

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, February 25th, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Cyril Alvin Henry, Joseph Alan Bryant and Frances Adelaide Bryant, praying for the passing of an Act for the relief of Cyril Alvin Henry, Joseph Alan Bryant and Frances Adelaide Bryant.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of United Dominions Investments Limited, praying for the passing of an Act respecting United Dominions Investments Limited.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The petition of Arnold E. Airhart and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Canadian Nazarene College.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts begs leave to present the following as their first report.

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Hon. Mr. Lyon as Chairman.

Your Committee recommends that for the remainder of the Session the Quorum of this Committee shall consist of ten members.

Your Committee has examined the Public Accounts of the Province of Manitoba for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1963, as published, and finds that the receipts and expenditures of the monies have been carefully set forth and all monies properly accounted for.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member from the Ministers, heads of departments, and members of the Comptroller-General's office, with respect to receipts, expenditures and other matters pertaining to the business of the Province and all necessary papers were produced for examination. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to examine vouchers or any documents called for, and no restriction was placed upon the line of examination.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that the Report of the Committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Chairman, as long as this is passed with the understanding the committee will meet again in the event that we should like them to meet.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Chairman, this is just the first report of the Committee. The Committee is in existence and will remain in existence until the House prorogues.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills.

MR. J. E. JEANNOTTE (Rupertsland) introduced Bill No. 52, An Act to incorporate The Catholic Foundation of Manitoba or La Fondation Catholique du Manitoba.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 43, An Act respecting Traders Mortgage Company.

MADAM SPEAKER: Present in the loge to my right reserved for distinguished visitors are His Excellency Max De La Fuente, Ambassador of Peru to Canada, and his wife, accompanied by the Consular Agent of Peru in Manitoba.

In the Speaker's Gallery we have present the Trappers Festival Fur Queen, Miss Iona Wood of Snow Lake, accompanied by Princess Jocelyn Wilson of The Pas and Princess Zaria

(Madam Speaker cont'd) Melnychuk of Yorkton.

Also present in the gallery are 30 Grade 8 students from St. Jean Brebeouf School under the direction of their teachers, Sister Carmelle and Sister Patrick. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

There are some 80 Grade 8 students from Golden Gate school under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Carlisle and Mr. Narick and Mrs. Ellison. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, a while ago I was asked by the Honourable Member for St. George if I could tell him whether or not the Manitoba Funeral Directors Association opposed the licensing of one Jack Harrison. A review of the file indicates that the Manitoba Funeral Directors Association have at no time opposed the application of Mr. Harrison to operate a cemetery. The only enquiry that came to the department was from the Associated Canadian Gardens Limited, who suggested that we get in touch with the Saskatchewan Deputy Provincial Secretary. We did so and received a reply from the Deputy Provincial Secretary stating that the company's operations in Moosomin were in order; that their perpetual care fund was in good standing; and that they had at that time received no complaints from the public in regard to the operation. Since all the other requirements of The Cemeteries Act of Manitoba were subsequently complied with, a license was issued on the 7th of October, 1960. The license expired on the 31st, 1961, and was renewed for one year, and no application for renewal of the license was received following the expiration of the second license.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Could he indicate to us, or tell us how much corn has been imported into Manitoba during the present crop year?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I think that this is subject matter for an Order for Return.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. Has the Department of Public Works made any investigation into the effects of the use of 100 percent salt on the streets and roads in Metropolitan Winnipeg, and also, as to any possible effects on clothing, furniture -- particularly flooring, in homes in the Greater Winnipeg area?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, I'd like to give thanks to the honourable member for having given me some notice of the question, and I might say that the department has made no investigation as such, in this regard but they are carrying on a watching brief as to what is going on in the Metropolitan area as well as what is going on in other centres. We don't make a great deal of use of 100 percent salt ourselves and we are, of course, interested in what effects it might have on the streets that we provide grass on in the Metropolitan area. As yet we have seen no positive indication that it causes any direct harm, but we're watching it. There seems to be some additional use of the salt being used and we're watching it quite closely. I think that it's fair to say that it's been evident to most people that it does certainly mark floors, clothes, cars, and it also has some other advantages. I'm not in a position to comment on which is the worst of two evils -- if I may say it that way -- and as far as his question is concerned, the answer would have to be no investigation as such.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question would be: will the department make an investigation, because from information that I have received, particularly insofar as the effects of the 100 percent salt on footwear is concerned, that we're going to face a very serious shortage of shoemakers in the greater Winnipeg area unless something is done to resolve this situation.

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, I think my answer to that would be that this would have to be a study, I believe, of those who are using the salt. My major concern is for the part that we use ourselves, its effect on the capital that we're putting into these projects. We wouldn't want

(Mr. Weir cont'd) to see anything come along and make short work of something we expect to last a long time. Any examination as to what it does to footwear, I believe would be the responsibility of the authorities that are using the salt.

MR. PAULLEY: May I say, if I may be permitted, Madam Speaker, I disagree with my honourable friend. However, I can't debate the question with him at this particular time. I realize that, but I would say this though, that if it has this effect on clothing it certainly will have a possible effect on the roads to which we in this Legislature have to make appropriations. And while I agree with the Minister that there may be areas where one benefit outweighs the other, I do suggest that he do make this investigation.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, a supplementary question. No. 1. What effect does it have on bare feet, because we're all going to be in our bare feet pretty soon. No. 2. Does my honourable friend purchase it from Neepawa -- the salt that is?

MR. WEIR: Its effect on bare feet I leave to those that have tried it. As to whether or not it's bought from Neepawa, if Neepawa submits the best price, Neepawa will sell the salt.

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

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The amounts the Manitoba Government is committed to future Capital Grants on outstanding Capital liabilities by School Divisions, School Districts, Hospital Areas, etc., not appearing in Public Accounts of the Province of Manitoba: (a) For the Department of Education; (b) The Department of Health; (c) The Department of Agriculture; (d) Others. 2. The amounts to be paid annually, in the categories named above, from 1963 onward until paid for. 3. The amounts paid annually, in the above named categories, in the years 1958 to 1962 inclusive.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable gentleman would consent to have this matter stand, because I am trying to inform myself as to the exact nature of the information he requires and I haven't yet completed my study of it. If it could be allowed to stand I might speak to him privately on it and see if it could be worded in a most felicitous way.

MR. FORESE: That will be quite agreeable.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of copies of the statement made by the Premier on Monday, February 10, 1964, in the House, relative to Aid to Private Schools, which were reproduced and/or printed. 2. The cost of reproduction and/or printing same. 3. The list of persons or bodies who obtained advance copies. 4. When these advance copies were distributed. 5. The total number of copies which were distributed. 6. How these were distributed. 7. What was the cost of distribution. 8. A list of persons to whom they were distributed.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I have no objection to accepting the question although I must point out the statement was not relative to Aid to Private Schools. That's what it wasn't. It was a statement on Public School policy, but with that correction I'm happy to accept the Order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of workers employed at the Manitoba Hydro generating plant at Selkirk, Manitoba. 2. The number of hours that this plant has operated from January 1, 1963 to December 31, 1963. 3. The amount of energy generated at this plant for the period January 1, 1963 to December 31, 1963.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

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

(Madam Speaker, cont'd) for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of Provincial Parks with swimming facilities where an admission charge is made and the names of same, and the revenues from each park, and by the leave of the House I would like to add "for this last calendar year". 2. The number of Provincial Parks with swimming facilities where an admission charge is made and where a lifeguard is provided and the names of said Provincial Parks. 3. The number of Provincial Parks with swimming facilities where an admission is charged and no lifeguard is provided.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: The amount of money paid by the Province for the Bain Hunting Lodge property at Delta, the amount of money paid by the Province for any other property formerly owned by D. H. Bain, and the person or firm to whom the money was paid.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of Boards, Commissions and Committees established by Order-in-Council by the Government of the Province of Manitoba since 1958. 2. The names and addresses of members presently serving on these Boards, Commissions and Committees. 3. When the members were appointed and term of appointment. 4. Remuneration and expenses received for serving on above Boards, Commissions or Committees.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. How many copies of the pamphlet "The Story of one of Canada's Biggest Excavation Projects -- The Red River Floodway", were printed. 2. Whether a tender was called for the printing. 3. Who the bidders were and what amount each bid. 4. By whom they were printed and what the total cost of printing was. 5. How many copies have been distributed. 6. How they have been distributed. 7. What other costs were incurred relative to this pamphlet, such as art work, preparation, mailing, etc.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. How many boys have escaped from the Boys' Home at Portage la Prairie during the past twelve months. 2. What steps have been taken to tighten security to prevent further escapes.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

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

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of psychiatric nurses employed at: (a) Selkirk Mental Hospital, (b) Brandon Mental Hospital, (c) Winnipeg General Hospital (Psychiatric Section). 2. How many psychiatric nurses have terminated employment in the last 12 month period for which records are available: (a) Selkirk Mental Hospital, (b) Brandon Mental Hospital, (c) Winnipeg General Hospital (Psychiatric Section).

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. James and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for Wellington

(Madam Speaker cont'd)... and the proposed amendment to the amendment of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, may we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Member for Hamiota.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, like the Member for Lakeside, I must commend the mover of the resolution for introducing new types of measures into this House; but unlike the Member for Lakeside, I find myself opposed to this resolution. If I recall the arguments of the former speakers correctly, neither one of them seemed to put forth his usual strong persuasive powers in advocating the lowering of the voting age to 18. The Member for Seven Oaks seemed to base his argument on two things. Firstly, because the number of voters in the older age bracket is increasing we should lower the voting age at the other end of the scale as a counter-balance; and secondly, because there is such a poor turnout at the polls we should allow the teenagers to vote in order to correct the situation.

The Member for Lakeside read us a long history on the background of elections and voters, inferring, I believe, that if the government had found it advisable to alter the voting procedures ever since the 13th century, that we could clearly lower the voting age today. His further argument was that we should lower the voting age to 18 in order to have uniformity. Madam Speaker, uniformity with who? I believe Saskatchewan, the province to the West of us, is the only province that allows voting at 18, and I am sure that there are many measures in that province on which the honourable member wouldn't wish to have uniformity. He does indicate that the Federal Government is going to lower the voting age, but I can hardly consider it being uniform when we haven't this measure passed at Ottawa. In fact, wouldn't we have disunity in our voting ages rather than uniformity? I wonder how far the Member for Lakeside would go in the interest of uniformity? Does he, for instance, believe we should have uniformity in the use of margarine in this province? Should we have unrestricted sports in Manitoba? Should we permit 18 year-olds in Beer Parlours? After all wouldn't it be possible, if this measure was to go through, that they could have the extra votes required that could make this possible? To my mind, Madam Speaker, uniformity should be the least of the considerations given in support of this resolution.

The part of this resolution that I have the strongest objections to is the permitting of 18 year-olds to vote on money by-laws. Surely it would be wrong to ask 18 year-olds to cast ballots for measures for which they couldn't be responsible for.

Yesterday, Madam Speaker, all members -- all opposition members voted to substitute electors for ratepayers under The Municipal Act, and now under this resolution they want to further abrogate the taxpayers' rights, if there is such a thing as taxpayers' rights, by reducing the age of electors to 18. Surely we should strive to protect what little protection the taxpayer has today. He has many obligations. He must properly feed his family; he must clothe them; he must house his family and educate them; and surely he's the only one that has the knowledge to say whether he can afford an extra expense in votes of this kind.

I wonder, Madam Speaker, why we concern ourselves so greatly with the lowering of the voting age, for I'm certain that the 18 year-olds are not particularly interested in being allowed to vote. Albeit the Member for Seven Oaks also used the argument that 18 year-olds today are much better informed and that they would exercise their ballots with more vigour and thought, but he also indicated that this would be somewhat impossible to prove and I entirely agree with him. Mr. Val Werier of The Tribune did some research on this subject out at the University and he found that the pattern that was established there followed very closely the voting pattern of their parents. He also discovered that very often the mock parliaments in the University were made up of minority governments. He also found that the consistency of the NDP vote of about 50 percent followed very closely the NDP vote in the Metro Winnipeg. It is also true that at the University that less than 50 percent of the students cast their ballots in favour of their own government -- and this when the ballot boxes are even taken into the dormitories to make it handy for the students to vote.

Dr. Saunderson, the President of the University, believes that there would be no change in the results of voting if we allowed 18 year-olds to cast their ballots. I think most of us would

(Mr. Strickland cont'd) admit to being radical in our younger years and I think this is one of the greatest factors that enabled Lenin, Mussolini, Hitler and MaoTse-Tung to ride power. They were capable of capturing and misusing the youths of their countries, particularly the students. Castro seized the imagination of the Cuban youth and he brought about a revolution in that country. Hitler captured the hearts of the German youth and he brought about a near disaster to the continent of Europe. We have witnessed on TV the riots in Venezuela, the snake dances in Japan and Korea, and these were all led by the youth of those countries. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that young people are rebelling against government and law and order. They have lost respect for authorities.

In 1960 at Fort Lauderdale in Florida, some 10,000 young people descended on that town and when they turned to pranks, which I believe is normal for young people, they nearly tore the town apart. It was so bad that the mayor called upon Evangelist Billy Graham to come and speak to the young people to see if he couldn't relieve this situation. From his experiences with young people, Billy Graham believes that adolescence in any generation is a transition period. He believes that the 18 to 21 year age groups is the most difficult part of life because, he says, that approaching your twenties, you are making the most important decisions in life. You are deciding who you are going to marry; you are deciding what your vocation in life will be; you are developing your credo and your philosophy of life.

To my mind, Madam Speaker, while this particular age groups is in the developing stages, we shouldn't allow them to identify themselves with any political party. For instance if a young person ever becomes tagged with the Communists in the United States, they are openly labelled for life, and in this country they would be carried on the records of the confidential files of the RCMP. Surely this House doesn't want to be responsible for subjecting our young people to this type of situation. Should we ask this age group to assume the responsibility of electing governments? Have we the right to ask them to assume this responsibility? I believe it's a pretty insecure world that our young people are growing up in. It is even complicated for adults. Surely young people are searching for security and safety, and isn't this one of the main reasons why we have organized gangs in our cities today?

Our young people in our Universities talk about being independent and on their own, but isn't it true that they practice uniformity of dress, of speech, and to an extent don't they practice uniformity in their moral attitudes and even in their thinking? Don't they follow fashion at the expense of integrity? Don't they dread to be alone? They don't want to stand out and be different; they only want to conform. Surely we shouldn't be asking this group of people to be electing governments, and surely we shouldn't accept conformity just to have uniformity in the voting ages.

There are many differences, Madam Speaker, between the provincial and federal election Acts and the voting age is only one of the minor ones. While I realize that there are many in the 18 to 21 age group who would be capable of voting and there may even be some of them who would desire to cast a ballot as a means of expressing their thinking, and while I have spoken to many people under 21 years of age, I have yet to come across one of them that would advocate the lowering of the age to 18. I am afraid that what I've had to say may sound overly-critical of our young people. I don't want to be critical because I am not too sure that they are any different today than they were in my generation or the generations before. I'm sure we all can remember doing a few things when we were in that age group.

I believe it is enough, Madam Speaker, for us to expect our young people to grow up and to prepare for their futures. It is my opinion that it's we adults who have to assume the responsibility of electing governments, and to some of us even that of becoming members of the Legislature, accepting the good and the bad that is part of being members. I don't think we have the right, Madam Speaker, to thrust this added burden on this particular age group.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, if I may take this opportunity to make a few observations in connection with the resolution that is under discussion at present, namely the lowering of the voting age from 21 to 18. I admire the way the Honourable Member for Lakeside the other day had reviewed the history of the elections and the voting and so forth in the days when it was a man's world -- and still are. However, when it came to a vote or the opportunity of women getting a vote, they asked for it and they asked for it in no uncertain terms. You know the women can really ask for things but they had difficulty to get

(Mr. Klym cont'd) it in the very early beginning, but I don't know why it was so arranged that the voting age to them was left at 30 and not 21 or 18. I don't know why the men did not trust the women in those days; we could trust them today for anything.

Madam Speaker, Saskatchewan to the west of us, I believe, has an 18 year old voting age; Alberta 19. They are two different forms of government -- two different parties -- but the Liberals at Ottawa are running I believe a poor third in trying to curry favour of the teenagers. Well, I think that in the resolution so ably brought before this House by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, he stated: "Why not give them a vote at 18 when they are allowed to drive a car at 16?" Well probably anybody could drive. I've known of a lady one time stopped on a Winnipeg street by a policeman, he told her, "Did you know that you were going 70 miles an hour?" "Oh", she said, "Isn't that wonderful? I just learned to drive this morning!"

Madam Speaker, I spoke to many teenagers, people who are under 21, during the last couple of months or so since this big idea from Ottawa had appeared -- I believe it appeared in the 60 days of intensive thinking -- and those young people to whom I have spoken about the lowering of the voting age have informed me that they could not see why our senior government was so anxious today to see young people becoming old men and women in a hurry. These people thought that they should remain young girls and boys, as they should be. They even told me about certain parents who were anxious to see their little one, probably at six or seven months of age, they like to see them walk; they tried hard to make them walk when they were not ready for it. "Well," they said, "We are not ready for it? How much do we care about the country's affairs? We think it is a serious problem." Those young people, Madam Speaker, I commend highly for statements of that type. They do not want to go to work and run the country into something that is not necessary. They like Canada; they like the Province of Manitoba; and they'd like to see it remain in good hands as it has for many years.

You know, youth today is being nursed into many things in a hurry, and it is a very tragic thing to see when they are being hurried into maturity very quick. We do many things by trying to have ourselves up in the air sooner than we are supposed to be there. A bird could not fly until it gets its wings and full feathers on it.

It was also mentioned by the sponsor of this resolution that young men at 18, and women too, are called upon for the defence of their country. But don't those young people get a very rigorous training? A training, probably not only to fight but to be able to solve their own problems and difficulties as they are confronted with when they are on a battlefield. I know we can do all kinds of things at home but when we get into a battlefield we have to do some thinking, and fast thinking on our own, and that is where that rigorous training, that rigid training that comes with military helps them along.

Now, Madam Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear that I'm not terribly against that resolution, but I still would like to see ample training given to those young people who would wish to vote at 18 or anything near there.

Now I happened to speak to a very nice young fellow and he listened to me very intently. He looked at me several times and he said: "Look, man, I'm not quite 20; I'm married; we have a little youngster. How would I look," he says -- "now this was mentioned, I believe about a year ago during the last session in this House, that family allowance be extended to the age of 21 years provided the young person stayed in school -- Now here I am," he says, "attending high school; we have that little youngster; how would I look probably to vote. There I'd have my little babe on my right arm, one of my Family Allowance cheques within two fingers and my baby's in the other two fingers, and a ballot in my mouth. Would I ever be a spectacle." I looked at him and I said, "I agree with you, probably that would be it." "Well," he said, "under such circumstances, I would not like to have any part in the vote."

I do not think that we should go to work and force something down the throats of young individuals who are not asking for it themselves. As I have said before, when the women wanted a vote they asked for it and they asked for it in no uncertain terms. We at all times must be careful not to feed the young people a diet that they are not ready to accept and which they do not want.

Now it was also mentioned that the people over 65 or so do not care to vote. Madam Speaker, I think somebody has made a big mistake, because to the east of Winnipeg here I find all those people voting at all times regardless what type of vote comes up. I found many

(Mr. Klym cont'd) . . . of them at the polls. That is why we have such very fine people representing Manitoba today. Someone also had mentioned that people of 18 are even allowed to get married. Yes, but it was also mentioned that they probably could even start fighting at home. But there again, immaturity to accept the problems of life, of adulthood are proven very very thoroughly.

Now again I would not like to burden this House with the liquor laws and liquor consumption. We have a lot of difficulties of that type at present. I think that we should just go to work and leave such things alone for a while, and provided only that the young people get a thorough training -- right in school they should be given the training, the necessary education so that they would be able to confidently accept their places at the polling booths at 18, 19, 20 and 21.

Now I have a little excerpt here from a paper which says: "Infants at the Polls." Now I am going to read this. I don't want to be accused of reading but this I must read because that's a quotation: "Infant politics appears to be the formula for our teenagers. Just as they emerge from the Baby Bonus, Ottawa proposes to send them marching to the polls at 18. Ever since the war, adults have worried about the mixed-up youngsters. Now we intend to let them do the worrying about us. This enforced enfranchisement could get Canada into trouble. After all, 18 year-olds are still infants before the law. They can be spanked but they can't drink or get credit cards without dad's signature. Back in the old days, governments got into trouble by sending toddlers down the mines. What about governments that send legal infants into the polling booths? Some totalitarian country might bring this up at the UN as being a crackpot intrusion on the universal rights of infancy. In most countries the general rule is that the old look after the young and the young are supposed to be grateful and obedient. What happens now? With dad a socialist and junior a reactionary, they get into political arguments and junior kills dad's vote. Dad then cuts off the weekly allowance and ends up in court charged with illegal threats under The Election Act. That could mean jail and junior who put him there won't be old enough to sign the bail papers." What a calamity! What a calamity!

Now to sum it all up, Madam Speaker, I make it abundantly clear that I am not against this resolution but I am all for educating young people towards the day when they will understand the meaning of the vote to which they would be entitled.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): I'm just going to ask a question of the Speaker, not to make a speech. I was going to ask the honourable member whether he believes that the Beatles, who are of voting age, are more mature than the young people they ?

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): I rise on a point of privilege, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to let the honourable member know that I did not make the statement that people over 65 do not vote. I used it as an argument, pointing out that the tremendous growth in the population of age 65 and over, and it was because they do vote more conscientiously that there is this unbalance. I did not say that people over 65 do not vote.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity of taking part in this debate because I have been deeply interested and given a great deal of thought to this question that we are now asking ourselves: "Should we lower the voting age?" I am convinced that this is a question we should not consider lightly; we should be very alert to the many complications that are involved. I would like to say to the honourable member who proposed this resolution and to the honourable members who have spoken in support of same that I do have a high regard for their opinions, but on this occasion I must disagree. I strongly oppose any attempt at lowering the voting age to 18 years.

I want to assure you, Madam Speaker, and the members in this House, that in opposing this resolution to lower the voting age I am not casting any ill reflections on our teenagers. Our teenagers are a splendid group of young people. Yes, there are delinquents among them but do we not find delinquents in any age group? Unfortunately, it seems to be the delinquent teenagers that receive the longest and the loudest criticisms. Again I say our teenagers are a fine group and are worthy of all the love, respect and admiration that we can give them. At the same time, I ask this question, Madam Speaker. Are these young people at the age of 18 years ready and prepared to accept the responsibilities which should be included with the voting privilege? I do not think so and I do not think we should expect them to be.

It seems to me in this day and age we hear a great deal of talk and stress about our rights.

(Mrs. Morrison cont'd) We should have the right to do this and the right to do something else, but too often we forget the obligations that should be included with our so-called rights. As has already been stated during the course of debate, we are living in a very complicated world; a way of life that presents many problems that only a few short years ago were not even heard of. Our young people are having to give a great deal of time and thought to their education if they are to be prepared to meet the challenges of the years ahead.

At this point, Madam Speaker, I am going to give you the views expressed by a young university student that I had the opportunity of speaking with very recently, and as we discussed the pros and cons of lowering the voting age, these were his words: "Those of us who are striving to get an education feel we have enough problems of our own without having to get involved in acquainting ourselves with the policies of the various political parties, and if we don't know something of the policies, we shouldn't be voting." He went on to say that "the 18 year olds who are not interested in advancing their education are not inclined to be interested in the political field either, and certainly needed a few more years to become more mature."

It has often been my privilege to talk with high school teachers who have discussed this matter with their students, and it was rather amazing to find that there was such strong feeling among these students that the voting age should not be lowered and they appeared not to be the least concerned about having the right to vote.

I made it my business also to discuss this question with interested parents who had sons and daughters in this age group, and I recall one mother in particular who said she could see no good in lowering the voting age to 18 years. She felt at this early age many young people were the products of their environment, not yet ready to make their own opinions, or to take their own opinions too seriously, while at the same time there was a limited number of young people at this age who have very radical ideas and who need a few years to come down to earth as it were and to take a more moderate viewpoint of their ideas. She concluded by saying, "As a mother of six, I am opposed to lowering the voting age."

Now, Madam Speaker, I firmly believe that our young people at 18 years of age, at least the greatest percentage of them are not ready, are not prepared to take on the responsibilities which go with the privilege of the ballot. They need at least another few years to get their bearings.

The statement was made that people crave recognition. I believe, Madam Speaker, that many of our young people are craving for recognition and security, but not the type of recognition or security that comes from going out on election day and marking their ballots.

Reference has been made also to the appalling situation that arises at election time, when the many voters simply ignore their voting privileges and do not bother to go out to vote. Thought was given to the idea that if our younger people were given the right to vote their example would improve the situation, would greatly add to the general interest. I find it impossible, Madam Speaker, to accept this theory. I do not believe we should expect that the teenage voters would teach the older members of our society to be more conscientious. It would appear to me that some other method of educating the voting public is necessary in order to make them realize their responsibilities and their duties as responsible citizens.

The Honourable Member for Inkster gave me the impression that he was ready to give over if only we would extend the voting privilege to the 18 year-olds. I cannot accept any idea that our elder citizens should not continue to make themselves heard. I do not know who coined the phrase, Madam Speaker, "that it takes an old dog for a hard road", but I think it holds a tremendous amount of meaning and good advice and I for one firmly believe that in this mixed-up complicated society we live in today, we need the voice of experience, the wise sound judgment of those who have been over the road to keep our modern day society somewhere on the level and our feet on the ground. So I express the hope that the Honourable Member for Inkster and many others like him will continue to lend a guiding hand for many years to come.

Now, Madam Speaker, I would like to make reference to one more theory that has been brought forth in this debate, the idea of uniformity across the country. This is something else I cannot accept. I think we in Manitoba should take pride in our way of life, should not wish to become just like all the other provinces. Surely there is some merit in having ideas of our own in upholding our individualism and, regardless of what any of the other provinces do with the voting age level, I cannot see that we in Manitoba should have to go along just for the sake of uniformity.

(Mrs. Morrison cont'd)

I must say, Madam Speaker, I shudder to think of the day if and when the voting privilege is lowered to the age of 18, because let me assure the members of this House, it will be only a short time until we hear the plea, "our young people can vote at 18, surely they should be allowed into the Beverage Rooms and the Cocktail Bar." I do not wish to have any part in this sorry mess. Let us not slough this off as an irresponsible statement, because it would happen just as sure as the night follows the day.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I again want to say that I have given this matter a great deal of thought and, as a result, I must vote against this resolution. Let us not be anxious for our teenagers to become adults. After they have reached the ripe old age of 21 years, they still have many many years ahead of them. Let us give them plenty of time to enjoy the glamour and excitement of their youth and the thrill of the Beatles.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words in this regard. As one who took part in politics at the age of 17, one who was elected president of a constituency at the age of 19, campaign manager at the age of 20, nominated as a candidate at the age of 21, elected at the age of 22, re-elected at the age of 23 and re-elected for a third term at the age of 26 -- possibly defeated at the age of 30, I don't know -- I would like to say a few words about this matter.

I am sorry that I missed some of the remarks of the previous speaker but I did listen to some of what she had to say and to some of the remarks made by the Honourable Member from Hamiota, and I must say in his connection that I never heard so many non sequiturs in all my life. The reasoning which he tried to give for opposing any extension of the franchise seemed to me to be very specious arguments indeed. I'm glad of one thing in this whole debate and that is the contribution made to it by my colleagues from Seven Oaks and by the venerable Bede from Lakeside, because I thought that he put the whole matter into its historical perspective, and what we are

MR. CAMPBELL: Beatle not Bede.

MR. SCHREYER: No, the venerable bede. What we are proposing here, Madam Speaker, should be placed in the context of the history of the English-speaking world of the past 400-500 years. I, of course, fully expected that there would be various arguments put forward in opposition to any extension of the franchise, just as there were in 1832 when reform of a most elementary kind took place, then again in 1867 and in 1884, in 1918 and in 1928. You can be sure that on each of these occasions there was the most bitter opposition to any widening or extending of the franchise, and those who oppose it today, obviously in full conscience and in sincerity, but nevertheless what it does reflect is a difference of opinion as between those who are Liberally-minded and those who are Tory-minded. Precisely so, Madam Speaker, because if I wanted to take the time of the House I could quote you the most dire predictions made by members of the Commons and the Lords in the British Parliament before 1832 and, in fact, about 24 Conservative Lords all cut their pigtails and went into mourning in 1832 when the franchise was extended, and here now we hear the same kind of argument, although it's not as extreme, saying that there will be blue ruin for this country if we should extend the vote to those of the ages 18-21.

For example some attempt was made here -- I know not why -- to link up in some way the extending of the franchise to those 18 to 21 with the rise of totalitarian regime such as Nazism, Fascism, and Communism in the earlier parts of this century. These young people were not enfranchised, so how can you connect that with the proposal that we have here? To the extent that the regimes at that time were able to receive the support of some of the younger people we can blame the younger people, but this was done extra legally and outside the law and outside having anything to do with the franchise. There is no connection. Furthermore, do you seriously believe, I ask the honourable member that these regimes could have solidified their strength in these countries if it hadn't been for the support of the many adult people in these countries? Surely the member shouldn't try to make any direct connection between youth and the rise of totalitarianism. The weaknesses of the Republic of the 1920's, the corruption and graft of the Czarist regime before 1919, these are the reasons for the rise of totalitarianism - not youth. I'm sure he didn't mean it in any derogatory way of youth in its generic sense, but it's an unfortunate reference that he made.

(Mr. Schreyer cont'd)

Now I would point out to him that when Hitler took over in Germany in the 1930's it was because of the virtual collapse of the economy and also because of the collaboration of many of the adult population and the industrialists -- the so-called urbane civilized restrained people. They helped him and we mustn't forget that either. In any case, if we must mention youth, let us not forget that when these regimes did rise and act aggressively it was youth that went to fight to save democracy. You might say, well what has this got to do with the franchise? I say just as much as the honourable member had when he mentioned youth in connection with the rise of totalitarianism.

My experience as a high school teacher and as a lecturer tells me that our young people over the age of 18, once they have either been working for a couple of years after school or if they continue, once they have had one or two years of university -- either/or two years of work, one or two years of university, are well prepared to exercise judgment as to the issues being debated in the political scene in this country and I have no fear that they will act in a monolithic and radical way. In fact the honourable member should be aware that the trend these days among many of the youths is toward a kind of conservatism, not any kind of conservatism that we need explore perhaps, and if some are radical it's not the kind of radicalism that is dangerous either.

There seems to be a balance as between the various groups of thought among the young people, so I suggest that what is proposed here has to do with one very basic principle, and that is in a liberal pervasive democracy, why not extend the franchise to all those who are rationally able to exercise it? This has been the trend in the past century and a half, ever since 1832 in our system of parliamentary government. I suggest that people, even if they are young, even if they are not ratepayers, should have a voice in the governing of their affairs, not only because they may or may not have property. Property consideration should be a secondary factor. What should be the deciding factor is people who are adult and rational should have a voice in their government by the very fact that they are living human beings and able to act rationally, not whether they own property or not, and there should really be no other criterion.

I suggest that if many of our young people seem to act irresponsibly at times, it's by far not the majority. Adults often act irresponsibly. In any case, the young people should be given an opportunity to participate, to involve themselves, in which case there would be a greater exercising of responsibility on their part if in fact we fear they are not acting as responsibly as they should at times. So whatever the reasons there may be I have not heard them yet and I suggest that we -- at least the liberally-minded in this House -- give some thought to extending the franchise in keeping with the spirit of democracy as it has come down to us in the past 150 years.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I would like to say just a very few words. I have enjoyed listening to these liberal-minded people; I've also enjoyed listening to some very good common sense coming from the conservative-minded people. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that the supporters of this proposal to extend the franchise to our young people between the ages of 18 and 21 ignores the fact, and what to me is the most important fact in the whole gamut of ideas and reasons that are put forward for and against, the fact that young people don't want this.

We listened the other day to the Honourable Member for Lakeside give a wonderful account of the historical development in the extension of the franchise. It did me an awful lot of good. I can listen to that kind of speech anytime and enjoy it. But in every case of the extension of the franchise that he enumerated down over the years, it was the result of a struggle on the part of man to find himself as a free and responsible citizen, and in this case it doesn't apply because the young people have not felt that they are discriminated against. As a matter of fact as a result of the talks that I have had to individual young people and to their leaders in the classrooms, I have come to the conclusion that the great majority of them are opposed to the adults of this province foisting further responsibilities upon them, because many of them, and rightly so, do not consider themselves free agents. If they are living in a

(Mr. Hutton cont'd) . . . home, under the roof of their parents, they do not consider themselves to be free agents and so this so-called right that is extended to them isn't as much of a right as what we would pretend that it was.

Now I have the greatest admiration for youth. I admire the soaring, the questing spirit of youth and I'm not necessarily afraid of their judgment. I think oftentimes they are closer to the truth than you and I who have been subjected to life's bitter experiences and in many cases our judgment may be twisted and distorted by these experiences, so I'm not afraid of their judgment but I think that we expect too much from youth today and we give too little. Oh yes, we provide them with better homes than they have ever had before and will provide them with better clothes than they have ever had before probably, and will provide them with all the material needs of life. But how much of ourselves do we ever give? How much of ourselves do we give and how many times do we buy them off with material goods? And here's another case. If we want to serve youth and help them, we don't do it by sharing our responsibilities. Goodness knows, in the present moment of Canada's history it would be nice to find another source of voters, another reservoir of voters who might give this country a government with a solid majority. But is this the way to do it? If the parties of this country don't command a strong support from the people of this country to form a government, they have no right to expect that the young people of Canada are going to turn the tables for them.

As I say, I don't distrust the judgment of youth but I believe, and because of my own experience, that youth is a difficult time. As one of the speakers or two of the speakers have pointed out today, these years are years of decision; they are years of many a storm within the breast of these youngsters. Then why do we want to hobble -- why do we want to hobble the spirit of youth with this further responsibility? Why don't we help them? If we want to do something for youth it's within the power of everyone of us who sits in this Legislature to do things that will help youth to prepare themselves to take over the responsibilities that we now hold, and if we want to give them experience in political matters we can do that now.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead outlined his career and how early he became involved in a very responsible way in politics. If we want to give our young people an opportunity to serve, everyone of us as members of this Legislature can trust them enough in our own local organizations to take on little responsibilities and gradually to build up their store of experience and to cultivate an interest in public affairs. But how much of this is done, Madam Speaker? How much of this is done? I think there are so many things that we can do for the youth that we say we are so concerned with today, without saddling them, without hobbling them with the responsibilities of making decisions that you and I should be making. If they come to me, if they come to the legislative members of this province and ask it, demand it, are willing to fight for it, that's time enough to give serious consideration to this question.

But in the meantime, I think that we can help the nation and we can help youth if we don't give them the franchise -- the 18 to 21 year-old franchise -- but if we give them a little bit more of ourselves. If we demonstrate this great confidence that we have in them in investing in them and investing in this country, in taking a chance on them and believing that they can and will be able to take over the affairs of this nation in the future and carry this nation through to the destiny that we believe it has, this is the way to answer youth's challenge and the challenge that they must be putting to us, if we have our eyes open, they are putting to us every day.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I'd like to add my little bit with reference to this debate. I feel that our youth of today is possibly more trained to vote in a more deserving sort of analysis of whether a candidate is a good one or a bad one. I think that the youth of today is far more capable than some of our middle-aged people, and to suggest that people of 18 years of age are unable to make up their minds is not a very nice compliment to the younger people of our society. Some call them teenagers; maybe they are teenagers. As far as I'm concerned, I have had a lot to do with people in the 18 to 21 year bracket and they are equally as capable and equally as competent as some of our people who are in the 25 and 26 year age bracket.

However, people of 18, if they are interested in politics or if they are interested in

(Mr. Smerchanski cont'd) every day life, they want guidance. They like to have somebody to fall back on just as much as people of 25, 35 or 45. I think in our every day lives and certainly with the increased type of responsibility that the individual has to society today, that all of us like to be able to look to somebody else for some additional support, and this is not a criticism of our 18 year old people of today. To suggest that our young people are revolutionary and to suggest that the people of 18 have lost the respect for authority is completely removed from what the actual facts are.

Certainly there are many teenagers today, or people of 18 who are getting in trouble with the law, but on the average these people do have a respect for the law; these people do respect their parents. If they have been raised and trained in the proper background of good home life, these people are very able to judge and are very able to make decisions in terms of what is right and wrong. Their background is important. I have a youngster of 18 and I delight in being able to discuss matters which are considered to be quite mature because I feel that this young mind has got the possibility of being very constructive, but only with proper encouragement. I feel that the younger people of today can turn their minds into being more constructive rather than destructive if we, as the older people in the community, would only undertake to give them a hand. It may be that they haven't learned where to go to get that type of assistance or help, and this is possibly the reason why people of the 25 or 35 age brackets know where to get this type of help or assurance that what they are trying to do is the correct way of life.

Why should we suggest that it takes an individual at the age of 21 to all of a sudden pass that imaginary age and be looked upon as having gained political maturity or having achieved some imaginary status in your everyday society that you are a full-fledged citizen. Why not at 18? You have many bright minds of 18 that can go out and teach mathematics, understand science, understand political science, just as good as some of the best of us sitting in this House today. To suggest that we should not open our beer parlours and liquor outlets to be favoured by the people of 18 years of age is irrelevant, because the youngsters of today, if they want to drink they will drink in the house, in your own home, or they will find occasions to drink in the evenings in cars and out at parties. Here again is that Golden Rule of application which means that if a youngster is raised properly in the home with a proper background, you need not worry yourself about its responsibility to society. You can rest assured that that individual will give a proper account of itself to society.

Now somebody mentioned the Beatles. I have forced myself to watch this performance on the TV and these boys have got a science, a psychology that is worthy of sitting down and giving it some thought for an hour. I tried it on a party of youngsters the other evening, at which there were some 21, and I played records of tunes that I had considered to be popular and there seemed to have been no reaction. But then when we put on the records of the Beatles, the entire room was alive with energy. And I want to tell you, Madam Speaker, that this is the very principle on which -- on which -- all the more reason that we as older members of this society should encourage our younger people of 18 and 19 to come in and take part in everyday living.

It is not enough to say that if they are 18 they are immature. I can tell you that people are immature at the age of 26 and 36 and 46. We say that our children are immature until they reach the age of 21. I always look upon my children from the very beginning as partners in a family unit. I want them to understand everyday life; I want them to understand what it is to have good government; I want them to understand what it is to have a police force; I want them to understand what it is to have animals of their own, because all these things go into society and make your everyday life. I want them to understand to be kind to their neighbours and to be responsible, and I think that if we raise our children in that type of a background, at the age of 18 they are capable and responsible enough to vote and to have a voice in making a decision as to the type of government we should have today. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Carillon, and the proposed amendment thereto of the Honourable Member for Fisher. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, could I have the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster, and the proposed amendment thereto of the Honourable the Member for Brandon. The Honourable, the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I'm going to break the chain. I adjourned this debate, Madam Speaker, for the purpose of reading the remarks of the Honourable Member for Inkster who introduced this resolution, and I want to compliment the honourable member in the excellence of his presentation and in the comprehensive and moderate way in which he submitted his resolution.

Unfortunately, I cannot go along with the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Brandon, although at the same time I have to openly admit that this resolution is academic inasmuch as regardless of whether or no we pass it in this House, it will have little effect upon our divorce laws when it reaches Ottawa. I don't think there's any possible chance of any changes being effected in our divorce laws at Ottawa at the present moment, and I feel the only way that we will ever get a liberalization or modernization of our divorce laws is by constitutional amendments such as those which I mentioned the other day when we were speaking on the resolution submitted to this House by the Attorney-General. But at the same time, Madam, I felt it incumbent upon me to express to this House my own feelings in this particular matter. I think that our divorce laws in this province are archaic; I think that they cause hardships; and I think that the time is long overdue for a change. I appreciate the fact that there are people in this House for reasons of conscience who do not believe in the institution of divorce. I respect their opinions and I respect their right to hold these views, but at the same time I would like to impress upon this House that even if our divorce laws were changed there is no reason why these people would have to take advantage of these changes.

I don't think that the Honourable Member for Brandon in his amendment really suggested anything. He suggests that the resolution be amended by striking out everything after the "ground of adultery" and substituting, "Where there has been a separation sanctioned by the court which has existed for four years or more." Now the amendment itself is not very clear, although I believe that what the honourable members means to say is this, that if there has been a legal separation, that is, a judicial separation, which has been in existence for four years, then these people if they have not resumed cohabitation could apply to the courts and have their marriage dissolved. Now if that's the case, Madam, there'd be no reason why we would have to have adultery as a reason for divorce, or a ground for divorce. All we'd have to have is two people to enter into a separation agreement, have it sanctioned by the court, live separate and apart for four years, then apply to the court and ask the court to have the marriage dissolved.

I believe that our laws should be brought into line with those that exist in Great Britain today and I think that the Honourable Member for Inkster has in his grounds for divorce fairly well set out the laws of the United Kingdom as they exist today. There is only one objection that I would have to one of his grounds for divorce, and that is No. 6 -- legal separation for more than two years. I think that if two people could get a dissolution of marriage by being legally separated for two years, well there'd be no need to have these other grounds for divorce

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd)...at all. All they'd have to do is legally separate for two years, then apply to the court for a divorce.

In conclusion, Madam, I feel, that notwithstanding the fact this resolution is purely academic from the standpoint that there's nothing we can do about it, I nevertheless feel that a useful purpose has been served by the Honourable Member for Inkster introducing it into this House. I think it is one way of bringing to the attention of the public a reform which is long due in our divorce laws.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I have no intention of closing the debate. I just want to speak to the amendment. I'll be very brief. I wish to thank very much the Honourable Member from Selkirk for the kind support he has given this resolution. His words are always accepted in this House; he very seldom makes any added mistakes with the exception of years ago joining a certain Party, but I feel that this is an encouragement from one who is so well considered in this House and to me personally it is very great moral help, and moral help is what I need at my age. As to the amendment, I am kind of surprised at the Honourable Member from Brandon whom I have and still am respected as a learned gentleman, a man who reads a lot, I know that, and to come out with an amendment washing out everything I have said, the entire amendment of the divorce clause, and puts in an amendment which does not mean anything because Item No. 1 Adultery still stands, plus the other one, and in order to whitewash a project which is from time to time being submitted in this House and instead of the members having nerve enough to vote against it -- I don't blame them, I vote against many items here -- what they do is whitewash it with something which has no bearing at all on the question in order to kill it in order not to go on record and be recorded that the member is opposed to certain things. The situation is serious -- not what I say -- but I have received many letters from people after they read in the newspapers about this Resolution -- heartbreaking letters, but naturally first of all I didn't have an opportunity to get in touch with them in order to get their consent and permission to table the letters, realizing I cannot read a letter unless a letter is tabled, and the rest of the letters I didn't want to take a chance. So out of many letters I'll only read one who gave me consent to read it and I am prepared to table the letter. But the other letters I can assure you, Madam Speaker, are unveiling -- that is a good word to use -- much bigger tragedies than the letter which I take the liberty of reading now. She says: "I wish to express my appreciation of your stand taken recently regarding the divorce question. So few dare speak out on this important issue that it is heartwarming when an elected representative does show that some people care. I represent hundreds of women in Canada; I am not unique. Nearly two years ago I obtained a legal separation after charging my husband with non-support, habitual drunkenness, and physical cruelty, to which he pleaded guilty. At present I am compelled to accept social welfare for myself and three children as my husband refuses to work. Unless our laws are changed I harbor no hope for a divorce; no hope for a chance to create a real family life for my children with a decent man. My husband is an alcoholic, an immature, irresponsible person who cares nothing for his children and his wife. I would never sacrifice my children by going back to him nor does he want us back." It is an impossible, disheartening predicament. Many women seek refuge from the situation by illicit affairs, alcoholism, physical and mental illness which only breed more heartbreak for themselves. The children and their families, many children in this unhealthy environment, seek escape in youthful marriages and juvenile delinquency. If these women were able to obtain divorces and look to a future of hope instead of helplessness, many of our social ills would be decreased, and so on.

Now as I said, Madam Speaker, there are a number of letters right here -- I have to table this one, I think. I'll table it later -- many letters which I do not wish to take up the time and many letters I know that perhaps it would do them harm if the names would be known. I have clippings here from other newspapers, describing the cruelties, the suffering, the hardship of many who are being prohibited to start a new life by the laws that we have here in Canada. I promised to be brief and I am not going to say any more. I think perhaps I made my point when introducing the original resolution. Therefore Madam Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan, that section 2, 3, 4 and 5 be reinstated and that the amendment be amended from "four years or more" in Section 6 to read "two years".

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, if I may offer a comment on a point of order, it does seem to me that this can scarcely be done technically because there is a motion before the House that sections 2 to 6 inclusive be removed, and until that matter is decided surely it is not possible to discuss reinstating something that hasn't yet been removed. It would seem to me that the amendment to the amendment must surely be considered directly contrary or contradictory of a motion before the House at the moment.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker I am the poorest man in this House on rules and regulations, but common sense tells me that once an amendment was made -- I am only amending not my motion, that motion is no longer mine, anybody could have done the same thing -- I am just speaking for somebody else, I am just amending the amendment and not my motion because my motion is still undecided, so common sense would indicate that it is a proper motion and I appeal to you respectfully to accept this.

MADAM SPEAKER: Well I would like to take the sub-amendment under advisement and I will give my decision at a later date.

The proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Which motion, (Interjection) oh. I am ready to proceed anytime, but the Honourable Member for Carillon has a resolution that has something to do with my own. For this reason either he withdraws his or -- I'll have it stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

The adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable Member for Portage, The Honourable the Member for Morris.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I'd like this resolution to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable the Minister without Portfolio.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Honourable Minister, Madam Speaker, I ask this be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I am still waiting for some material so I'd like to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk: "Whereas the greatest possible understanding, co-operation, goodwill and prosperity in and between the nations of the world is highly desirable; and Whereas world trade and world travel are conducive to such understanding, co-operation and goodwill, at the same time add to the prosperity and standard of living of the people concerned; and Whereas world trade and world travel are facilitated by as great uniformity as possible in matters affecting trade and travel; and Whereas the United Kingdom, United States and Canada are great trading nations, whose citizens travel extensively; and Whereas France, Germany, Italy, Russia, China, Japan, the Benelux and Scandinavian countries, and many others, are also great trading areas with large travelling public; all of which have adopted the metric system of weights and measures; and Whereas the United Kingdom, United States and Canada, though legalizing the metric system, have not as yet officially adopted it; and Whereas official adoption of the metric system by the United Kingdom, United States, and Canada would facilitate trade and travel with and among those nations, areas and peoples who already officially use that system; Therefore be it resolved that this House recommend to the Government of Canada that it take the initiative in discussing with the United Kingdom and the United States, the advisability of adoption by these three countries of the metric system of weights and measures."

Madam Speaker put the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, if the honourable the members of the House are inclined to agree to a reasonable extent with the "whereases" of this resolution then I am prepared to leave the discussion of that part of the resolution out of my remarks. I think there would be

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)...general agreement on that part. I have tried to keep the whereases as factual as possible and I am inclined to believe that there will be no major differences of opinion regarding the first whereases.

I would suppose that many people when they first glanced at this resolution would be inclined to think that I was going to come up in the operative part with a suggestion about free trade or something of this kind. I have avoided that controversial subject not because I think it's improper to debate it here but because it would complicate the operative part of this resolution. So if I may at this time, I will confine my brief remarks to the operative part alone. Also I am going to spare the honourable members from attempting to give the history of the development of the metric system. I have for some weeks now been conducting a bit of research in the Library of this building into this matter and once again, if there is any emphatic demand that I develop the history I would be prepared to accept a draft and accede to that request -- but I think it's not necessary to argue on the history of the system.

MR. PAULLEY: They need the education over there.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, there's something to be said on that point. I can feel myself slipping. This is a resolution where it might easily be said that it does not fall within the purview of this government or this legislative assembly. I'm sure it doesn't entirely, and that's why the operative part says that we are simply recommending to the Government of Canada that they consider the advisability of discussing or take the initiative in discussing with the United States and the United Kingdom, the advisability of adopting this system of weights and measures. If it was an open and shut case, we wouldn't be needing to tell them to do that, because one or the other, or both of them would likely have adopted it already. They have reasons for not doing it. Those reasons may be much better than any that I can summon to suggest that they should adopt, but I think it's worth taking another look at it now. I think that in these days when we have more trade and more travel, throughout the world, when we can get around so much better, when I think that the maintenance of peace in the world, which is the greatest single thing that could happen to humanity today perhaps depends, to some extent at least, on more trade and more travel, and inasmuch as so many of the major countries of the world have adopted this system, then it seems to me that it's a good time for other countries, also major ones who have not adopted it, to take another look at the situation. It's not a big thing among the many movements that are abroad in the world today, but it's one thing that might do something. And then as far as Manitoba is concerned, we have a direct interest in having the best trade relations that we can with other countries. The recent wheat sales to Russia are a case in point. Russia uses the metric system. I assume that to the people who are dealing in this type of work, year after year, that converting one system to the other offers no great problem at all. But I think the understanding would be a little bit greater if we, too, like the Russians, were able to think in terms of hectares when we are talking about area, and if we could think in terms of quintal rather than bushels.

As one who has not travelled extensively -- and the honourable members will find it hard to believe that I have travelled perhaps a little bit more extensively since I've been paying my own way than when the taxpayers were paying it -- I know that's hard to believe, but I found that in just a couple of months in Continental Europe that even one who is so slow to change as I, still found it quite easy to be thinking after a few weeks in terms of kilometers, rather than miles and in terms of liters rather than gallons. It was quite easy after just a few weeks there. Naturally I would be thinking in terms of liters because I was looking at the amount of gas that I was using. But I think that there is something here where we could benefit actually by having some further consideration of this matter. So the proposal simply is that this House, and I'd like to find something -- I'd really like to be the discoverer of something that we could all agree on for once. It would set quite a record in here -- and maybe this will be it -- I'd like to find something where this House could send forward an unanimous recommendation to the Government of Canada that it discuss this matter with the United Kingdom and the United States, and then they, if they were in agreement with it of course they would extend it to Australia, New Zealand and other great countries that have not yet adopted that system. The vast majority of the ancient countries, I should say the developed countries, have adopted the system. Perhaps some of the newly developing ones have not, and generally speaking, quite a few of the English speaking ones have not. So if we could simply get a start made by having this discussion take

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)... place between the Government of Canada, the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom I think a start would be made. And to those people who suggest that we shouldn't be dealing with things here that aren't strictly within our own authority, I say that once in awhile it's a good idea for us to look at the world situation. In this I am trying to emulate the example of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, and the House may remember that a few years ago, a couple of years ago, I gave notice that I was thinking about bringing in such a resolution as this.

Well now, what is the metric system? Well it's a decimal system as differentiated from the one that we employ at the present time, and being a decimal system and both the multiples and the fractions progressing by tens as far as measurement is concerned and then the squares of those being hundreds and thousands and so on, it seems to me that for calculations and records and general use, that it is much, much simpler and much better correlated between weights and measures, distances, even temperature, and a connection with electrical measurement and all the rest. But as I mentioned a second ago, it's not to be thought that the United Kingdom and the United States and Canada have been waiting for me to make this suggestion. They have been looking at it of course in the meantime, and they have some reasons for keeping in touch with their own system -- which we are inclined to say looks a bit antiquated as far as money is concerned in the United Kingdom. We are inclined to say when we get over there and start wrestling with pounds, shillings and pence that this is a funny system. Madam Speaker, you are aware that in all the other weights and measures, with just the exception of money, that we are just as antiquated here as the United Kingdom is. There is no relation between our inches, feet and yards and rods -- you have to learn a mathematical table. They do not progress in an orderly fashion. To the lay mind and the man who is not too acquainted with all the ramifications of this subject, at first glance, certainly the metric system looks to be the sensible one, but I am told by the people in the old country that they have found that for building construction and even some things in commerce that a system where the measurements are divisible by 3 rather than just by 2 is also a useful system and that so much of their history and practice has been founded around that other system that it would be very difficult to change and certainly a change in anything of this kind is quite a major undertaking.

Any of you who have driven an automobile in the British Isles realize that it is going to take a long time for the United Kingdom to get back to driving on the right side of the road and having the driver sit on the right side of the seat. Some people tell me that that will come reasonably soon. I'm doubtful of it. I think it will be a long time before it comes because the mechanical difficulties of changing that system is considerable. Some people tell us that their monetary system will be changed, the pounds, shillings and pence will be soon converted to the decimal system. I'm a little doubtful that that will happen quickly, although I am aware that a committee over there, I believe not a committee of the House but rather a business man's committee has been studying this matter and that the report that has been brought in favors going to the decimal system. But whatever is decided upon this is not an easy matter to change. Mechanical equipment, bolts and the components of machinery, hoses, couplings, all this sort of thing have been based on another system and I don't pretend that it's just as simple as saying alright we'll get rid of this other system and adopt the new one. But what I do say is that as pointed out in the preambles of the resolution -- and I certainly made it long enough, and still it is not exhaustive -- as pointed out in that preamble, there are I think good reasons for us suggesting here that the Government of Canada should in co-operation with the United Kingdom and United States take a look at this question once again, because I believe that the world conditions are something that are a factor now, that didn't exist a few years ago.

MR. MARTIN: May I ask the honourable member a question, Madam Speaker? The member has just referred to the mechanical difficulties which would have to be undergone in changing the rules of the road in highway traffic in the Old Country. I wonder if in his exhaustive research he has given some study to the colossal cost which would be involved in introducing the metric system here in Canada?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I just mentioned, Madam Speaker, that I am quite aware that the change from the present system to the metric system would have undoubtedly a lot of difficulties and that there would be cost in it as well. I'm quite aware of that. The fact that the United Kingdom and the United States have not legalized this system -- that isn't correct -- that

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) they have not officially adopted this system as yet is the best evidence that there are certain evident difficulties inherent in it, and the mechanical ones are certainly among the foremost of those.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I'm not prepared to speak on this. Some material that I need hasn't arrived. May I beg the indulgence to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage, "Whereas the Province of Manitoba did construct two additional twelve foot concrete traffic lanes, together with sixteen foot median divider on Portage Avenue between east limit of the Municipality of Assiniboia and School Road. And Whereas since the aforesaid construction the traffic density has doubled; and Whereas the 42-day racing season during summer months at the Assiniboia Downs and the construction of the Odeon-Morton Drive-In Theatre has added considerably to the traffic on Portage Avenue west, making present facilities greatly inadequate, Therefore be it resolved that the Government, when establishing the current year's highway program, consider the advisability of giving priority to the construction of: 1. Additional 12-foot traffic lanes on both north and south sides of Portage Avenue from School Road to the junction of the Perimeter Highway and Portage Avenue. 2. A cloverleaf and overpass at the said junction of the Perimeter Highway and Portage Avenue. 3. A curb median divider from School Road through the business section of Kirkfield Park.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I want to assure you in presenting this resolution that it wasn't the last year's debate during the Public Works estimates that prompted me to present this resolution, even if the Honourable Minister for Public Works did say, "If you want a road or a bridge, you'll have to ask for it."

I also don't want to base my argument that the overpass should have been built first on No. 1 West instead of the one on No. 4 East, or on Trans-Canada East. As you know the junction of No. 1 West and No. 100 today is probably one of the most important intersections in the highway system of Manitoba. I think it will probably be one of the busiest too when No. 100 highway is completed. I know my colleague, the Honourable Member from Portage has presented a resolution for an extension of Highway No. 1 further west and I would heartily agree with him that he's justified in asking for an extension of that part of the highway to curtail the rate of accidents that's been going on on that highway, and also to save the many lives that have been lost during the past few years.

I'm sure you would appreciate, Madam Speaker, that the traffic through the Municipality of Assiniboia has greatly increased and it is a great concern of the people in that constituency to make provisions that will improve the present facilities for traffic as it now is. It has also been recognized that when the construction from a two-lane to a four-lane is extended the place that the construction should first take place is where the highway is not wide enough, or where the highway is at the narrowest point. I would agree with this principle and I would like to explain it later on in my remarks.

The explosive expansion of east-west traffic in Assiniboia I think at the moment is probably greater than any part of Greater Winnipeg. Assiniboia, I think, is growing fast -- in fact, much faster than any other municipality in Manitoba. In the last year we've had something like 775 homes built in Assiniboia, which is almost 37 percent of the construction in Metropolitan Winnipeg. Our population rose from 8,000 in 1962 to over 12,000 in 1963, which is, I think, probably a greater increase than any other municipality within Greater Winnipeg.

In addition, when the construction of the shopping centre in Westwood is completed I think we will again have that much more traffic on that part of the highway through the Municipality of Assiniboia. I think the density of the local traffic is multiplied and promises to continue.

(Mr. Patrick, cont'd)... Assiniboia Downs, West Canada's probably finest racetrack, draws considerable amount of traffic for 42 days every year. I think the Odeon-Morton Drive-In as well draws a lot of traffic for 300 days of each year. When this traffic comes out into Portage Avenue at dusk, the present condition I don't think is safe, or the present highway is not wide enough to take all this traffic as it is now. I feel that two paved lanes on each side plus the median divider through the Municipality of Assiniboia would make driving much safer for automobile as well as pedestrians. I think this is an urgent need in Assiniboia where race traffic pours into Portage Avenue and cars from the drive-in cut into the heavy traffic on the Trans-Canada Highway.

The construction of the perimeter north in this area has been neglected for the last three or four years. I feel if the cloverleaf at the inner section was constructed a lot of this traffic would probably be diverted to by-pass Assiniboia, by-pass St. James and by-pass the greater part of Winnipeg.

I pointed out, Madam Speaker, the need for action to be taken in regard to this section through Kirkfield Park. I would also like to deal with the planning and construction of a cloverleaf and overpass at the perimeter of 100 and No. 1. This government has not shown they have planned for adequate highway planning because if we look at the present construction of the perimeter, I think this would be a good indication because for the last few years there hasn't been too much progress shown as far as the perimeter highway is concerned. So I'd like to urge the government to get busy and come forward with some proposals, a cloverleaf, and an overpass should be, I think, one of the overall plans for highway construction. My constituency is concerned and would like to know why the government is delaying any progress, thereby causing inconvenience to many of the people in the Constituency of Assiniboia.

To briefly summarize, Madam Speaker, I would ask this House to direct the government to announce the widening of the section of that highway from School Road to the junction of No. 1 Highway and 100, which is the perimeter; and secondly to begin to plan now for a cloverleaf and overpass that would be built at this intersection of No. 1 and the Perimeter Highway.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand as I'm still awaiting a reply from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, just on a point of order, the honourable member mentioned he is waiting some reply from the Minister of Mines and Resources. I'm not aware of any reply that I should give him on any subject.

MR. FROESE: I asked a question in the House the other day in connection with minerals, the definition of minerals under Item 7 of the Resolution.

MR. LYON: Well, Madam Speaker, still speaking on this point of order, I believe I answered the honourable member at that time by saying that what he was seeking was a legal opinion, which was not properly a question to be put on Orders of the Day. So I do hope that he's not standing the matter waiting for the answer which he won't get.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, in any event I think the House is content to allow the matter to stand for today and allow the honourable member to consider his position.

At this time we would have been glad to call the motion to go into the Committee of Ways and Means but I understand it does not suit the convenience of my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition. We would be glad to call that first. So in the circumstances, Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Waiting for the Estimates - we are in Department V but the item

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Gimli): No. 2 (a) (b). (2) we completed last night, is that right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on (3) -- starting on (3) of item 2 (c), University of Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSON: Now without opening up the salary again, I wondered if I could answer some questions from yesterday, if I may.

With respect to the Member from St. George: he asked a question about a teacher who came from England to teach in Winnipeg. In reply I would say that a letter came from the School Board of a gentleman who was in England, showing he had a total teaching service of nine years and eight months in England, and he was assured that he would be given credit for our grant scale for this service. After he arrived in Canada it was noted that some of this service would not ordinarily be counted for grant purposes, as it was obtained prior to his qualification as a teacher.

The department recognized the commitment to pay grants with respect to this gentleman on the basis of the ten years of service with which he had originally been credited, and we stated some months ago we would discharge this obligation. This gentleman is employed by the Winnipeg School Board and this was a mistake which happens very rarely in the department, but we are living up to our commitment insofar as our teacher grant for this gentleman is concerned. But I think specifically he wanted to know how often this occurs, and the Director of Teacher Training advises me very seldom, if ever, does a mistake like that go through. It was an honest mistake in that a re-examination of the -- it was after he arrived here that a certain part of the course he had taken in the Old Country was not considered eligible.

Concerning permit teachers: I think I was a little mixed up last evening trying to follow this but I thought I should point out that there are more permit teachers in this past year. Apparently in the fall of '62 when the admission standards were raised to the full Grade XII this resulted in a smaller enrollment at the Teachers College of by about 99 students, which meant there were fewer graduates last June than June of '62 which meant there were fewer qualified teachers in the fall of '63. However, the increase in permit teachers is directly related to the rising standards of teacher training. However, as I pointed out last evening, there are in total in the four teaching institutions 894 in training, compared with 662 teacher training last year, so they are hopeful that in the coming year with 232 teachers graduating, it should result in a substantial decrease in permit teachers in the coming year. We hope that is the case.

The Leader of the Opposition - I just wanted to clear up a statement I made to him. Section 258 of The School Act talks about those people who are allowed into our public schools and it says: "That the members of the Advisory Board, judges -- which I didn't realize -- MLA's, and such other persons as may be designated by the Minister, and members of Municipal Councils in their respective municipalities shall be school visitors. Every clergyman who is a British subject shall be a school visitor in the municipality in which he has pastoral charge." Those are the regulations with respect to visitors in our schools.

With respect to the bursary scholarships and loans, I made copies of the summary of loans given out in '63-64. They are in the annual report for the previous year but I thought it would be better just to hand a copy of these, Mr. Chairman, to the Member from St. John's who asked for them. I can distribute that.

The member for the school bus specifications, we checked on this. I was quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that the department and administration were most concerned and on their toes here and I find that the Leader of the Opposition asked this question, that the bus specifications were made up in the consultation with the authorities concerned in New Brunswick, Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta. They said they tried to use what was considered the best from the specifications of each province. Then, of course, the Superintendent of the Provincial Garage and the Safety Division are consulted on advice and proper specifications. There apparently have been no complaints from bus operators or owners regarding the Manitoba specifications. Periodically, apparently the department consult with other provinces; obtain copies of all their legislation and regulations and keep ours in concert. At the present time apparently some revisions are being discussed, that is, revisions to present specifications but they may not result in any lowering of cost because of the fear of sacrificing safety and convenience with any lower standard. The department assure me with respect to bus specifications, standards and so on, these are kept under pretty constant review with the various provinces.

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd)...

With respect to kindergartens and the St. James School Division, the Member for Assiniboia asked about this. I must advise him that under the Act, the Public Schools Act, the provision of kindergarten is permissive and this educational service is not required to be provided by any school board. In school districts and divisions where boards have deemed it expedient to operate kindergartens, they have used space in school buildings which has become available through changes or shifts in school population. In other words, no specific requests for kindergarten space has been made by any other district or division, other than St. James, who, as the honourable member knows, in July of '63 requested permission to build two kindergarten primary schools and it would have been to provide 16 classrooms specifically for kindergarten purposes and would have involved a total cost of around one quarter of a million dollars. On the grounds of the substantial costs, and secondly, that this would have to be extended to other school districts or divisions, and would involve substantial capital outlays in this area, and that this would result in rising educational costs for local authorities and the province for a permissive service, approval was not granted at that time.

The refusal of the grant doesn't mean that the Department of Education are not in favour of kindergartens. On the other hand, they believe the properly run kindergarten can render an invaluable service for pre school children. However, I think it's just a matter of priorities and the multiplicity of educational services offered today. Boards are being faced across the province with choosing the quantity and quality of educational services regarded as being most beneficial. This is a frank and candid statement as to the reply to the question of the Honourable Member which I thought I should relate to him.

There are, I think, one or two outstanding questions -- which I haven't been able to complete at the moment -- that I recall. I think but for one or two questions that brings it up-to-date, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, there was one question -- I wonder if the Minister has an answer to that now -- about the waiting period for school grants, that the Minister undertook to answer, that the districts have to wait for over six months.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll get a report on that.

MR. FROESE: We are still under Resolution No. 25 and I have a few questions on grants. Under the total allotted for grants: how much of that will be applied against capital grants? Then also, are we still supporting the two trustee organizations with grants as in the past. A further question has to do with the textbooks. What is the policy of this government in connection with textbooks and the distribution of them? Is the practice more or less the same all over the province; and is there a great variance from district to district as to the placement of these textbooks, that one district or one area will use more textbooks than the other, or is it general?

MR. JOHNSON: Will the honourable member repeat his first question, I missed that I'm afraid.

MR. FROESE: The first question was how much of the grant under Resolution No. 25 is being applied against capital grants?

MR. JOHNSON: \$5,367,700 is capital. With respect to textbooks, as far as I am aware, the policy is the same; it's uniform across the province.

MR. FROESE: What about the support to the trustee organizations? Are we still continuing?

MR. JOHNSON: What's that again please.

MR. FROESE: What about the support to the trustee organizations? Are we still continuing in giving them grants?

MR. JOHNSON: The grants are the same as last year.

MR. SMERCHANŠKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister, in reference to the general grant under the University of Manitoba, what percentage of this grant is for interest on the debentures? And then, how is the principal of the debentures paid for by the university? And also, are there any debentures going to be issued for the current year?

MR. JOHNSON: You wanted the amount of the University Grant here which is involved in amortization of loan? In the coming year \$1.2 million servicing debt. What was the other question?

MR. SMERCHANŠKI: The other one was: "Is the principal for the debentures paid out of

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd)...the current grant?" Or do you include that in the servicing debt?

MR. JOHNSON: I'm sorry I'll have to get that.

MR. ROBLIN: It's in the servicing debt.

MR. SMERCHANSKI:paid out of the servicing debt?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes I believe it's in the servicing.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: In other words then it would seem that out of your \$6,369,000 you would discount it by \$1,200,000. Is that correct?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: So that in other words then the actual current grant to the University of Manitoba is more like \$5,169,000 rather than the \$6,369,000. Mr. Chairman, the reason I make this inquiry is that it is very interesting to draw to the attention of this House that ever since this government has come into existence they have been financing a good percentage of the expansion of the University by virtue of issuing debentures. Now, in all their reports they are including the matter of debenture expenditure into the total amount which is being given to the University, and this gives the impression that there is a great deal of money being given to the University by this government -- and this is not so. The thing is that the University since this government has come into being has been financed by debentures issued in the amount of \$12,600,000. You will notice that the current grant has to be discounted to take care of the carrying charges which amounts to roughly in the amount of \$600,000 and then on top of this you also, have to deduct from this grant the service charge in order to pay back the principal on the debenture, and I would strongly recommend to this government that they take a good hard look at going back to what was practised in the past and that is, give the University the proper grants out of current operating funds and do not saddle the University with a debenture issue. There might be some merit in the debenture issue but all I point out is that whenever any publicity or statistics have been issued by this government it has included the carrying charges and it has been including the servicing debt charges and this is an improper and incorrect reflection on what is being given to the University. I'd also like to find out from the Honourable Minister, as to what status, if any, has been taken on the government's proposal to offer matching grants for those that the University will raise on its own. Have any of these grants been paid over, and if so how much, and under what category?

MR. JOHNSON: First of all, I think the honourable member can take little comfort from the record which I will read to him of the support of the University from back in prehistoric days. In 1950 the general grant to the University was \$800,000, in '52, \$900,000, in '54, \$1.1 million, '56, \$1.3 million. Non-recurring grant, there was never anything there. The total current grant was \$1 million 3 in '56, for 3,400 students. And the student population had remained the same pretty well between 1950 and 1957. In 1958 the general grant to the University was \$1,551,200 with a non-recurring grant of \$96,900. This is a grant which is paid to the University as a current expenditure called a non-recurring capital grant for a total of \$1 million 6. Now just to go through. In 1960 the grant had risen to \$3,852,000, non-recurring of \$115,000, for a total grant of \$3,967,000. And then around '62, '63 it was \$4.8 million, \$218,000 non-recurring, for a total grant of \$5,066,500. And then this year up to \$6.7 million. And student population last year 6,099 students from 3,841 in '57-58.

Now I'm sure the honourable member shares with all of us the satisfaction at seeing the University enrollment going up as fast as it is. I'm sure he is aware of the capital fund campaign which has been conducted and the role of the administration in that regard. The choice of method by which the University capital fund and operating fund is amortized and the way in which -- the matter of the University's finance I should say I imagine is a matter of opinion. However, I feel that nonetheless the very tremendous explosion in facilities and services has come about in the last few years and we should take considerable satisfaction from that.

I would like to look at these figures once more but as I understand it, a reconciliation of the capital funds provided by the province in '62-63 \$1.2 million, '63-64 \$2.7 million, '64-65 \$2.4 million for a total of \$6.4. The province's commitment under the arrangement of matching two for one, I believe, has come to \$7.5 million; the grants paid to date are \$6.4 million with a net balance of a little over a million - \$1,066,000.

Now I missed the last question of the honourable member. I wonder if he would give me that one again.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: I think that the Honourable Minister has answered that one in terms

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd)... of the grants that have been given in reference to the matching grants.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Honourable Minister has said and I certainly have no quarrel with the grants to the University of Manitoba, but I certainly have got a quarrel in reference to the figures that are being published because when we read the general grant of \$6,369,000 we must offhand discount it to the amount of \$1.2, so that the net grant is not \$6 million, it is more like \$5,169,000; and I, Mr. Chairman, want to bring this to your attention that as time goes on these are debentures that are amortized over 9, 10, 15, 16 and 20 years. What's going to happen in the next 10 or 12 years? You are going to saddle this institution of ours with possibly a debt close to -- you've got 12 now -- you may quite conceivably saddle it with something in the vicinity of \$50 or \$60 million. And to take the carrying charges as well as your servicing of the debt out of current grant. I think that this is a burden on the University, and these figures as published in the estimates are completely incorrect if you start to compare them with previous years. The point I make, Mr. Chairman, is that this is not a proper comparison of what had gone on in reference to University grants prior to this time, prior to the time that this government has taken over, so that whenever you see any figures in reference to University grants, you have to turn around and discount them to the extent of the current discount of \$1.2 to pay the interest and the amortization of the debentures that have been issued; so that actually this grant when you discount the amount for the servicing debt it performs no function at all. All that you are doing is asking the University to finance the grants which this government rightly should give to the University without any strings attached to it -- and this is the point I make, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Minister, how much is allotted for night classes or night school grants and whether there is an increase in this amount from last year?

MR. JOHNSON: \$76,000 -- up \$7,153 from last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (c) University, passed.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, while we are still on the University. It's my understanding that one of the reasons for the visit of the Ambassador of Peru to the Province of Manitoba is to donate Spanish books to the University and to encourage the University of Manitoba to establish a Chair of Spanish studies. I understand that Peru has taken the lead in this matter and has grouped a number of South American countries as well as Spain itself who will be prepared to co-operate with the University of Manitoba in this regard. It seems to me that this can be a very important step in the University here. I believe that there is at present no University in Canada with a Chair of Spanish studies as such. In the past Manitoba has taken the lead, I think, in establishing Chairs of cultural study. My honourable friend, for example, will know that we have, I believe, the only, certainly if not the outstanding Chair of Icelandic study.

I believe there is a very practical reason here in the matter of the Spanish study. By the very force of economics, probably by choice, in fact, we should be having closer ties with our sister nations in South America. I believe that we have tremendous opportunities there for cultural exchange, but as well for economic and business possibilities for Canada. I don't think we have come anywhere near exploring the tremendous opportunities open to us in South America. There is a larger population there than in North America. A good deal of that population I think looks with sympathy towards Canada. The fact that we have never been a colonial nation; that we are not imperialists; that we have no colour bar, I believe is important to South America. I think they are prepared to look upon us as friends and to work with us. Now I would encourage the Minister to do everything he can to assist this very worthwhile venture and to -- and I know he cannot instruct the University on these subjects -- but to show every assistance possible, because if we were to do this in Manitoba we would be leading the way, which surely is the right one for Canada itself.

We have an added advantage in South America as a Canadian nation. In several of the South American countries French is the second language. This means that as a bilingual nation we would have added opportunities there; so I urge this upon the Minister and I would appreciate knowing if he has taken any steps so far.

MR. JOHNSON: I will take this under advisement. It appeals to me more than the metric

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd)...system, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words at this time because under this item "Universities", the Brandon College appears as an item. I would like to go over a bit of what has happened in the past, and while I normally don't believe in polishing apples, I would like to put myself on record as complimenting the government on the very great development which has occurred at Brandon College and tell members something of what the college means to this community.

Members who were in the House when I first entered in 1952 will recall that every year I rose in my place during the estimates -- with the exception of one year when direct negotiations were going on between the college and the government and I didn't want to embarrass any arrangements that might have been developing -- but I rose every year and asked that the grant, which at that time was \$22,500, be raised, and year after year no recognition was given to even the devaluated value of a dollar, inflation in other words, and year after year it stood at \$22,500.

Currently during this time, too, I was urging the adoption of teacher training at Brandon College -- and I know, Mr. Chairman, it appears further down but I can tell the story more completely if I'm allowed to proceed in this particular way -- and year after year the then Liberal Minister of Education would say, "Oh, no, we have the Teacher Training College in here and there's no point." However, public pressure eventually through the newspapers, the story getting around, did, I believe, cause the Liberal Government at that time to weaken and teacher training was introduced into Brandon College. And members can hardly realize the value that this has been to that community -- aside from the fact that an additional average of probably 100 teachers have been turned out since that time -- a year. I was impressed myself as to the value of this to the western part of Manitoba when at least on several occasions someone would come up to me and say, "Your name's Lissaman" and I'd say "Yes", "Well we come from Minto" or so and so, some small town around that end of the province. They would say what a great value it was to them to be able to go in, interview teachers right there and pick up an excellent young teacher for a country school. This happened on more than one occasion.

Well, getting towards the last two years of the Liberal reign, public pressure again, I believe, due to newspaper stories and members of this House no doubt believing what I was telling them then that certainly some day Brandon College would be of value to this province more so than at the present, and that advantage should be taken of a college which was already existing even though it had a very difficult time keeping its doors open during the depression years. And during those last two years in power the grant was raised I believe, in the first instance to \$50,000 and then to a total of \$90,000.

Well, as you know, in '58 or '9 we decided that we must really do something -- now I say "we", the people of Brandon and the Brandon College Board -- and we decided that we could no longer stand still, that we must do something for the good of Brandon and the western part of Manitoba in trying to expand Brandon College. We decided that we would put on a public drive for funds and see if we could get support for capital monies from the Province of Manitoba. I am happy to say that the Provincial Government, the Roblin Government, saw the value of a college in the western part of this province; saw the need that it was serving and made the very generous offer of getting \$2.00 capital-wise for every dollar we raised, and as a result we have been able to proceed with a \$3-1/2 million building program. At present there in on the campus the following all new buildings: an Arts and Library Building, a Lecture Theatre, a Dining Hall -- and we took the advantage of, because we can't have everything we want at once, of excavating -- we have a very excellent student's utility room below the dining room -- it's quite a large building -- a men's residence, a new women's residence and an off-site boiler house. Proposed in the last part of this first phase of the expansion -- because we realize that this is an endless thing nowadays, that we must keep on expanding Brandon College -- as the last building in the first phase of the expansion a gymnasium is proposed. A gymnasium is the last in this immediate phase because it wasn't of such immediate necessity to the expansion but now we must provide some facilities for the students themselves.

Now just to give you some idea of how the western part of the province is responding to this expansion: In 1960 we had 374 full-time students and in 1963 this had grown by 52 percent to 570 full-time students. But the college also serves in a far greater way than this in that we have people taking music, summer courses, part-time students, and these have increased since

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd)... 1960 from 360 in that year to 684 in 1963. So that we are serving students both full-time and part-time in the number of 1254 in 1963. The budget has increased since 1960 from \$453,000-odd, to \$905,809 in 1963.

Now, I think I can hardly explain the total value of this college to the Brandon people. I made several speeches to service clubs at that time, and because I was speaking to business men emphasized a little of the commercial angle of it. I pointed out that the college was far more value to that community than a business of a similar size might be, because any business of a similar size would no doubt be importing raw materials and a certain portion at least of the total budget would leave the city -- but this largely, this \$900,000-odd circulates largely in the community. And I think this is one of the things that enabled Brandon to maintain its face and not be hit too badly when the Brandon Packers was forced into ruin by dishonest management and the coupling action of the labour unions in dispute. But with this construction money being spent there and the college in operation, it softened and cushioned this blow which otherwise might have been quite disastrous to employment in that area. And while this is just a side profit you might say of the government's interest in the college, it nevertheless served a very useful purpose and cushioned the impact of the closing of Brandon Packers at that time.

The college I might say, too, as we used to argue with the previous Minister of Education -- not immediately previous, the Liberal Minister of Education -- when we were urging teacher training be extended to Brandon College, that it would enable many more young people to take the training, and this certainly has applied here. Young people from that area who might otherwise never get a college education are able because of the closeness and the reduced costs, the living cost and so on, and the proximity to their parents -- at least, for the first year or two because it is a wrench to have young girls and boys go off to college -- have been able to at least start a college career with some reasonable hopes of finishing it.

The college is growing and we are endeavouring in each department as expansion takes place to secure a top-notch man. We had occasion to lose probably one of the most brilliant chemists in this part of the country probably, in the name of Dr. Kidd last year. Dr. Kidd had had a very varied career. He had worked for British Chemicals Industries in England and due to illness returned to Canada -- he had been raised in Canada -- came to Brandon College and taught chemistry. He was the author of several textbooks and was referred in other textbooks as an authority, and it was quite a loss, but we are making good that loss. The college is, as I had forecast in my early days in this House, becoming the real instrument for progress in that part of the province I had suggested it would be and that the value would be emphasized over the years, and I know that this now has come about. I cannot compliment the government highly enough than to compliment them on their foresight, realizing the necessity of a college in western Manitoba of greatest service to the youth of this province. And while I am complimenting them, I serve notice I'm also urging that they not relinquish this grasp of the future they have in Brandon College.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8 o'clock.