

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 10, 1967

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may take a few moments before we get down to business. I would like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have a young man, as a personal Centennial effort, has this morning completed a journey on snowshoes from The Pas, Manitoba to Winnipeg, leaving The Pas on February 25th covering some 400 miles on foot. I have personal knowledge of what such an arduous trip such as this entails, sleeping in the open, being lost, short of food on a trip of that distance. He duplicated the trip of Henry Kelsey who made the same journey on foot in 1691. Walter Koshel is 26 years old, is married, was a former employee of the Department of Natural Resources, and is presently attending the Teachers College at the University of Manitoba. Mr. Koshel, on behalf of all the members of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly, I congratulate you on a job well done and welcome you here today.

We have also in the gallery with us today, 45 ungraded students from the Hugh John McDonald School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Erickson, Mrs. Mirosh and Mrs. Graham. These students are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan. We also have 48 students Grade 7 and 11 standing, from the Blumenort School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Doerksen and Mr. Penner. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member of La Verendrye. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

MR. LYON: I believe there were some discussions among the members of the House which would approve your calling the second readings of private bills. This is of course not government time and I can only put forward the suggestion as I understood it, but the private bills on Page 21 might be called in order to perhaps advance some of them because of the meeting of Private Bills Committee on Monday morning next.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, we have no objection at all. In fact, we recommend that course of action to get them into process. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that there has been some discussions, unofficial, suggesting that the House might close early today for those who have some distance to go insofar as the school division vote, and we certainly would have no objection on this side of the House if it was agreed to rise, say, at 4:00 o'clock.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think we would take the same position. We realize that some members of the House may have to travel some distance. I don't have to go very far in order to vote for the referendum, which I intend to do. However, there may be some members that would find it convenient to quit, say, around 4:00 o'clock in order to vote on the referendum, and I'm sure that we in this group would be perfectly willing for a closure an hour and a half ahead of time in order to facilitate this.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for me to ask the Member for Rhineland to supper?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm almost tempted to yield. However, I think I have already made arrangements that I would come home a little earlier, but I concur with the other members here in an earlier adjournment. I'll take up the Honourable Minister's suggestion some other time.

MR. LYON: We can certainly give this matter serious consideration between now and that hour, keeping in mind always that when the end of the session arrives that honourable members on all sides of the House will remember that the government is not trying to trench upon honourable members' private times - you know, for debating private matters.

MR. PAULLEY: On this point may I say that the members of the Assembly were prepared in order to give the government an opportunity to expound their theories, we were prepared and did absent ourselves from the Assembly for a full week, and an hour and one half at this particular time I don't think calls for the remarks of my honourable friend. I did rise however, Mr. Speaker, to say that I have no objections, we have no objections to proceeding with the Private Members bills at this time.

MR. STEEN presented Bill No. 36, an Act for the relief of Dorothy J. Ungar, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is similar to one which was presented to the last session of the last Legislature in the dying days of that session, and was defeated at that time by a vote of 21 to 16, with 17 members of the Assembly being absent. This Legislature, being

(MR. STEEN cont'd.) of slightly different composition, and we having the advantage of a full House today, the petition is again seeking the same relief.

The purpose of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to lift the limitation imposed by the Insurance Act to allow the petitioner to sue the Niagara Fire Insurance Company because she did not do so within the statutory one year limit imposed by the Insurance Act. I might mention at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the evidence of the fire in question is still available. This fire occurred on the 16th day of April 1964, at the residence of the petitioner in Lockport, Manitoba.

The relief sought by this Bill is outlined in Section (1) and it is to make an application by way of an originating Notice of Motion to a Judge of the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench who will then be able to hear witnesses and on the basis of the evidence make a decision as to whether or not the petitioner will have the advantage of making, or commencing a law suit against the Fire Insurance Company.

This Bill is similar to many that have been presented over the years to the Legislature. In 1963 there was a change in the method of these bills which, because of the inadequacy of the Legislature to deal with some of these bills because they didn't have before them all the facts and details, because they didn't have the time to go into it, the Legislature said that all the bills had to have a provision that these matters could be taken to a Judge who in his discretion, hearing the evidence, would decide whether or not they should go any further.

This serious misfortune I said occurred in April 1964, the 16th of April, and for four or five months the petitioner did nothing about commencing any action. Finally she went and sought the services of a solicitor but it turned out that the fire insurance policy was destroyed in the fire. The petitioner did not know with what agent she was insured or with what company she was insured, and another several months were spent in locating the actual insurance agent and the insurance company, policy numbers and details, so that proof of loss claims could be filed. These proof of loss claims were filed on three separate occasions and on three separate occasions were rejected. Meanwhile, the solicitor for the petitioner became seriously ill and was hospitalized and underwent serious surgery, and during the time of his hospitalization the year lapsed.

Some might say that this is the result of an error on the part of the solicitor, and this might very well be true, but they would say also that the petitioner has a civil remedy that she should avail herself against the solicitor. This is, true, a possibility, but it is certainly no certainty on how any judge or any court would rule against such an action, and it is the petitioner who would suffer if we refused to give the relief sought in this bill.

What I am asking for, Mr. Speaker, is that the House would give this bill second reading, so that the petitioner and her solicitor could appear before the Private Bills Committee and speak for themselves and answer the questions of the members of the Committee and provide any details that I am unable to provide. Thank you.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, we find that every year a bill comes before us on the question of the relief of some person involving the impact of the Statute of Limitations, and I think it was back around 1963 when we came up with this formula of rather than giving the applicant or the petitioner the power to sue by removing the limitation we said, "Well, we don't want to act as the Court in hearing evidence and adjudicating on the real issues as between parties. The effect of delay -- the adverse effect of delay that might apply to one or other of the parties to the litigation, we don't want to hear evidence. We think it should be in the hands of the Court to be able to assess the impact as it is on both litigants and then decide whether or not in the sense of justice and in the sense of what happened and in the sense of the adverse effects, then the Court should decide whether or not permission should be granted."

Unfortunately, on two occasions that I believe took place, when the matter came before the Court, the Court took the position that if the Legislature wanted these people to have the right to have their day in Court then the Court would grant it, and I feel that there is a danger that the Court, looking at an Act such as this, might just in a perfunctory manner grant the rights to sue, and I would think that would be unfortunate because it is always possible that a defendant could convince the Court that because of the lapse of time certain evidence is no longer available, certain matters have taken place which result in the defendant suffering a real hardship by being compelled to defend a claim some years after the cause of action arose. Whether or not judges read Hansard is something I am not aware of, but if they do at least I wanted to say what I did in order to indicate my attitude to the nature of the framing of this type of relief which is requested.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, what bothers me much more is that we have discussed on these various occasions - and I think indeed on the estimates of the Attorney-General and certainly when the present Attorney-General was the then Attorney-General - the entire question of the limitation periods, the variation of limitation periods and whether or not the time allowed or the time limited is a fair time for this purpose, because too often it happens that litigants on the defense will drag matters out and the time arrives while they're still negotiating and the time comes and passes and they're still negotiating, when negotiations break off the unfortunate claimant discovers that the time has run out. For that reason we have discussed time and again that there would be a study made, and we were assured that a certain committee or group of people with some legal status or otherwise, and we were told recently under the Attorney-General's Act there is some method of establishing a group of people who are members of the Bar but whose names are not too easily obtainable, to sit and study questions of law. -- (Interjection) -- The Honourable the Attorney-General indicates that all one needs to do is to be able to read, and I'm under the impression that one of the qualifications for candidature for the Legislature is the ability to read. But to read through covers of books which are not easily obtained is a feat which even the Honourable the Attorney-General can probably not do. Nevertheless, if it bothers him so much that we don't know the names, I assure him that I for one am confident that if he had to set up a committee of lawyers that no doubt they would not be his buddies but rather people who are fully competent in the field which they are charged to delve into, including the Member for Inkster who is not even sure himself that he's a member of the Law Reform Committee. The reason I mention that, Mr. Speaker, is that I doubt very much if the Law Reform Committee meets in stated times for a certain period or in any way whatsoever that they themselves remember whether or not they appear on that list which is available somewhere to someone who can read. And that is what bothers me, Mr. Speaker, because I am sure that three years ago, and if I am exaggerating then two years ago, but I'm pretty sure that three years ago we were told that this Law Reform Committee was studying the question of limitations of actions, and I don't only mean that we were assured this in the House, because I remember speaking to a lawyer who turned out to be one of the members of that Law Reform Committee who indeed told me that they had studied it, and I don't want to mislead anyone in the House. I am under the impression that not only was the matter studied but that it was also reported upon, but since this is a personal committee of the Honourable the Attorney-General, since it reports only to him when it does report, we are not privy to the reports that are made, and I intend to speak on that question when I have another opportunity to do so.

But dealing specifically with this Bill, I can tell the Honourable the Member from St. Matthews that there is a committee somewhere consisting of certain people of whom the Attorney-General can elucidate, which has undertaken, according to the Attorney-General, to study the question of the extension of time or the uniformity of the period of limitations of actions, and I can advise him that it would be in his interest - and in ours too if he would care to divulge what he finds out to us - to communicate with the Attorney-General and find out what is happening with that Law Reform Committee's study on the limitations of actions. I think that the whole idea of this type of personal advisory committee is very good, but it shouldn't be one recognized by this body because it's not accountable and doesn't report to this body, and we therefore only know by hearsay that matters have been referred to it; we have no opportunity to ask for the reports.

Well, I have made a personal decision and of course a bill of this nature is not a Party matter, it's a matter for each person to deal with as his conscience directs him. I have decided that I've had enough of this waiting for this study, and until we get it I propose to go along with a bill such as this and say, "Yes, we have not had the report; we have heard of the advisability of the study; we have heard that there was a study; but until this matter is brought to this House by the Attorney-General, whose responsibility I think it is, I intend to consider that people who come to this Legislature for relief - and certainly they have to have relief if at least for nothing more than the slow process of operations of this Law Reform Committee and its report - that I for one intend to vote in favour of the bill to put it into committee so that we could hear representations and have to act because we haven't had the direction that I think we should have had prior to this on the entire question of limitations.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the stand which I have previously taken on such bills, and in view of the fact that I did not vote on this bill that came before the House last

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) year, I think that I should explain to the House that the reason why I did not vote was because I had an indirect interest in it, and for that reason I do not intend to vote in respect to this bill.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, just for the record; in past years I have supported the bill that was introduced in connection with similar matters, and I think on this one in particular as well, and I intend to support the bill.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can't say at the moment what I as an individual would be prepared to do with regard to this bill. I propose to vote that it go to committee so that we have an opportunity of considering some of the events which will be urged upon us by, no doubt, counsel for the person who is seeking relief. I do say, Mr. Speaker, that in principle I think that it's wrong to legislate with regard to an individual, to select a person out of society and pass legislation affecting that person, and for that reason there would have to be very very compelling reasons - and I can't even conceive of the reasons at the present time which would urge me to say that a law of the Province of Manitoba should apply differently to one individual as against the other 900,000. However, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I do think that this is the right time to make some remarks concerning the general principle of the statutes of limitations.

The people who lose legal rights by virtue of the operation of a statute of limitations are in the unique position of having lost a legal cause of action by virtue of nothing more than the effluxion of time. Now generally, Mr. Speaker, the effluxion of time and delay can be, and in many circumstances is, relieved against. For instance, let me say that the Court of Queen's Bench rules and the Court of Appeal rules and the Supreme Court rules all provide that where something should have happened by a certain date and didn't happen when that date came, if a right was lost the person who had lost the right would be entitled to apply to the courts, and if it could be demonstrated to the courts that there was sufficient reason for reinstating or not permitting the lapse of the particular right, then the court could allow them to continue, and generally the basis upon which the courts do relieve individuals in these circumstances, is if it can be shown that the rights as between both parties have not been either prejudiced or substantially altered as a result of the effluxion of time.

Now I'm aware that in most insurance contracts and with regard to the Statute of Limitations under the Highway Traffic Act, there is a period of one year, and at the end of that year if action hasn't been taken, the right is extinguished, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the number of cases which have come to the Legislative over the years, and I haven't been here during those years, but the number of cases which have come to the Legislature with regard to extending a limitation period or providing for the enactment of a statute for the relief of a particular individual, is a practical demonstration that the present thinking with regard to statutes of limitations is not working; it's not practical; it is usually unconscionable to a great number of human beings and people who are elected by the community, that a person lose his right for no other reason than that a calendar date has passed. In other words, the right existed on August 1st, 1967, it expired on August 2nd, 1967, with nothing else occurring as between the parties.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it's time that there be some consideration of changing the thinking behind our statutes of limitations. One of the changes that I would like to see - and I would ask the members of the government to consider this to see whether it's such a radical change - one of the changes that I would like to see is that every limitation period be contained in the Statute of Limitations. In other words that if a person has a cause of action, that he can look through the statutes of limitations, and the limitation period that is expressed therein is the limitation which applies to his particular claim. If he follows those limitation periods then he can be considered as having kept his claim alive.

That is not the present situation. At the present time there are different limitation periods and they can be found under different statutes. For instance, the medical profession has a limitation period. Fortunately in this case it's the Limitation of Actions Act; although it doesn't contain reference to the medical limitation, the statute itself does contain a note referring you to the Act with regard to medical people. There are limitations in the Municipal Acts; there are limitations in all of the charters; there are limitations - and very stringent ones - in the Public Works Act. I know that there is a limitation with regard to officers of the Crown which is six months instead of a year, and I think that this has been an issue within the last several years, that an officer of the Crown who is involved in an accident on the highways, if he isn't sued within six months, the cause of action expires, and, Mr. Speaker, despite the general

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)..... knowledge of many lawyers of limitation periods, I would have to be frank in saying that I as an individual wouldn't be able to point to all of them at the present time and I don't think that any lawyer can know every limitation period. So I think that where a person does lose his rights by the effluxion of time and the effluxion of time alone, that all of those provisions which would cause this to happen be contained in one statute of limitations, and the statute contain a further provision that notwithstanding any other section of any other Act, if the limitation is not expressed in this statute it will not result in the forfeiture of a person's rights.

So that's one of the concepts that I would like to introduce with regard to statutes of limitations, that they should be specific; that they should be easily located; that they should be contained in one statute; and that if they are not there that they don't operate against a person having rights.

Secondly, and more important, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should bring the laws closer to what is the practice of society as evidenced by these bills that keep coming before the Legislature; that we should provide a savings provision within the statute of limitations itself; that a limitation should not operate to bar a claim unless there has been some prejudice to the person who is the other half of the claim - that is, the defendant; that if a limitation period intervenes - and let's take the case of a highway traffic act where the limitation is one year. I think I'm right on that. That's one that we all know very quickly because we run into it so often. That if a person doesn't sue within the year that they should then have to go to court and prove that the position of the defendant has not been altered after the lapse of that year, and if the court can ascertain that the rights of the parties are indeed the same, that there should be a trial to determine whether or not one person or the other was responsible, that the court should then permit the action to proceed.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the petitions for these various bills (and this is the first one that I'm going to have to take a stand on) are in fact resulting in that kind of jurisprudence but it takes place in the Legislature rather than in the court, so that every year I can predict with some accuracy because all I have to do is go backwards and show that one has come up every year during the past several years, and the future being not substantially different from the past, we can predict that every year there's going to be a new bill for the relief of an individual, and the Government of Manitoba is going to have to sit and decide whether the laws are going to be changed with respect to one individual. And I say without hesitation, Mr. Speaker, that I disagree with legislating for an individual. If the laws which are enacted for 900,000 people are good, then they are good for that one individual that doesn't seem to be getting justice by virtue of it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am concluding my remarks. I think that the concept of limitations has to undergo a change. I think that if the Legislature can see that both the reason for a limitation period - and that being the desire to have finality at a certain period of time as to a person's rights and some security as to the future - if that reason for a limitation period can be consistent with the essential justice as between the parties, that this Legislature should enact that for all of the people of Manitoba and not for one individual, and I would think that that would be far preferable than considering a case for the relief of one individual every year for the next number of years ad infinitum.

Now if we ever did enact that kind of provision, Mr. Speaker, I think I can say that it would involve some responsibility on the part of the people of the Province of Manitoba. Insurance rates would no doubt go up because the people who are now insuring drivers in the Province of Manitoba are insuring them on the basis of a one year statutory limitation. We would have to accept an increase of insurance rates but that would be preferable, Mr. Speaker, to -- and I don't know just what that would involve; it might be picayune - but it would be preferable than this Legislature sitting every year thinking about an Act for the relief of one individual.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the mover of the Bill and particularly to the remarks of the Member for Inkster who has just taken his seat, because there is much wisdom in what he has said. Apropos of nothing, I may contrast his speech with the speech of his colleague from St. John's, and say that there was a great improvement in the speech from the Honourable Member for Inkster. It's one thing to carp; it's another thing to do; and carping really doesn't get anyone anywhere when you're dealing with a problem of this nature.

It's a serious problem and it's one that is not terribly easy of resolution. The Law

(MR. LYON cont'd.) Reform Committee has looked at the problem over a period of a year or two, and as a matter of fact as I think I mentioned to the House earlier, there will be a statute coming in very shortly, because there's still work being done on it by the staff, because there are innumerable professions and groups and so on who are affected by any such statute of general application. It will be coming in but I don't know that it will meet the peculiar type of situation that we face, not only with this Bill but some of the other Bills that have come forward in other years. If you are to achieve finality in the question of responsibility for damage, you must have a Statute of Limitations and you must also have a Statute of Limitations which sets firm periods.

Now it makes very little difference, I suppose, in the long run, if that statute is to be amended from time to time for one particular individual, or whether the court is permitted to amend that provision by some ameliorating section that is put into the Act. However, my honourable friend from Inkster has put his finger on it when he says: Is the public of Manitoba prepared collectively to pay the price, financially and in other ways, for this luxury that we permit ourselves as a Legislature from time to time, of permitting a person who has exhausted his legal rights to re-initiate? This is a luxury and it's a luxury that we're conferring on one person to the disadvantage, potentially, financially, of all the other people of Manitoba, and so long as this principle is clearly understood by all members who may vote for this Bill, and if they pass the Bill, fine. I only say that they must understand that it works to the advantage of one and to the disadvantage of the other 960,000 people in the province. Now that's a stark proposition, but my honourable friend from Inkster points it out and I daresay that if you canvassed any lawyer in the province he would tell you the same thing, that this is the case.

Nonetheless, I'm not going to oppose this Bill at second reading. I think the people should be allowed to come before the committee and to state their case. I am not saying later on, however, that I will vote for the Bill because I think it is wrong in principle; I think it is wrong that the Legislature should be considering these bills. I mention now, as I have mentioned before, that this is the only Legislature of record in the Dominion of Canada where these bills ever see the light of day, and I don't know why that peculiar anachronism occurs in the Province of Manitoba where the people of Manitoba are being asked, as a group, to bear a particular extra cost of, for instance, insurance rates in order to give a remedy for one person.

But these are the facts that are before us. I don't know that there is any general cure that the general amendments to the Statute of Limitations can bring in that will prevent this type of legislation from coming before us. I think it is a question of self-discipline of the members of the Legislature realizing what they are doing when they pass such legislation. As I say, the Bill which will be appearing before the Legislature, I don't think will still answer this problem. I'm confident it will not answer the problem, although we can give consideration, as we have already done, to the question of permitting a Court in special circumstances to suspend the rule as to time, but the minute you do that, again to reiterate what the Honourable Member for Inkster has said, the minute you do that you abolish the doctrine of finality, perhaps even more effectively than we do by passing a bill for one person in this House. And all of this must be said against the background that it has nothing to do with the peculiar or the particular rights or the circumstances in which the unfortunate petitioner finds himself or herself.

This is something that we are all concerned with, with the individual of course, and anything that I am saying has nothing at all to do with the merits of any particular case because that's really not what's in issue. There's a much greater issue before us on all of these bills, but I'm not going to weary the House with a reiteration of arguments that I have made before, that the Member for Selkirk has made before, that perhaps even the Member for St. John's, when he's in a better mood, has made before; because these arguments do stand and they are meaningful.

And so I say this legislation will be coming in; there will be, I think, many items in it that will find favour with the Member for Inkster because there has been, I understand, although I was not privy to the discussions in the committee, I understand the matter was studied in considerable depth. The Bill will come before us. The Bill may well be passed at this Session of the Legislature. But I don't know that that will have any final bearing on this type of case still having to come before us from time to time, and I think we must consider and consider very seriously as this Bill advances through its various stages in the House, as to whether or not the end result, when we come to the third reading of this Bill, we are prepared in our own minds to say that we as a responsible group of legislators who are elected to service all of

(MR. LYON cont'd.) the people of Manitoba, are prepared to amend one Act for one person and then to close the door immediately and say that nobody else can take advantage of that particular provision, because that's what we're doing - to the potential ultimate disadvantage of all of the people of Manitoba. Now these arguments are not new - they're almost axiomatic; but I think they should be expressed when bills of this nature come before the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, every year it seems that we end up with more of these bills before us, and we end up with roughly the same discussion on every occasion. I'm sure that of all the bills that come before the House these are the ones that really disturb the members most of all because we're placed in a position that -- we're asked to judge on something which we're really not capable of judging and yet we're faced with precedents in cases, where we have allowed one such bill before and why not pass this one. Surely we have to get out of this situation in some manner and I don't profess to know at this time what the manner is - we've discussed it before; either have a more uniform Statute of Limitations or more clearcut rules or what we will, but certainly the method that we're following now is the wrong one.

My colleague, the Member for Selkirk, who is unable to speak on this Bill this afternoon because, as he has said, he has an indirect personal interest, has spoken in the past on the question of principle on these bills. And I would just like to quote what he said last year on one of the bills of a similar nature, Mr. Speaker. He said then, "I feel it my duty to state that the Statute of Limitations was enacted in the public interest and it must either be allowed to remain inviolate or it should be altered completely so that the public at large knows exactly where it stands at any time. If there is to be any orderly method of dealing with those who allege negligence on the part of others and seek recovery of damages from them, there must be definite periods during which any rights must be exercised. If this is not to be, or if this principle is to be waived from time to time by the enactment of private bills, then no one will know where they stand and no one will know when they may be held liable for something they have long since forgotten. There are very serious and far-reaching implications in the waiving of any public law, and I would urge that this should never be done except in the most exceptional circumstances where the interests of the whole public are at stake and not when it merely affects an apparent injustice or hardship to an individual or a small group."

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this sets out the principle of the situation, but then the members of the House are faced with the humanities of the situation. We're faced with -- the one that came before us on two occasions, of the famous "swab" case, which disturbed all the members of the House and where no one knew whether we were doing the right thing or the wrong thing. And in all of these I think the members have a right to wonder to themselves: are we in fact acting here to protect an individual or are we acting here to protect the lawyer who's failed to act and who should have acted at a particular time and didn't do so? And are we in fact shoving the blame over to someone else when it belongs elsewhere?

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the actions of the House I think reflect best of all the problems of the members, because if you go back to the 18th of April last year, on that day, Mr. Speaker, the House was faced with two bills of a similar nature. One was Bill No. 42, an Act for the Relief of Dorothy J. Ungar. It was moved by the Member for Winnipeg Centre that the Bill be passed. Sixteen members voted in favour and twenty-one voted against. Within the course of a few minutes presumably, certainly in the course of the same debate that evening, Bill No. 120 came up, an Act for the Relief of three individuals, to be now read a second time, introduced by the then Member for St. Matthews constituency, and this time, Mr. Speaker, the House reversed itself totally. Twenty-one voted in favour and seventeen voted against. As I said, the very same day on an earlier bill it had been exactly the opposite. Now what sense can we make out of that and what sort of justice is that? Surely there could be no better proof than our own actions of last year to show, Mr. Speaker, that we have to change our method insofar as these bills.

Well, having said all that I'm faced with the same problem as the members of the House, the human problem. What am I to do now? Am I to say, "Well, let's get back to principles; the time has come for principles;" and vote against this bill now? Or am I to say, "Well, we've let them by in the past, I suppose we should let this one go too." Mr. Speaker, quite honestly I don't know what is the right answer and I don't think the members should be placed in that position, and so I propose to support the second reading of the Bill, to let it go to committee, with extreme reservations I might say, in the hopes, Mr. Speaker, that we can get out of this dilemma and establish some method by which we will in fact be giving proper justice and not the type of justice that we gave on the 18th of April last year by presenting two different points of

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) view in the same debate on identical problems.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the lawyers and I've listened with a great deal of interest to the Leader of the Opposition in respect of this Bill. I was one of those last year when both Bills referred to by the Leader of the Opposition were before us and I was one of those that voted on each occasion against sending the bills into the committee on private affairs on the matter of principle and I cannot see myself this afternoon deviating from the stand that I took a year ago on the matter of principle. Now I appreciate and realize the position taken by my colleague from St. John's and I would not suggest as the Honourable the Attorney-General has indicated that the position taken this afternoon by my colleague from St. John's was carping. I want to say to my friend the Attorney-General I don't think the representative from St. John's uses this assembly for the purpose of carping on this or any other matter. I'm somewhat surprised to hear my friend the Attorney-General referring to my colleague in such a manner and I'm sure that on reflection the Attorney-General when we adjourn this afternoon will speak to my colleague and express his apologies for the use of his verbiage this afternoon -- (Interjection) -- Pardon.

MR. LYON: He's no worse than the rest of us.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh well possibly my honourable friend then the Attorney-General associates himself with my colleague. I don't know who the King Carper is between the two in this particular case and if there is such a thing as the King of the Carpers may I respectfully suggest that the mantle and the crown should be worn by my friend the Attorney-General.

MR. HILLHOUSE: What sort of fish is the carp?

MR. PAULLEY: It's sort of a scavenger fish that pollutes the water by its very presence. It's Friday and I don't know if my friend the Attorney-General is an eater of carp or not.

A MEMBER: The carp muddies up the waters.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, it muddies up the waters. It's a scavenger in the water and it also pollutes the water by its very presence. I don't suggest as the Attorney-General does that my friend from St. John's is a carp in this Legislature. I think far more highly of my colleague.

However, Mr. Speaker, back to the Bill itself. I stated that on the two occasions that we had similar bills before us last year that on a matter of principle I voted against the bills on both occasions, and on a matter of principle I can't see myself changing in the short period of a year and supporting the contention of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. I agree with the contention of my carping friend, in the opinion of the Attorney-General, that the Attorney-General has been negligent in introducing into the House, or the government has, whoever is responsible, a promised method or almost uniformity of dealing insofar as the Statutes of Limitations are concerned. He has failed us in this; however, he has failed us and so has the government failed us in many other occasions and among other areas as well. This to me, unlike my colleague from St. John's does not give me sufficient reasons to change from the attitude and my position of last year.

Now I welcome to some degree the fact that we've had this discussion on the question of the principle involved in the Statutes of Limitations and this Bill might be used as the media to re-impress upon the Attorney-General and the Government of Manitoba the necessity of the clarification within the law itself. If it serves no other purpose than that then I think that it's well worth while. Again, Mr. Speaker, I cannot, in principle - and I try to adhere to principle - change my opinion that I expressed a year ago today or around about this time.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the principles of the Statutes of Limitations. One must have rules and regulations, for whatever rules one has wherever one draws that line there is bound to be a small number of cases through no faults of their own who should be given special consideration, I think the number actually is quite small. I agree completely with those that have said that these bills put members of the Legislature in a very difficult position and as far as I am concerned I feel I'm in no position to make any judgment of these cases. I feel that until such arrangements are made whereby these cases can be put directly by the petition to a body who are qualified to judge, these bills will automatically come into this House. I'd hate to see anything done in this House that would prevent them coming here but I would strongly suggest as I have done in the years gone by that arrangements be made whereby they can be directed.

I fully appreciate those that have told me that when we bless a bill of this kind, a relief of, the courts very often assume it has the blessing of this Legislature in principle, but until we find that alternative means of handling these cases, Mr. Speaker, we are faced, and I am faced with this predicament and I have no alternative under these circumstances but to support this Bill.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it is a question of anybody's voting in favour of this Bill forgetting the principle of the Statutes of Limitations, for a layman, somebody that's certainly not trained as a lawyer, we ask ourselves what recourse do these people have? After a certain time they can go to court unless they come here and we waive the Statutes of Limitations I might say in giving them a chance to go ahead to appeal. We're not making any decision; we're not saying guilty or not guilty or somebody should pay or anything like that at all; we are just giving them a chance, extending the period that they could go ahead and bring these matters to court.

Now if this is the case it would seem that this is the recourse that the people have at the moment. Somebody that comes in after election, you come in in this House and you're presented with these briefs, you feel all right, these people for some reason or other have passed the time, the limit, but it must be all right if we're asked to vote for this, if these bills are in order it must be all right and it is more or less an appeal. I certainly agree with my leader that it is embarrassing and you do an awful lot of soul searching every year when these things come up. But until somebody that is trained in these matters come in with the answer and until we are not faced with these bills anymore for some reason or other that this statute of limitation is final -- I think before we do this I would advocate that we look at all the possibilities and that we should try to make sure that the people are aware of these things -- but if this is the case if we could come, if the people come here, if we can present, a private member could present such a bill I don't think that we are going back on any principle. We are just asking to go ahead and extend this period. Under ordinary circumstances I think that if this is allowed to keep on like this I will most of the time vote in favour of the poor people that might have made a mistake because of ignorance, because those people are not trained in the law, they don't know these things; and if we have a chance and if it's perfectly legal to have a private member come in with this Bill I will support this Bill. I respect what was said in the House by different members, I know that everybody is certainly sincere in this, but to me it's not a question, this kind of principle at all, to me it's people that have recourse - this is their final recourse - they can come in and if this Bill is passed we waive the Statute of Limitations, so there's nothing wrong, and we are not judging or pre-judging. So until this government or this legislature I should say, because this is a worry that we all have, come in with some changes - apparently this is wrong this is not the way it should be done; legally it is but we should arrive at something a little more adequate a little better where we wouldn't have to like my leader said change our mind in the same day on two different motions. So I certainly will support this Bill if for no other reason but to give these people who maybe through no fault of their own weren't aware of this, maybe it was a lawyer's mistake, I don't know, and I certainly will support this Bill and I don't feel that I'm going against any principles at all.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, these bills as several members have mentioned are a real problem when they come before this House. I know I have always had great difficulty in deciding how to vote and I have voted both ways on bills of this type. I've tried largely to base my decision upon whether the individual faced unusual circumstances and could be literally held blameless in passing the time of time available to him to appeal to the courts or whether it appeared that a solicitor had been in error. In the case of the latter I've usually voted against it because I don't think it's the duty of this body to try to bail professional people out of shortcomings or their own errors. But I do believe that until we have some legislation which gives a reasonable view and further recourse to justice on people who are barred through the statute of limitations on various cases that they should have the right of coming here.

One of the things that certainly does not induce maybe the ultimate justice being given a case here is that largely the evidence we hear in committee is not evidence at all, it's more or less hearsay; people are not on oath and we have to be making decisions on something that may in court not stand up. So I think there is need to examine this whole situation and give some real attention to giving special consideration to people who through no fault of their own are being barred from their day in courts - until that time I believe they should come here.

Now in this present instance I have some reservations as the particular Bill has been explained to us but I would like to have the Bill go to committee, hear what evidence there is pro and con before making a decision.

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

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet) presented Bill No. 28, an Act to Incorporate the Lutheran Campers Foundation of Manitoba, for second reading.

MR. BJORNSON: I'm happy to explain the Lutheran Campers Foundation of Manitoba represents the work of the Lutheran churches at institutions of higher education in Manitoba and it attempts to assist in the overall growth and development of youth and especially to help Lutheran students understand their lives in terms of their religious heritage.

To carry out these purposes this foundation employs a university chaplain, the Reverend Marvin Hovey, with office at the Fort Garry campus and responsible also for United College, Brandon College, the Manitoba Institute of Technology and the School of Nursing. The work is done by means of study and discussion groups, worship, service projects, visitations and counselling. The Foundation wishes to be incorporated to make it better equipped to do its task by having legal status and freedom to engage in business matters such as the ownership of property. Incorporation would also bring it into line with six other Lutheran Campers Foundations in Canada, that of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. This Foundation is governed by a board elected from and responsible to the churches. The Lutheran Church feels that much is at stake in higher education today and that the church has a significant role to play in this development.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 50. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 50, an Act to amend the Society of Industrial and Cost Accountants Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, this just changes the name of the Society as is being done in every other jurisdiction in the country. At the present the Society is called by three names: the Society of Industrial and Cost Accountants, Registered Industrial and Cost Accountants, Cost and Management which is a national magazine. This has created confusion among the people and among their own members and throughout the country they are standardizing on the one name. This Bill purely does the same in this province as in other provinces to establish one name for the Society.

MR. SPEAKER: I would remind the members once more that there is considerable talk going on, banging of desks and other things, which to say the least has a very disturbing effect on the operation of the House. I would again ask you to kindly co-operate. If you must talk do it in a subdued manner in order that it's not disturbing the general operation of the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 57. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin) presented Bill No. 57, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, there is only one point I would like to draw to the attention of the Legislature in dealing with this bill. The rate of interest at the present time is limited to five percent and this is the change that the Co-operative Credit Society would like to have made.

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

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

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, the threat of the shutdown at Rivers poses a problem for those who support the Federal Government in its attempt to modernize our -- or I should say the Armed Forces. When we argue for the retention of the Rivers Base are we in fact putting the interest of one center or one area of the country over the interest of the nation as a whole? Well I believe in the case of Rivers the answer is no. Rivers is important to both Western Manitoba and to our nation as a whole.

The points that are covered in the resolution prove the value to the Federal Government that Rivers is one of the finest bases in Western Canada. The base itself employs a thousand people including civilians and it has a five and a half million dollar payroll. Should the base close there would be a \$9 million retail sales loss to the area. What I think we must point out to the Federal Government is that the Rivers Air Base and Brandon are in a "designated" area. I'm sure that every member sitting here knows what a designated area means. This is where the government are prepared to subsidize industry. We, in that area, feel that not only have we one of the finest bases in Western Canada but we are also justified in asking the Federal Government to subsidize us in some manner because this is one of the biggest industries in Manitoba and it is the biggest in Southwest Manitoba.

(MR. DAWSON cont'd).....

Now to show you how difficult it would be to attract other industry, as we know, when the Macdonald base closed in Macdonald it was hoped by the Provincial Government and Federal Government as well that industry would be able to be attracted to Macdonald, but to date we have not done anything with Macdonald Air Base and the -- to prove this point Wessman Regional Development Corporation is a new corporation that has the blessing of the government, Provincial Government that is, and its office is in Brandon and it has been setup for the south-western area of Manitoba to promote industry. Now I would read a small paragraph of what they had to say in the Brandon Sun last November. It says that: "Since Wessman Regional Development Corporation started operations in June of this year we have been advertising in Canada and United States to attract industry to our region. To date we have not contacted any industrial firm that would be able to come anywhere close to matching the contribution that the Canadian Forces base at Rivers is making to our economy."

Now this corporation as well have made an extensive study of the area and what the area would actually suffer in population loss, school, children, telephones, etc., and I would like to read you those figures. Should the base close at Rivers the population loss to the Province of Manitoba would be 4,270 people. We would have 660 less school children. There would be 3,930 less telephones. We would have 1,310 less householders. There would be 30 less retail stores. From the deposits in credit in the Credit Union and the banks in that area we would suffer a \$2,290,000 deposit loss. We would sell 1,870 less passenger car licences. These are just a few of the things that would happen to the province as a whole, so you can see how we would suffer provincially on the whole. You can picture what it would do to our particular area.

It has been mentioned that should we lose the base in our area it would be far worse than never getting Simplot at all in Brandon. But we believe that the most important factor in the Town of Rivers and the surrounding area is the fact that there are approximately 125 people, civilians, employed at that base that have been considered permanent employees for the last 15 to 16 - 17 years. These people have purchased homes whether it be under Central Housing and Mortgaging or other -- through bank loans or credit union loans -- nevertheless they have financed these homes over a 20 to 25 year period. Now these people are also in the age bracket of about 40 to 45 years of age. They have teen-age children. Some of them have children that are getting ready to go to university or colleges. They wonder, they face the thought of not having a job and being at the age of 40 - 45, as I said, they wonder who would want to hire them, but most important they feel that their life savings have gone down the drain in the amount that they have invested in their homes because I am sure that should that base close, these homes will be worth nothing overnight. As a matter of fact I understand one base that closed down east, Central Housing and Mortgaging buy the houses to close out the deal for one dollar. This is all these people would have with no future, no job to go to. Another thing -- and when I say that we don't argue this point from the poor businessman suffering we feel that this is one of the gambles a businessman takes when he sets up, but we do feel that the Federal Government is obligated to our area. They have forced us into so many situations.

Another question that has run through the taxpayers of Rivers and the area is who would pay the bills that would remain? Take care of the taxes in the town. Who pays the bills for the hospital? The two new schools that we have built? Because of the fact that we have personnel from the air base attending our schools we have been forced to build larger schools. We would be left with the payments of these schools. The town has a beautiful new town building and complex of firehall, library, etcetera in it. We wonder who would be left with the bill for this. We have a senior citizen's home. We have four new churches - or five I should say. It wasn't the citizens of Rivers that built these churches on their own. The churches prior to that possibly weren't nice churches when we compare them to the churches we have today, but they were churches that were suitable to the people. But when we had people moving in, maybe ten, twenty families in each church that were people from the air base and they said, "Let's build a church," and they showed us their enthusiasm, they showed us their money, they showed us their volunteer labour, we built these churches; but there's still fifteen to twenty years to pay for most of them. Should that base close, once again we're stuck with the - or someone is stuck with the payments. Personally I think the town would be bankrupt; the area would probably never recover.

Now we have done some things to try and persuade the Federal Government that the air base should remain open and I would just give you a brief rundown on what we have done.

(MR. DAWSON cont'd).....My Leader, the Member from Ste. Rose, has made a trip to Ottawa on behalf of the Rivers area. Myself, the mayor of Rivers and another delegate made a trip to Ottawa on behalf of that base. The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Urban Development has made a trip to Ottawa on behalf of that base. She went down for exploratory talks and reported back to us that it looked very much like Manitoba would lose one of its bases and she gathered, like so many others of us did, that the finger was pointing at Rivers. The First Minister has written a number of letters on our behalf to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Defence in regards to the air base. We have had no satisfaction. We have been told there is no thought of closing the air base in 1967. But we that live in that area know differently. There are people slowly disappearing from there and they're not being replaced. So this is causing an uneasy feeling in the entire area. The merchants that have hardware stores that sell paint have told me they sold no paint last year. They haven't sold anything for home improvements because everyone is wondering where they go to tomorrow. The people are uneasy. They're worrying continually and you can't blame them.

We feel that we have an argument in so much as they tell us that Manitoba should lose one of its bases. It already has five. But we don't believe that in our area or I'm sure that members on that side of the House don't believe it either. We feel that all the defence money is spent down east. We don't get contracts for munitions, to make fridges for the homes that are out there, make aircraft parts, or anything. You name it, it's made down east. All the defence contracts are down east. Millions of dollars are spent there. Some of the largest bases in Canada are down east. So we feel in that area that we're justified; we feel that the Federal Government is obligated to us and we feel that we would like this House to go on record that you adopt the resolution as I have proposed unanimously.

.....continued on next page

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Russell; the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in amendment thereto; the proposed motion of the Honourable Member of Brokenhead in further amendment thereto. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I may have this stand.

MR. SPEAKER: After all that effort. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface; the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of my colleague the Honourable Member for Selkirk who will be speaking on behalf of our party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my Leader for adjourning the debate on my behalf and I am sorry that the First Minister is not in his seat as I have certain remarks that I would like to address to him in particular.

Now it would be a cliché to state, Mr. Speaker, that history repeats itself or that politics makes strange bedfellows, but this is exactly what has happened here. From 1950 to 1957 the First Minister always supported the resolution on the reduction of the voting age to some age between 18 to 21. Now when the First Minister took over as Government Leader in 1957 he took a different approach - as a matter of fact his approach from 1957 up until 1967 was purely negative - his government voted against it - he took no stand on the matter at all other than to turn it down. Now he takes an entirely different position and we find that by his amendment he is not now prepared to take the same stand which he took when he was in the opposition and while he was Leader of the Opposition, but he resorts to what lawyers call "confession and avoidance" by bringing in an amendment which in my opinion is a sheer stall. Now this change of heart on the part of the First Minister is very interesting to me, for while I was on the government side of the House I took a similar position and at that time the Honourable First Minister who was Leader of the Opposition opposed the position that I took, and I can recall very vividly the way I was trounced "Under the Dome" by Mike Best for the position and stand that I took then. But frankly at that time I sincerely and conscientiously believed that we were dealing with a package deal and that to reduce the voting age in Manitoba was not sufficient, we should do all other things at the same time. And I would like to read from the speech that I made - I think that it was in 1954 - which clearly set up my position, and I think in substance fairly well is the same position which the First Minister is now taking.

I said this: "for the purpose of this resolution only I am willing to admit the truth of every statement and argument made in advance by both honourable members who have spoken, but in spite of this admission I am not prepared to support this resolution for the simple reason that even if this House did pass it and did subsequently amend the Election Act by lowering the voting age in Manitoba to 19, or any other age below 21, we would be unable to assure to young people of that age the right to vote." The explanation for the above is quite simple, eligibility to vote being based on age, a qualification which we can regulate, and on naturalization, a matter which is entirely within federal jurisdiction, if therefore we lower the age limit we only overcome one of these hurdles and still have to overcome the hurdle of citizenship and unless the federal government lowered the age at which a youth in his own right could apply for citizenship to correspond at whatever age under 21 we place our eligibility, we would be unable to achieve in its fullest sense that which we would seek to achieve by such an amendment. At the present moment a youth under 21 years of age can only become naturalized through its father but if that youth is an orphan or if his father is denied citizenship through being a bad security risk or by reason of conviction for an indictable offence, that youth would be denied the right to vote until such time as he could apply in his own right for naturalization.

I further feel in spite of what the honourable mover of the resolution has said that it is

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd).... inconsistent with citizenship for a citizen to be under any legal disability, statutory or otherwise. At the present moment an infant is a person under the age of 21 years of age and I respectfully suggest that if we are going to lower the age of eligibility of voting to 19 or any other age under 21 years, we must recognize that we are doing so on the assumption that a youth at that age has reached maturity, and this being so we must recognize the necessity of removing from his legal status all disabilities at present suffered or enjoyed by him. If we simply lower the age limit without effecting these other changes in the law we would in Manitoba have the paradox of an elector, (1) who could not contract freely; (2) who could not make a will; (3) who could not sue or be sued, except in certain specified instances, without the observance of certain conditions precedent; (4) who could not vote at a municipal election, run for municipal office or stand as a candidate for election to this legislative assembly, in spite of the fact that he could vote for another candidate; (5) who would be under disabilities under our new Liquor Control Act; (6) who could not do a lot of other things and matters too numerous to mention.

The honourable mover of this resolution says that we need not remove any of these disabilities, but my answer to that is this, you are going to give that youth a vote, you are going to give him the right to tell you what changes he would like to have effected in the laws of our province and that doing so why not face the issue squarely and make a real job of one fell sweep. The fact that Saskatchewan only changed the voting age without any corresponding changes in its law is no reason why we should adopt the same expedients here. If in my opinion we lower the age limit for voting in this province, such a lowering must be predicated on the premise that youth of that age has reached sufficient maturity to vote and this being so why should that youth be under any disability, statutory or otherwise by the laws of our province. I think that this is a matter in which we should act in cooperation with federal authorities and I would suggest that the Honourable Attorney-General make representations to the Minister of Justice at Ottawa with a view to exploring the possibilities of lowering the age at which a person under 21 can in his own name apply for naturalization. I would also suggest that this whole subject in all its ramifications be gone into very thoroughly as I consider that this is a matter of vital importance to the welfare of our province and one which should not be disposed of or treated lightly.

That was the position that I took back in 1954. For three years following, on three different occasions following that, my leader who was then the Premier of this province took up the question with Ottawa but he was unable to get to first base with Ottawa respecting any changes being made in the Federal Election Act and as a consequence nothing further was done. In 1957 when it became perfectly evident to me that we could not do anything in co-operation with Ottawa that Ottawa was unwilling to co-operate with us, I changed my mind and decided that I'd be a horse trader, that I would agree to the voting age in Manitoba being reduced to 18 years, and take a chance on having the other changes effected at a later date. Now during that time, the First Minister who was then in the opposition and who became Leader of the Opposition - that is during the period from 1950 to 1957 - he took a stand, a very definite stand on lowering the voting age in Manitoba - and the journals of this House will show that on every occasion that that came to a vote in this House he voted for the lowering of the voting age. Now when he became Premier of this province, for what reason I don't know, but for a while there it was a negative stand that he took. I'm sorry I...

MR. ROBLIN: You were right in the first instance.

MR. MOLGAT: The statement was absolutely correct.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I didn't intend to make it that way anyway but that's the way it came out. I don't know for what reason the Honourable First Minister changed his mind regarding the lowering of the voting age, but if it was on account of the fact that he felt that he had more responsibility or he felt that there was other things that should accompany such a lowering, nevertheless he did do it.

Now as far as I'm concerned I'm not prepared to wait 13 years on this being achieved. I think that we should have some evidence of good faith and good will on the part of the government, and what I would suggest is this, that while we are making representations to Ottawa, while we are holding committee meetings to decide what we will do regarding the status of youth in this province, removing the obligations of the disabilities under which youth is or taking such other action as maybe necessary, but what we should do in the meantime to show good faith is to immediately enact legislation in this province reducing the voting age in a provincial election to 18 years; and as a consequence I wish to move, seconded by the

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd).... Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "appropriate" in the fourth line of the first operative paragraph thereof the following, namely: "But that in the meantime and as of evidence of sincerity and good faith the Government of Manitoba take immediate steps to lower the voting age within the aforesaid limits for the election of members to this assembly."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker I was up on my feet quite a while back. I don't know - your glasses must be foggy today, I guess.

MR. SPEAKER: Don't tempt me. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: I wish to adjourn debate, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by....

MR. HARRIS: Wait! -(Interjection)-

MR. SPEAKER: I know, I heard the first time. I'm thinking.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I presume that the voice vote that was held is cancelled. Is that correct?

MR. LYON: Didn't call it.

MR. SPEAKER: That's what I was thinking about. The Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the hour now having arrived at which it was suggested by the honourable members opposite that we adjourn, I am pleased to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until Monday afternoon at 2: 30 P. M.