at the political structure from the outside. If they joined us or yourselves in that side why they may bring about some of the reforms that they're after in that manner, but the same thing to some extent applies in this case. We're all aware -- certainly the Member for Rhineland is aware -- that there has been a fair amount of division within the credit movement over the years. I'm happy to say that this has to a great extent evaporated, there's a far greater area of co-operation now existing to the extent that they have reasonably good conventions annually that include by far the majority of the people involved. I am convinced, or else this Bill wouldn't be before you in its present form, that the amendments, the Bill in its form is acceptable and desirable for the credit union movement and I cannot accept any amendments, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture mentioned several people who appeared before Law Amendments Committee who raised the same kind of misgivings about the legislation as has been raised by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I recall as well there was another credit union appeared before Law Amendments Committee and they were represented by a member of that credit union, Mr. Mitchell.

The point that I wish to make about his presentation is that it differed essentially from the kind of objection that my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland has. Mr. Mitchell said that his credit union which was not a member of the League, which was a Civic Employees' Credit Union, agreed that legislation of this kind was desirable, but felt that his particular credit union because it was not amongst those that apparently had the Minister's ear when the legislation was prepared, did not have anything to say about the various mechanics that are set forth right in the Bill. And he merely pleaded for a chance to exercise a democratic participation in how this type of legislation would ultimately be enacted -- and I repeat, he was in favour of what the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture is sometimes very much against. He was in favour of every credit union being asked to pay to the stabilization fee. That principle he did not object to. I know that my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland does object. But he didn't object to that. Well they apparently now have a voluntary stabilization fee and I'm inclined to think that for the thing to work properly it would have to be based on the type of legislation, in principle, that the Minister is bringing forward. But what apparently has happened here is that a part of the movement has got the ear of the Minister with regard to the presentation of this legislation and what Mr. Mitchell requested and what I think we of the Legislature should feel these people are entitled to, is that all of the people, and this includes for instance the biggest credit union in the Province of Manitoba, which is not a member of the League and which the Member for Rhineland now says has sent a letter to

(MR. GREEN cont'd.): him indicating that they have some objection to the legislation.
-- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry.

MR. ENNS: Would the member permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes, certainly.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster. I just draw the attention to him. Would he by the same token suggest that, for instance if the government is approached by organized labour to move in certain directions, desirable directions as far as legislation, that we wait until we hear from all of the wage earners or all of the people? I suggest to him that when government seeks to be guided it's quite natural that you listen to those within an association. When I'm talking about construction industry I listen to people within the construction association; when we talk about securities legislation we -- I don't know if there's an association of security people, trust companies -- but this is not unnatural. I know what the Honourable Member for Inkster is saying but I throw this out to him in the course of his discussion.

MR. GREEN: . . . question, Mr. Chairman. He wants me to answer that question? I'll answer it by doing exactly what the government does when they talk to organized labour. They say to them: "You are organized labour. There are many people who you do not represent and we would appreciate hearing from them as well." And they do hear from them. They do hear from them and they give that very reason. They give that very reason for not adopting the legislation that organized labour presents: That you are a portion of the population, a portion of the labour movement and we don't regard what you say as being representative, as being . . .

MR. ENNS: That's your position. You would put it forward.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I have never said - and not only have I not said, but I have said that I would not support the legislation that organized labour has asked for on occasion, because I've been opposed to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Let's not get into a debate on labour here. We're on the . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not dealing with a debate on labour. I'm dealing with the question as to what considerations a government should give to organized groups in the community. I have said on numerous occasions that I would ask for the repeal of The Manitoba Labour Relations Act. Organized labour doesn't want that. They want the Act. I would not certainly be guided by everything that they said and I don't ask the Minister to be guided by everything that this Credit Union League has said. And if that's what he's doing then I say that fundamentally he is not approaching this question on a proper basis. All that has been requested by the various delegations that have appeared is that the principle appears good; we would like to have a voice in deciding some of the things that this Act provides for. We've heard from -- as I've said, we know that the Steinbach Credit Union, the biggest in the Province of Manitoba, has reservations; we've heard from the -- (Interjection) -- No reservations?

MR. FROESE: We have reservations . . . The Winkler . . .

MR. GREEN: Well the Member for Rhineland said that he got a letter from them. Perhaps I'm wrong about that. I heard that in his presentation.

MR. ENNS: Surely they would forward me a letter, as they are aware that I'm bringing forward the legislation.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Member for Rhineland then who has indicated in his remarks that he has received a letter, may I ask him to either table the letter or document it so that we know that what I am saying here, and which I got from him, is correct. We know that the Civic Employees' Credit Union were here and they took what I thought was a very progressive position on the Bill. They didn't come here and say negative, negative, negative, you're ramming this down our throats. No, they said, "This thing has merit. We think that in the long run something like this is necessary but we would like to have a hand in talking about how it's to be finally formulated." The Minister surely has given that type of consideration to others and I say that there would be no harm, no harm at all in giving it to the people who appear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I'm in full agreement with the position as expressed by the Honourable Member for Inkster. There are a couple of points that I

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) would like to add. Firstly, I just wish to repeat the request that was made in Law Amendments, and that is for time to study this Bill, for time to study this Bill by those who in fact will be paying for it. It will not be the Credit Union League that will be setting up the Stabilization Fund. It will be the individual credit unions that will be making contribution to it, Mr. Chairman; and surely, and surely those who will be paying into this fund, those who will be establishing this fund, certainly should have the right to examine and study this Bill. Surely, Mr. Chairman, that is not an unreasonable request.

The Honourable Minister says that these people had an opportunity to appear before Law Amendments Committee, those who were opposed to it, or anybody who had a view to express on this Bill. But these people did not have the time to appear before Law Amendments. It was pointed out by a delegation appearing on behalf of one credit union, the Civic Employees Credit Union, and that point was very well taken, that the boards of most credit unions meet once a month. There was not time for these credit unions to receive this Bill, to call a meeting of the Board, to study it, to report back to the Board and to enable the Board to formulate a position that it intends to take.

I appreciate the fact that this Bill came into existence with the assistance and guidance of the Credit Union League. Now the information that we've received is that the Credit Union League as such was the only source, or the primary source of guidance and assistance that the government received in the formulation of this Bill. I understand that . . .

MR. ENNS: That's not right.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe that I am right to this extent, that there wasn't much heard from the individual credit unions as to how this Bill should be set up, as to what should be contained within this Bill. If the Minister can show me that, then I will retract that statement, but I do not believe that the Credit Union League was really speaking on the basis of resolutions adopted by its members at its convention saying that this is the manner in which we wish to see a Stabilization Fund set up, and then on the strength of that the Credit Union League would then go to the Province of Manitoba and say these are the changes that we wish written into the Credit Union Act. This originated at the Credit Union League level, at the board management level of the Credit Union League. But wherever it originated it doesn't really matter; the point is that now there is a Bill before the House and surely, surely those people who are going to be financing this Stabilization Fund have a right to be heard, have a right to be given an opportunity to study the Bill, which they haven't had. And if the Minister feels that that request is unreasonable, then I certainly can't see his reason behind it, on what basis he feels that this Bill ought to be proceeded with and the credit unions be denied the right to study the Bill.

And I will repeat again, I am not speaking in opposition to the recommendations made therein. There have been some observations made, points drawn to the Committee's attention requiring study, two or three points in particular, and perhaps there is need for amendment there, but essentially what we're asking for is to give the credit unions an opportunity to study this Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the Minister is so reluctant to have this Bill referred, or Section 9 referred back so that the credit unions can have further discussion on it and further consideration, because there are so many areas that need further consideration to the section.

Mr. Chairman, just by having a big pool of money as a reserve for bad loan situations and mismanagement and so on, is not sufficient. I know that in our particular case, the Winkler Credit Union in 1950, they had a defalcation, there was a cash shortage of 19,000, there was a bad loan situation, only 10 percent of the loans outstanding were secured, and here we had some losses - about \$40,000 - and the reserves that we had at that time were 9,000. This is what we faced in 1950. I wasn't on the board at that time but however, we had a complete reorganization and at the meeting we had all the assets frozen and we started working and in so many cases where we had no security whatever on the loans we tried our best and in many cases we had to prime the pump, so to speak, whenever they required additional money, and in this way got the loan secured. It took us three years to come out of the situation and since then our organization has been growing, I think by leaps and bounds, but it took three years of very, very hard work on behalf of the whole group on the Board of Directors, the other committees, in order to get it re-established and get it back on its feet. This was all done voluntarily and I'm afraid by setting up a big pool of money of millions of dollars to help

(MR. FROESE cont'd) out credit unions whenever they go wrong or get into trouble, if they know, well there is money that will cover us, I'm worried about this, that they will not take proper care and will run into trouble more often and more fast than they have been heretofore, and to have it tied down to the Provincial Audit Department which will also have their say in this Stabilization Fund, I think it's principally wrong. I feel that the Director of the Co-operative Services Branch is the one that has been pushing so hard for a Fund of this type and that it be controlled in this way, so that he is in charge of the auditing operations. Now he will be able to cover up and use the funds here to cover his mistakes. I've made charges on previous occasions that too many of our credit unions have ran into trouble, had their bonds jeopardized because of the Audit Department not doing a proper job and I stand by that. The Minister the other day accused me of naming them. All he needs is to go to his files and he'll find out. This is the . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think it's quite improper for the honourable member to be naming civil servants in the Legislature who cannot defend themselves from his charges, which may or may not be accurate. I'm not rising to the defence of the Minister, but I do have to rise to the defence of civil servants whose positions are being banded around by my honourable friend with great abandon and making remarks about their capabilities and so on. If he has a case to make let him make it in a proper way but I don't think he should make it so loosely.

MR. FROESE: Well, I don't want to have the situation get worse and I think by the setting up of a fund of this type under his department and under his supervision that things will get worse. This is why I feel we have to have changes made and not let this section go in the way it is. And as far as what the Honourable the Attorney-General said, I'm not the only one. He can go out into the credit union movement and find out for himself what the situation is.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Member for Rhineland would elaborate on the objection of the Steinbach Credit Union which he indicates that he had a . . . Can he do so?

MR. FROESE: Well, they had these several questions. They point out that the credit unions should be in a position to elect members to this Stabilization Fund Board. This is one of their prime concern. I named it before. This is the thing that they question. I talked to Mr. Reimer on the phone the other day, who is the manager of the credit union, and they had attended one meeting in Winnipeg where they had raised objections to the way or the proposition that was made. I also mentioned before the matter of the budget and that there should be an approved amount set out each year as to the cost and money that would be expended in the operations of this Fund.

I also mentioned the matter of reporting to the credit unions and that there should be an Annual Meeting whereby they would get reports. The way the Act reads now in the last sections of the Bill is that the Stabilization Fund Board report to the Director. Well, we feel that this report should be made to the credit unions themselves, the ones that will be contributing, that they will have a voice and a say in the operation of the Fund. These are the three principles that were contained in the letter from the Steinbach Credit Union.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE: Would the Member permit a question? Does the Steinbach Credit Union belong to the league or the federation?

MR. FROESE: They don't belong to either. They belong to the Credit Society, though. That's the banking end of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to call for a division. I do hope I have support.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does he have support?

MR. FROESE: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you three supporters? Call in the members. Bill 63. The Motion before the Committee that Section 9 of Bill 63, be deleted.

A COUNTED vote was taken, the results being as follows: Ayes: 19; Nays: 25.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

(Pages 2 to 7 of Bill 63 were each read and passed.) Page 8 . . .

MR. FROESE: On Page 8, I move that 104 be deleted. This is the section that has to do with deposit insurance. I feel that if we allow deposit insurance to come into the credit union movement they will be subject to federal supervision and that this might be the thin edge of the wedge. I don't see that it's necessary. We have our reserves and I don't think that we

(MR. FROESE cont'd) need federal deposit insurance to come in at this particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I've been admitting that I am not as well informed as I would like to be on the details of this administration, but it seems to me that my honourable friend really wouldn't need to worry about this section because as I understand it it is only permissive, and if it is only permissive then surely the corporation does not need to apply unless they wish to and if we're going to have such a corporation set up, shouldn't we leave it to their own good judgment as to whether they apply or not?

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

(The balance of Bill 68 was read page by page and passed. Bill 67. Pages 1 to 11 were read page by page and passed.)

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Mr. Chairman, there were amendments I believe on Page 4 . . . Page 4 as amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon me, yes, that's right. Page 4 as amended and page 11 as amended, passed.

(The balance of Bill 67 and Bill No. 73 were each read page by page and passed.)

Bill 75.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay the proceedings on Bill 75, but I thought it might be worthwhile to mention for the record what honourable members will all be familiar with, namely that we have before us a reprint of Bill No. 75 containing all of the amendments that were moved in Law Amendments Committee last evening and produced for the use of the Committee this afternoon - a matter of some 12 hours later - with the amendments all included in, all done by the computer. I think this is the first time that it's been done in the Legislature and I think it's worth brief mention, that this is a good procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bills Nos. 75, 76, 80, 81, 82 and 84 were read page by page and passed. Bill No. 86 was read.) Bill 86 be reported?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to go on record in connection with this Bill that I do not support the principle of passing this type of legislation when there are other means whereby it could be accomplished and should have been done properly. This is to have a referendum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 87 was read page by page and passed. Bill No. 92, pages 1 to 10 were read and passed.)

MR. CAMPBELL: I think, Mr. Chairman, that it's on Page 11 dealing with the Board of Governors that my honourable friend and Leader has an amendment that he proposed to make.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, we're on Section 8 are we? Bill 92? Mr. Chairman, I planned my wording here but there were some amendments in committee and I would have to ask you to be able to fill in the correct figures that's all. My motion is that Section 8 of Bill 92 be amended by changing the words "twenty" - and is it "twenty-three" now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's twenty-three now. That's right.

MR. MOLGAT: "Twenty-three". So by changing the words "twenty-three" in line one thereof -- right?

MR. CAMPBELL: That's right.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . to read "twenty-four" and adding the following Section, which will be Section (f) -- correct? To read as follows: One member elected by the students of the university who are members of the Manitoba Students' Union.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've all heard the motion. Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I could not be at Law Amendments Committee yesterday to move that motion there as I had indicated on the second reading of the Bill that I would. I move it now. I understand it was moved in committee by one of my colleagues the Member for Emerson constituency. I would appeal once again, Mr. Chairman, to the government to reconsider their position in this regard. I know that this sounds like, possibly in the view of some of the members of the House at the moment, like being too progressive but I strongly recommend that the action be taken now, Mr. Chairman. If we postpone it I think we're simply placing the students in a position where they will resent this, that some time in the future this House will grant this in any case. It will appear then like a grudging thing on the part of the House; that rather than be in that position we should be open, progressive, do it before we are forced into doing it - and I'm certainly not taking the position right now that I'm

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) being forced into this. I think it's a right thing to do. I think it will involve the students as they should be. They are part and parcel of the university. They are certainly the largest group at the university, and going back historically on the university structure, it began by students who merely assembled to listen to a teacher.

I think we have to give our students credit for wanting to be at university. They are not there under compulsion, they are there because they want to be there, to improve themselves, to be better citizens. I think that they have shown in the past that they do have the responsibility to carry out these functions on the Board. There is no danger whatever to the University Board by having one member out of 24 from the student body and I just cannot see one single reason, Mr. Chairman, why it should not be passed at this time. I think if the government refuses this amendment it is simply burying its head in the sand, it's not aware of what's going on right now in the world, in student circles. It is simply refusing to face the facts and it's being most backward in its attitudes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in Law Amendments we took the position that the students should be given this seat that they ask on the Board of Governors. You may recall that Mr. Dowse, Professor Dowse, who spoke on this when asked the question about how he felt about student representation answered that as far as he could see although there may not be any advantage, there certainly would be no disadvantage to the Board. And for the world of me I can't see how one lone student is going to influence in some negative way 23 adults. One would think that with the 23 adults there that the likelihood is that the student being amongst 23 adults would be more than easily handled. So that it seems to me that the government is simply digging in its heels simply for the sake of saying no the students should not be on the Board of Governors, they haven't earned that right. All the students are asking is that they be now involved in all levels of government administration and policy. It's been finally recognized that they should sit on the Senate. That's one step. The next step, the logical step, is that they be on the Board of Governors. And by the government's attitude that somehow they have to keep them out of this particular level one would get the impression that something happens at the Board of Governor level which the students mustn't know about. It's this sort of suspicion, this wall that we are creating or that the government is creating between the student body and the Board of Governors which I think antagonizes the students, and quite correctly, because I don't believe that if the students are part of the Board of Governors or sitting on the Board of Governors that they're going to be all that excited when they get there. The meetings are not all that exciting. They're probably quite dry. They deal with mundane matters mostly and I think the students might be quite surprised that when they got to this Board of Governors there wouldn't be quite, as I say, the excitement that they expect to find there. But to deny them this right and to say to them you haven't earned the right to sit on this Board of Governors, you are still students, you cannot be here, is wrong.

Now it's true the government can answer and say well they might be - one of the students could be elected because six members of the Senate are going to be sitting on the Board of Governors and it could conceivably be that one of the students might be appointed to the Board of Governors. Now this is a very remote likelihood. The students move on, that is you don't get the same people sitting year after year, and since there's a very large Senate as we know, the likelihood of them getting an appointment to the Board of Governors are mighty slim.

I feel that if the students are expected to act responsibly, if they're expected to understand the workings of the university and to participate both as students and as policy makers in the sense that they are part and parcel of the university life and university ideas, that they should be sitting on this Board of Governors. Particularly these days when the universities are so very large. One of the cries that one hears from students is that there's a feeling of isolation, that the days years ago -- not too many years ago, 15 - 20 years ago even -- when the campus was so much smaller, when the university professors knew their students and the students knew their university professors and there was a dialogue that could develop between the professors and the students and the administration. Today because of the large universities this is impossible. One of the criticisms and one of the objections that one hears from the students is the feeling that they are being isolated, that they are remote from what is happening to them and they feel like pawns somehow being pushed around at the will of an administration. Putting them on the Senate will help. The next logical step, the one that follows as day follows night is to have one member on the Board of Governors. I feel the government should have

May 24, 1968

(MR. MILLER cont'd) done so; I don't believe that this one man or one student is going to have a negative on 23 adults nor is that one student going to lead 23 adults astray, particularly when the adults are twelve members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and the President and the Chancellor. So I see no justification for it except the government's adamant position that because they don't want it it shall not be. And for that reason we support the amendment.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Ayes and nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the results being as follows: Ayes, 20; Nays, 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost. (The balance of Bill 92 was read page by page and passed).

MR. LYON: Would it be the wish of the House to remain in committee or rise and start over fresh?

MR. PAULLEY: We start afresh. I want to know what you're going to do with 12 cans of beer?

MR. LYON: Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. The Committee of the Whole has considered further Bills and passed without amendment: Bill Nos. 49, 53, 62, 63, 67, 73, 75, 76, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 87, 92 and directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Friday evening.