

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 28, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

Before we proceed, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my right where we have 36 students of Grade 11 Standing from the Neepawa Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Cox and Mr. Bray. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa.

On my left we have 24 members of the 91st Cub pack under the direction of Cub Master Mrs. Guile. Also on my left we have 24 members of the Cougar Cub Pack under the direction of Cub Master Jones, and also on my left we have 14 of the 44th Cub Pack under the direction of Cub Master Mrs. Empy. On behalf of the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable the Attorney-General if he has that question which I asked him last week in his desk.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I have. I hope my honourable friend will permit me to read it because the answer is at some length and I think my honourable friend would like to have the benefit of the views of the law officers of the Crown on it.

The original question was: Is it the policy of the Crown in the right of Manitoba, as openly expressed in court by your Crown attorneys, in criminal cases to refuse to submit for the perusal of defence counsel, written statements made by complainants as a basis for laying, or in the course of an investigation into, a criminal charge?

I should add that I had the answer the other day but the honourable member was not in his place and I deferred it until he was in his seat.

The law officers for the Crown advise as follows: The right to cross-examine a witness on a previous statement is contained in section 10 of the Canada Evidence Act, which reads as follows:

"10. (1) Upon any trial a witness may be cross-examined as to previous statements made by him in writing, or reduced to writing, relative to the subject-matter of the case, without such writing being shown to him; but, if it is intended to contradict the witness by the writing, his attention must, before such contradictory proof can be given, be called to those parts of the writing that are to be used for the purpose of so contradicting him; the judge, at any time during the trial, may require the production of the writing for his inspection, and thereupon make such use of it for the purposes of the trial as he thinks fit."

It should be noted that section 10 of the Canada Evidence Act confers no right upon a party or his counsel to require the production of a witness' prior written statement. It merely gives the trial judge power in his discretion to require the production thereof for inspection by himself. The authority for this is *The Queen versus Tousignant* 38 C.R. 319. This was a decision of the British Columbia Court of Appeal. The Court stated that "the intent of this section is to give the judge power to examine and inspect the statement." If the trial judge is satisfied that the statement contains inconsistencies, then it is within his discretion to order that the statement be given to defence counsel and to be used for the purpose of cross-examination.

It has also been held, however, that where a police officer uses a police report to refresh his memory in court, this report should be produced for the use of the accused's counsel for the purpose of cross-examination pursuant to section 10 of the Canada Evidence Act. The same obviously applies to a witness refreshing his memory by looking at his written statement.

Our Crown attorneys are aware of the provisions of section 10 and of the *Tousignant* case. They have, however, been instructed to voluntarily produce any statement where there is a patent inconsistency between the evidence given under oath and a statement made at a prior time by the witness.

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

Insofar as preliminary inquiries are concerned, there are two cases which hold that a preliminary inquiry is not a trial and that therefore section 10 of the Canada Evidence Act does not apply. Therefore there is no authority which would make it mandatory for a Crown attorney to tender such statements to defence counsel for examination and use, but the same general practice as indicated above is followed.

I am therefore advised that there is really no policy as suggested by the Honourable Member for Selkirk nor have any instructions ever been given to that effect. It is, however, a general practice not to provide counsel with copies of statements made by complainants in criminal prosecutions, except as above qualified.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Thank you for your statement and I would like to ask a supplementary question. Do you not consider that it is contrary to what should be the basic concept of criminal justice, namely, the ascertaining of the truth, to withhold from defence counsel, even at a preliminary hearing, a statement which might be contradictory to the evidence given by a witness as part of the Crown's case?

MR. LYON:want to make a comment on a specific circumstance in the light of this rather complex opinion that I have just given.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to place on the table of the House a return to an Order of the House No. 50 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Neepawa-Gladstone made March 14, 1967, and a return to an Order of the House No. 57 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone-Neepawa made March 16th, 1967.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, I would like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Agriculture. I understood that when the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission was set up two or three years ago - and incidentally it is doing a very good job - but there was to be a vote within two years after its establishment. I understand now that the Hog Marketing Commission intends to proceed with new facilities and new administrative offices in St. Boniface, and the question is of course, do they intend to hold the referendum or vote prior to proceeding to build the facilities or not?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, we'll take the question as notice.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Provincial Treasurer or the Premier. When can we expect copies of the Gilson report of the study on the use of purple gas? The resolution has now been given to us but we don't have the study.

MR. ROBLIN: Pretty soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Monsieur le Président, il me fait plaisir de féliciter chaleureusement le Cercle Molière qui vient encore cette année de remporter des beaux succès au festival général.

Mr. Speaker, the Cercle Moliere of St. Boniface again this year achieved marked success at the regional festival held just lately. Their play, Bousille Et Les Justes, of the French Canadian author Gratien Gelinas, won the best overall production of the festival. Mr. Gilles Guyot, the producer, who had previously been awarded the Canadian Drama Award for 1966, has received the best actor award and Miss Carmelle LeGal the best supporting actress. It should be noted that there was no special award given to the best actress but two to the best supporting actresses, and she received one of them. Also, the Manitoba Annual Corporation presented a \$1,000 cheque to the Cercle Moliere to encourage them in their good work. I think that we have been very fortunate to have a troupe such as the Cercle Moliere who started quite a few years ago, and we have had Mr. and Mrs. Boutal connected with them and now younger people such as Mr. Guyot, and I think that they are doing an awful lot to promote understanding between the different groups.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly, as usual, particularly on the first part of the proposed motion, the names of all advertising or public relations firms who have been employed or retained by the Manitoba Government relative to the sales tax, education tax, or revenue tax.

Mr. Speaker, as our Leader pointed out yesterday, it seems hard to understand why the government of the day would ask the taxpayers to use money, taxpayers' money, to try and inform the people why they have to pay more taxes. This to me seems unbelievable. Our Leader has also pointed out that if the government would see fit to allow this Bill to go to Law Amendments it would get all the free advertising in this world. There would be no doubt about it. As it is, the MLAs on this side of the House, I am sure, are prepared to do all the advertising that is necessary, and I for one in Birtle-Russell will have no trouble informing everybody why and what they are going to do with this money.

I have tried to refrain in the past from being overly critical as I have often pointed out it is not my way of doing business, but, Mr. Speaker, this to me is the most ill-advised political suggestion that this government has ever had. It's the most unwarranted waste of money; it's the most unwanted waste of money; and it's the most unnecessary waste of money. I find it most difficult to believe that this government would see fit to spend - and I'd like to know how much, we will when we get the Return - but I dare say thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money to inform the people of Manitoba that they are going to have to pay 5% sales tax and what they are going to do with it. Do they intend to use the television, a smartly dressed advertising executive talking to some poor little fellow who is going to finance a \$1,000 automobile and tell him why instead of paying the \$1,000 plus the 10 or 15% finance charges that he is going to have to pay another 5% sales tax? I don't believe that this is feasible, and quite frankly, if they would accept my suggestion they would forget about this. This is utterly out of all rhyme or reason. I am sure there is not a person in the province who is not aware of this.

I know from being in business that any large manufacturer, whether it be the automobile people or the implement people, the last thing they would do is spend a fortune in advertising to tell people their product was going up. But if it was the other way - and I just happened to look through the paper this morning briefly - one of our large stores in town has a full page of advertising, and what does it tell? The ordinary price of a small article here is \$3.50; the sale price \$1.75. This is terrific, I can understand it, but what would the people say if the ordinary price was \$1.50 and we are now going to charge you \$3.50? Wouldn't this boomerang? I am sure it would.

The automobile business, which I am fully familiar with and I know the First Minister is, he knows what happens when the automobile people are advertising. Look here: wholesale - stop, look and listen - wholesale. If you want a good buy, it's here. All sorts of gimmicks to get people to come in and buy cars because they are going to save money, but I can't fathom what kind of advertising is going to make people feel happy to pay this sales tax. It just doesn't add up.

Yesterday the Honourable Member from St. John's - he had an excellent suggestion - he suggested that the government backbenchers have enough courage to stand up and be counted and tell the people why this little man has to pay this extra charge for his car, and I suggest to you fellows in the back that you do this, because if you don't do some of these things, I'll tell you right now a few of you won't be around here after the next election.

Now what about -- would it take an advertising agency to tell the voters of the 19 of the 33 divisions who voted against the single-district school that they're going to have to pay a five percent sales tax without receiving an upward revision of the school grants? I was kind of hoping the Minister of Education would be looking and would give me the wink that maybe we're going to get it.

Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to believe that this government who is in as much trouble with the people of the rural parts of Manitoba, plus the cities, would be foolish enough to hire an advertising agency, and probably one out of the province - probably, I don't know - to put over the idea or justify the idea of a sales tax to the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the people know there's going to be a sales tax and I suggest they know why. The

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd)....estimates on Welfare have gone from 29 to 34 million; there's another five million dollars this government needs. Education is up from 83 to 119 - there's another 26 million. Mind you, if the school divisions that didn't vote for it don't get their money, perhaps we won't need all this, but then I hope they do get some of it.

This is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to the members of the Roblin Government that if they honestly believe this sales tax is necessary - and I'm sure at least some of them do - that they accept the responsibility, go out to the public themselves and sell this idea, and not by using the taxpayers' money by paying it out to some advertising agency. This is almost, from a business point of view - mind you, I've spoke out before that I'm not a politician and maybe I don't see what'll happen - but from a business point of view it just wouldn't add up. The Canada Pension Plan - we're giving the people something. And what are you doing? Charging them something. Put that in your pipe and smoke it.

Mr. Speaker, I understand from the grapevine that on the evening of March 10th last that the First Minister of this Legislature had some harsh words to say and there were some pretty flushed faces when the returns were coming in from this last election, and I suggest, Sir, that if the First Minister is around, and I hope to be around when the returns are coming in from the next provincial election, there'll be more than flushed faces and heated words; there'll have to be a few crying towels around.

MR. ROBLIN: Don't let your imagination run away with you.

MR. CLEMENT: Well, it's the first time it's happened, Mr. First Minister, and I feel quite proud that at least I've got you to acknowledge that I'm around here.

Mr. Speaker, we have one member in our Party that can get under your skin; I didn't really want to be another one.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, if there is any truth in this government's point of view that they have hired an advertisement agency to sell this sales tax, Mr. Speaker, I say it is wrong; I predict the taxpayers will say it is wrong; and I predict the voters will say it is wrong. It is wrong, wrong, wrong! Three wrongs don't make a right, and I'm looking forward to the night of the next election.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that the debate be adjourned.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend would permit, I would be glad to offer a few remarks before the debate is adjourned.

Well, I can add a fourth wrong and that's the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell. He.....aloud and he spluttered away but he didn't say anything that bore on the point, because it isn't what you don't know that gets you into trouble, it's what you know for sure that isn't so, and the fact is the Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell based their entire case on something that just simply isn't so, and I would like to offer a few remarks on this proposal. Incidentally, I propose to vote for the motion. I think it is perfectly proper information for the House to have and I propose to vote for the motion when it comes to the vote.

The tax affects the buying public and it affects the vendors. There are 20 to 24 thousand people in retail stores - 20 to 24 thousand retail outlets in this province that are going to have to carry out some fairly complex duties with respect to this tax and they can't do it without information. My honourable friends across there have been trying to establish in front of the public that the purpose of this advertising will be to sell the sales tax or to tell them that there is a sales tax. Nonsense! Surely no one with the slightest sense of reality could think that an advertising campaign would either be necessary for that or would accomplish the purpose. We must put information, particularly in front of the vendors, which is of rather complex nature --(Interjection)-- if my honourable friend will keep quiet I will finish my address and then he may have his chance to speak if he wishes to. But there's rather complex information that must be put in front of these vendors with complete accuracy, and my honourable friend really hasn't had to wrestle with the kind of thing that I've had to wrestle with, and that is to take the kind of language that is provided to me by a combination of lawyers and tax experts and try to make it intelligible to the ordinary people in a completely accurate way.

MR. ROBLIN: To make it intelligible even to a car dealer.

MR. EVANS: And it all depends I think -- there's no use having a good pitcher unless you have an adequate catcher. But this information must be understood by a great variety of people in the Province of Manitoba, and when I tell my honourable friend that the information has to be conveyed to people in as many as 12 languages, he may wonder why I don't agree that

(MR. EVANS cont'd).....some casual debate in the House, mostly initiated by the Opposition, is an adequate base upon which to convey information to the many kinds of people we have in Manitoba, at the many levels of education, and speaking in their home language - up to 12 different languages in the Province of Manitoba.

So there are complexities to this matter. I see in my friend's eyes over there, he's beginning to realize there's more to this than he thought there was, and we are going to need every means of modern communication to convey the kind of information that first the public must have; and second, the vendors. Make up your minds. Do you believe that the public and the vendors should be informed about this sales tax or don't you? The burden of all the comments that I've heard in the sales tax debate and the amendments to it have been: "Why don't you inform the public?" Now I hear that we are to be denied some means of informing the public in another attempt to hamper and harass the government which is now verging on obstruction and irresponsible -- it's obstruction of the government in carrying out its announced policy and the policy for which it is responsible to the people and as announced in the budget, and I don't propose to deny myself the modern means of communication to get the information across to the public and to the vendors that they must have.

The government is often accused on many grounds of not keeping in touch with the people, not affording information to the people, and in many respects I'm inclined to agree. I think in many respects the information services and the kind of information and the degree with which we lay our information before the public is probably lacking. Certainly we have not kept pace in technique with businesses and with other institutions, and I propose to make that good by providing the public in Manitoba with the information that I think they should have.

I have heard that parliamentary reporting will do it. Well I say it won't. I say in conveying the kind of information to the vendors and to the public, it would be too much to ask the parliamentary reporters, who have after all only so much space, to put into their columns the kind of tabular material worked out with complete legal and accounting accuracy in a way that would be a proper guide to a vendor or to a person in the ordinary public in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act. So I propose to have control of the text that appears in the public to convey information to the people who must use this information to carry out their responsibilities under the Act.

Well, what kind of information is necessary? It's necessary to say with complete accuracy what the exemptions will be, to describe them in such a way that the details are given. I have a complete 8 1/2 by 11 sheet of paper, single spaced, which sets out the details of what children's clothing consists of. That would not be picked up in casual debate and put to the public and announced to the vendors in that way. There will be many divisions in drugs and health appliances, some of which will be taxable and some of which will not be taxable. We have to inform the vendors in clear-cut language exactly what their responsibilities are and the means for carrying them out, and where they should go for additional information and matters of this kind. It's only fair to them. They are being required to act as agents of the Treasury in collecting a tax, according to the Bill, and it is only right that I should assume responsibility for the text of any information service that is put in front of them. And I propose to assume that responsibility and to provide them with the kind of information that they should have.

When the regulations are eventually passed by -- if this Act passes the House -- when the regulations eventually are passed by an Order-in-Council, and there are no regulations until an Order-in-Council is passed, I propose to see that they are distributed suitably. I do not believe it will be necessary to send to every class of person all of the regulations. I think it's more important to send certain classes of information to those, shall we say, in the drug trade, certain other regulations to others who may be in the farm implement trade or the farm supply business, and others to food stores and so on. This is a government responsibility to get selective information into the hands of the people who require it and I propose to take it up and to avail myself of a very ordinary common or garden means available to every business and institution - and they all use it - placing information in the public press and by other media. This, after all, is only one part of a fairly substantial information system that is being set up within the Taxation Branch to cover these requirements.

In the first place, my honourable friends already know that we set up a battery of telephones the morning after the tax was announced in the House to begin to receive telephone calls. Well, how did the people know the number to call? There was an ad put in the paper.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): By an advertising agency?

MR. EVANS: The Ag Reps are going to assist us to arrange a series of seminars in the country, particularly for retail outlets, for those who sell the goods, and it will be announced in regional meetings in the press where these meetings take place. There will be advertisements placed to tell the storekeepers where they can go if they wish to attend a seminar to understand what their responsibilities are.

The Department of Mines and Resources will assist in this by acting as information officers, merely to have at hand a supply of literature to explain, either to the public or to the vendor, what their responsibilities are, and of course for that purpose pamphlets will be published and distributed in that way.

The regulations, when they are eventually passed, will be published in a flexible form - perhaps loose-leaf - because if experience in other provinces is duplicated, we will have a constant series of changes of the regulations to accommodate the differences of trade and the extraordinary cases that we find. I find in Ontario they had an Act of some 24 pages. The first year they published 29 pages of amendments to the regulations and by the end of the second year the total had grown to 95, so my honourable friends will see that we have something here that is not fixed and set from the beginning but something that must be adapted to conditions as we go along, and so the pamphlet and the regulations will be published and distributed.

There has been an extraordinary request for speakers to go around and explain to different associations the workings of the tax Act. These speakers will deal entirely in facts: information about the tax itself, its application, how it works, what is taxed, what is exempt, what are the responsibilities of vendors. All of the speakers will be dealing entirely in facts and there will be nothing that would be described as "selling the sales tax." I don't see how anybody could sell a sales tax; nobody wants to buy it. I don't really see how --(Interjection)-- no buyers. You could easily try to sell it, and if advertising would sell the sales tax, I'd buy up all the space you ever saw because that would be a very great advantage to me.

However, the speakers -- we will answer as many, and all I hope, of the requests that come to us for speakers to inform the public or the vendors about their responsibilities under this Act and how the tax will work. There will be a special section within my staff of people to help the small retailer who may not yet be familiar with such forms as we're going to ask him to fill out and the records we're going to ask him to keep. They will be trained especially to take care of the requirements of the small retailer sometimes, I hope affectionately, known as the 'Mama and Poppa' store, some of them not speaking English as fluently as they sometimes speak another language, and we will have a special staff within our - what we call compliance officer staff - to help them to comply with the requirements that are placed on them by the law. This is some part of the information and assistance and education machine that is being set up within the department to endeavour to continue with the problem of informing people, helping them and - not selling - because that is the farthest thing from my mind.

Well there is nothing new about a government taking paid advertising in a newspaper to publish instructions, information and regulations. It's done all the time. I do it in my other department all the time. How do you think we inform the fishermen about the commercial fishing regulations for example? Or how do you think we inform the public at once about the extension of a sport fishing regulation or tell them about the limits and the catch limits that there are per day or whatever the limits may be? We do it by paid advertising in the newspapers. How do you think we advise people about the hunting regulations or to publish tender calls, or indeed, as my honourable friends have seen, to advertise for people to join the sales tax staff. Advertisements have been in the paper right the way along. How do you think we attract these opportunities to people's minds and have them come in and apply for the jobs? Well of course we do it by advertising as every other government does. The government has no advertising department; that's why we hire an advertising agency. --(Interjection)-- I say advertising department; I didn't say public information department. I said advertising, and I think apparently from the debate here in the House on this question, I have to start with some pretty basic education of the honourable members opposite because they don't even know what an advertising department is. My honourable friend the farmer from Birtle-Russell nods his head. He sure doesn't know anything about it. He uses the most modern methods on his own farm. I've seen him flying around in a helicopter where he goes out and looks at his cattle. He avails himself of the most modern means out there but he wants to deny me the common or garden means for conveying information within my responsibility to the public.

Well, what does an advertising agency do? Well in the first place they select the media in which advertisements will be placed. I think my honourable friends will recognize when I

(MR. EVANS cont'd)....say that there are at least twelve language groups that I can think of who deserve to receive this information in the language in which they are most familiar; that there is some question of selection. We have to have geographical distribution across the province because every part of the province has to hear about it and we have to do it in the most effective and the most economical way.

Then there is a good science in choosing the position on the page and recommending the proper size for an advertisement to accomplish the purpose, to get notice, because an advertisement has to be noticed or it's no good at all. Second place, the position on the page, and we receive technical advice in that way. They draft the advertisement from the technical papers we hand to them and they go out and get the type set, either in the newspaper itself or very often elsewhere. The type is set; it has to be put out and proofed. They read the proofs; they do the translations for the foreign language newspapers and get those set in type and get the proofs and proofread them. Then eventually an advertising agency pays the bills and sends us one bill for the grand total and we pay them, but in the meantime they have financed the deal. They have done - and they do all those services - I have to allow myself a small margin here and not say absolutely, but they do those things by and large or in large measure for no direct charge to the government. They get a discount from the newspapers and the supply houses. They get a discount. The normal advertising agency is rewarded for its services by submitting the bill to the newspaper and taking a fifteen percent discount, and if the bill is paid within thirty days they get an extra two and a half percent discount, so their total is a seventeen and a half percent discount on the money that would otherwise go directly to the newspaper and it doesn't cost the client any money extra. I allowed myself a slight margin there because if there are additional requirements which are not the normal function of an advertising agency, possibly translation, possibly other matters of that kind, they might have to be added to the bill but they're not a big proportion of the bill.

Well, other governments use paid advertising. I wonder if I need to remind the Liberal Party that the Canada Pension Plan was advertised in full pages across the country. When? Just before the election. --(Interjection)-- And look who is talking at us. I should think that if you live in a glass house, Messrs. Liberals, you ought to be a little careful before you start throwing some stones around because there are just as big stones around on this side of the place and you'd better duck.

I'd like to also draw the attention of the honourable members to a current campaign that is on by the Income Tax Branch to draw attention to the fact that some changes have been made in the Income Tax Form and to help people to fill out their income tax forms. They're paying for the advertising. It's paid advertising put in the papers in exactly the same way that I propose. It's a service to the public. It's justified; it's the right thing to do. I approve of it and I'm going to copy it, and our people in Manitoba are going to have the same advantage, the same chance to follow the requirements of the Sales Tax Act as Ottawa is endeavouring to give them to fill out the requirements of the Income Tax Act.

I might tell you that -- there is one outstanding authority that has been mentioned in this House before, Professor John Due, who is regarded as the North American authority on sales tax, and he deals with this question of advertising. He deals with the program that was entered into in Nova Scotia and he not only commends them for a considerable effort in instructing the public, in providing them with information about the tax, but he recommends that everybody else do so as well, because how can you have a successful installation of a tax like this unless the people concerned know what it's all about.

Well, I have in the Department of the Treasury at this time what has been described - and I think it's true - the largest, perhaps the most complex administrative job to be started certainly within the period of time in question in Manitoba's history. We had to take and install in 20 to 24 thousand vendors a system and an understanding of the system which will enable them to carry out their responsibilities under the Act, and I have to do it by June 1st. Perhaps my honourable friends will understand why I have - not pressed the matter - but I have been asking for responsible consideration of my responsibilities on this side of the House in carrying out my duties to levy the taxes in Manitoba, to collect the money and to balance the budget, and I want to inform the House, in as low key as I can, that the time limit has now passed at which time my staff told me they could install this thing.

I have made changes in the administrative system which cut out a complete step, and I might say it has made it very awkward, but any further delay in this tax or any obstruction of

(MR. EVANS cont'd)....the tax will cost us three-quarters of a million dollars a week, and if my honourable friends across there want to impose that kind of thing on us by stretching out the debate, it's entirely possible for them to do so. Certainly I'm not in control of the House and I wouldn't have anything to say about -- no one is talking about forcing a measure through and all I'm trying to do is to lay some of my problems, if you will, in front of the House and tell you why I have been urging us to get ahead and stop playing games with the sales tax.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker, I just was going to ask the Minister a question or two, if I may. I must compliment him on rising to his feet and raising his voice and getting a little colour in his face. He has certainly added colour to this Legislature. --(Interjection)--All right, the question. What are the twelve languages we are going to advertise in; and secondly, I thought perhaps we had an advertising agency because there seems to be lots of propaganda coming out every week and surely we don't have to hire another one. And will they use the newspapers in our local media as much as possible?

MR. EVANS: Well, I'm disappointed to find that I've been unable to reach my honourable friend with my description of what an advertising agency is. He holds up something put out by the Information Section of the Department of the Provincial Secretary and describes that as an advertising agency. I might as well have saved my breath. He has said that he cannot understand and I really grasp that there are a good many things beyond the intellectual grasp of my honourable friend. If he wants to know a list of the twelve languages in which it is proposed we put advertising, I'll provide him with it. If he wishes them in the House publicly, he can put in an Order for Return, otherwise they will be provided to him privately.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Could he describe to the House how the people of Manitoba are going to lose three-quarters of a million dollars a week if the sales tax is not implemented or if there is any delay in implementing it?

MR. EVANS: Because if we are not able to begin collections on the first of June and had to postpone it until the eighth of June, that will be \$750,000 for the first week and so on from there.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the question I asked him is: how are the people of Manitoba going to lose three-quarters of a million dollars because this is the inference that he left, that it would cost the people of Manitoba three-quarters of a million. Would he explain that?

MR. EVANS: If the honourable member wants to fall back on a play on words he can do so. It shows the weakness of his case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the Provincial Treasurer spoke and did not permit the debate to be adjourned by myself because a lot of the things that he did say were matters which concerned me greatly and which I think justified this Order for Return.

I would indicate, Mr. Speaker, that this debate, I believe, has been prompted by the following question and answer. Mr. Molgat, Leader of the Opposition, on page 1798 of Hansard: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. Is it correct that the government has employed a firm of public relations or advertising people to sell the sales tax to the people of Manitoba?" And then the answer: "Mr. Speaker, we're receiving assistance from an advertising agency in preparing our advertising."

Now I don't think that the Provincial Treasurer adopted the words that were used by the Leader of the Opposition in answering the question, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, he left a certain amount of misgiving on this side of the House as to whether the government being in a position of difficulty in selling their program to the people of Manitoba in the Legislature sought to employ an advertising agency to sell their program in the Province of Manitoba by means of using the public revenue to do this. I'm glad that the Minister clarified what is intended, but I think that he should recognize some responsibility for having initiated this debate by the answer that he gave. I don't think that he sufficiently negated the suggestion that there was to be a sale or an attempt to sell the sales tax in the Province of Manitoba.

I also appreciate the fact that the Provincial Treasurer appears to realize that any attempt to sell the sales tax would be a most unproductive enterprise. I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we recognize, or we would feel, that any attempt by a government in power to sell their political programs through the expenditure of public funds would be one of the most flagrant abuses of the democratic process imaginable. If the government wishes to sell the

(MR. GREEN cont'd)....sales tax program to the people of Manitoba, they should do so through the funds collected by the Progressive Conservative Party and not by the funds which they receive from the people of the Province of Manitoba.

The program that the Minister has indicated is a program which, from his description of it, would be necessary for the implementation of this tax, and if they do proceed with it, certainly they will have to give information. We would like to caution the government that we feel that there is a fine line between what has been suggested and an attempt to sell their program, that where it is necessary to give information that this is justifiable, but that any attempt at using public funds to try to make this tax palatable would be an abuse of their position in government and we've seen this type of abuse. I know that when I was on Metro Council that one of the things that Metro did was to complain through the "Take-One", the imposition by this government of the tax on the gasoline used by the transit buses. At that time I objected, though fully in sympathy with the fact that the government should not be taxing Metro buses, I objected to us spending money to sell what was patently a political program of the Metropolitan Councillors, that is that the Provincial Government shouldn't be taxing us. And the most flagrant abuse that I have ever seen - and I'm glad that the Minister pointed this out - was what occurred during the Federal Election Campaign in 1965. I don't think that the one-page advertisements appearing weekly previous to the election campaign, published by the Liberal government ostensibly giving information regarding the Canada Pension Plan, but blatantly an attempt to sell the Liberal Party to the Canadian people by the use of public funds. This was another such example.

Now I suggest to the government that they are treading on dangerous waters, that the Order for Return is justified by the answer that the Provincial Treasurer gave, and that when dealing with this matter that they be very judicious in making sure that what they do is disseminate the information that is necessary for the implementation of the tax and not try to sell that tax to the people of Manitoba with their own money.

MR. EVANS: Would my honourable friend permit me just one question. Would he inform me of means that might be used to make the sales tax palatable?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we've been trying to inform the Honourable Minister that the sales tax is not palatable and I agree with him that any attempt to do so would be a very unproductive endeavour. That's not the reason I'm suggesting that they don't spend money. I'm suggesting that they don't spend money in trying to do this because it is wrong; it is contrary to the principles of democratic government that they do this. Even if it was saleable, I would suggest that they not do it.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, earlier on I had more or less intended to adjourn debate on the motion that is before us in order to discuss it more fully, but after listening to the Honourable Minister give certain explanations, I feel that I should make my comments at this time.

To me, it always seems that a public relations job is a two-way street, not just one of telling the people something and leaving it at that, but I think we should have their ideas as well. I think this is what we were after when we tried to put forward the amendment to the tax bill that this should be discussed in Law Amendments Committee so that we would hear as to what they had to say and so that we could consider these matters that they would be bringing forward and making use of them, putting them to advantage.

However, we see now that the government is afraid to face the public and that they now want to do their advertising through the papers, giving it a one-sided view. Certainly I would be interested to get sample copies of the ads that were mentioned here as creative ideas. I certainly would appreciate getting copies of these later on to take a thorough look at them. Then I would also think that if I got a portion of those funds to do some advertising, I certainly could tell the people in Manitoba how to get away with less taxes and not more taxes. Surely we have ways and means of bringing about less cost in government and not always heaping it on more and more. Certainly if we spent a small amount of that we could inform the people much better.

HON. J.B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare)(The Pas): Like you did with the school vote.

MR. FROESE: Yes, and I think I was more effective than you were with all your thousands of dollars that you people spent, and I think I could do a much better job than you people can.

Then the other point I think is that if we can save the people of Manitoba three-quarters of a million dollars per week by prolonging debate, I think we should stay in Session all year

(MR. FROESE cont'd).....and not have the people pay the sales tax. I think this is a good thing for Manitoba that we delay it.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I was amused to note how the Honourable Member for Rhineland hadn't been listening to what the Provincial Treasurer said about the purpose, and I for one, like the Honourable Member for Inkster, am prepared to accept his statement, with the caveat that all of us are going to look carefully at the nature of the advertising that is presented so that we can find justification for the purpose of it as he defined, and certainly I don't see how any one can quarrel with the purpose. There is, as the Honourable Member for Inkster said, a fine line, but it is one which is an important line and which must be watched, and which certainly the Liberals in Ottawa went way overboard in the advertising of the Canada Pension Plan.

It has been said that there was insufficient explanatory advertising of the school division referendum, and I think there is some justification in that since people did not understand what was really intended there and people were dealing with actually the sales tax, which brings me to the reason that brought me to my feet, and that is the fact that we stated clearly that the sales tax was one of the reasons that the school division referendum failed, but I want to assure the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that although it is difficult to sell the sales tax in principle, one of the major troubles with this type of taxation is that once imposed it is very easy to maintain because the people paying the tax overlook the fact that they are paying tax, even though they are reminded of it daily, but don't realize the extent of the impact of that tax, and unfortunately it is accepted much too readily and without a proper appreciation of the taxpayer of the burden placed on him. I wish it were possible to make sure that in this form of informational advertising which the Minister pictured, that he could remind the people in a positive manner that this tax is imposed in such a way as to be a continuing burden on them, and especially on those in lower income groups. I suppose that would be too much to expect from the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, and yet I think it is a bit of information which is valid and which ought to be passed on.

I think also we should comment that his accusations of obstructionism I think are completely unfair. I think very few days have passed by without someone in opposition speaking on this question of sales tax. I would suggest that there would have been a great deal of debate saved had the very man, who accused this side of obstruction, stood up and answered so many of the questions that were asked of him, and he had ample opportunity to do so and still has, without closing debate.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order at this point, my opportunity to reply on the subject matter of the sales tax is confined to my reply to the second reading. My honourable friend has commented on whether or not as to why I said something about obstruction. There was one speech from each of the Opposition parties which did not justify an adjournment of the House.

MR. CHERNIACK: I respect the Honourable Minister's knowledge and experience in the field of rules of the House, but certainly he must agree that he has the right to speak on every amendment and there is the second one before us now. He has had ample opportunity, and assuming that he is not the only one with all the knowledge on the government side on the question of sales tax, he certainly ought to have people there amongst the 30 of them, or the 29 excluding his own ability, who would be able to answer so many of the attacks - more than attacks - so many of the questions that concerned so many of us and which have been repeated for want of clarification. So I for one do not accept his explanation. Maybe it's one that satisfies him, and that's of course important for him, but there are 29 others who had every opportunity to deal with these questions and clarify them so as to reduce the number of questions and statements that come from this side of the House.

MR. EVANS:my honourable friend is slightly misrepresenting.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if we are not getting away from the theme of the

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, you are absolutely right. We got away with it the moment that the Honourable the Minister started talking about obstruction.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am merely bringing it to the attention, not only of the Honourable Member for St. John's but also the Provincial Treasurer. I am appealing to both that we get back to the resolution as stated.

MR. CHERNIACK: I accept your belated interruption, Mr. Speaker, and I will certainly close by saying that the explanation as to the nature of the advertising is one which I think should

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd).....be acceptable, but I think that we all should watch carefully, as it is our duty to do, that the advertising does not go beyond the bounds of his own restrictions as to the nature of them. I would welcome from him a further continuing explanation to the people of Manitoba that they are being taxed some \$33 million this year, some \$44 million in the following year, on the basis of this calculation on a sales tax, which is one which is hurting those who are least able to pay.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, the only reason that I am prompted to speak on the Order for Return at this time is that I know full well that we will not get the Return at this Session of the Legislature. There is no doubt but that this is one of the Orders for Return that will not be.....

MR. EVANS: You are wrong again.

MR. SHOEMAKER: He has assured me that we will. How can he, Mr. Speaker, because a lot of the information that is asked for here will not be determined until the whole program of selling the 5% sales tax has been concluded, as I read it.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, what has prompted me more than anything else, I think, to speak on this Order is the remarks that my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer made to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. In fact he and the First Minister, and a lot of the other front benchers opposite, were apparently surprised at some of the remarks and attacks that the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell had levelled at the members across the way, and I want to say this, that if the government would operate their business on the same sound principles and the same sound management as my honourable friend from Birtle-Russell operates his, there would be no complaints from this side of the House. If there is a person in this House that knows how to run a business -- if there is a person in this House that knows how to run a business.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am sure the honourable gentleman heard my words a few moments ago addressed to the Honourable Member for St. John's and the Provincial Treasurer. I wonder if he too would come back to the motion that we are discussing in order that the House's business may proceed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Very well, I think I got the point across anyway on that one, Mr. Speaker.

But another question that was raised by my honourable friend - and surely I'll be permitted to talk on the same subject matter as the Provincial Treasurer talked on - but one of the points that he was trying to make was this, that the Federal Government had spent a lot of money advertising the Canada Pension Plan, and by that token there was nothing wrong at all with this government spending a lot of money advertising this sales tax and promoting it. Two wrongs does not make a right, and I don't care whether it was the Liberals, the Conservatives, the NDP or the Creditistes who started the whole campaign, it's wrong. It's still wrong. My honourable -- (Interjection) -- well the pronunciation's wrong, but can you comprehend the import of what I'm trying to say? That's the main thing, that two wrongs does not make a right. I don't care what Party starts it; it's still wrong.

Now someone has suggested - the Honourable Member for St. John's - that it wasn't palatable. It certainly isn't palatable. You can pour all the sugar on it and all the cream on it you like and it's still not going to be very tasty - the five percent sales tax - I can tell you that, and it's no wonder that my honourable friends are going to have to spend a lot of money advertising it. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this was the first time that I heard members opposite even suggest that it wasn't popular. My honourable friend said he would like to know of new techniques that might make it more palatable. He is admitting by that statement that it isn't - that it isn't palatable. But I'll tell you what would be helpful to me, if some of the members of the backbench would get up and tell me how are they going about selling this five percent sales tax to the people in their areas because I am not getting along very well, I'll admit, and if some of them would just get up - a dozen of them or more - maybe we would find new ways and means of selling this program to the people of Manitoba. Maybe they're pouring on a little more cream.

MR. SPEAKER: I must sincerely appeal to all honourable members to assist me with the business of the House. The honourable gentleman will persist in leaving the meaning of this Order that we're discussing, this Order for Return, and I appeal to him most sincerely to stay with it, if he will, in order that we can get along with the business of the House, and that applies to all members of the House.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was just trying to find out some new techniques for selling it because the whole Order for Return has to do - the six questions here - with the

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)....selling of the sales tax and I thought.....

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman isn't convincing me at all. Surely

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll try again. But surely I will be allowed to make this statement anyway in light of what the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer has said, and I must say now that I was completely amazed and alarmed that he would even ask the Ag Reps of this province to organize meetings in all of the Ag Rep areas to sell the sales tax to the people.

MR. EVANS: That's not so.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, when did the sales tax become any part of the Ag Rep's work? The Ag Reps in this province are overworked now. They can't do half their work. We need twice as many of them, and surely to goodness you're not going to ask the Ag Reps to come in and help sell the sales tax. I think that's a lot of nonsense. I see the Acting Minister of Agriculture looking this way and he agrees with me, I'm sure. It's nonsense.

Now, my honourable friend talked about publishing a lot of the propaganda sheets in 12 languages - 12 languages. --(Interjection)-- He didn't say so? Well, he mentioned there would be 12 languages, a crash program.....

MR. EVANS: I did not say I would publish propaganda sheets in 12 languages.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, he certainly said that an effort would be made to sell it in 12 languages, or words to this effect. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, he can explain the 12 languages in 12 languages if he likes after I've sat down, but he certainly mentioned 12 languages, and as I say, you can talk about it in any language you like and it's still not going to be very palatable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know the First Minister the other day said that he noticed that there was a new innovation at this Session and that was speaking on these Orders for Return. It's something that never happened before, I know. In my 10 years in the House, this is the first year that we have debated Orders for Return, but I think, as so many have said, that it wouldn't have occurred on many occasions if we had got the information we were seeking at the time, but failing to get it, it has encouraged this kind of debate and I think it's bad, but we have no alternative if we want to get the information that we're asking.

Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of other things I could say but I find it difficult, as you have stated for me to stay within the subject matter here of the Order. Now the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell has said that we have a propaganda machine in this province that's second to none.

MR. SPEAKER: I trust the honourable gentleman is not suggesting that the Chair is not allowing him to follow his trend of thought. I think the Chair has been rather considerate and I think the honourable gentleman knows that he'll have a good deal of opportunity to discuss the matters that he's bringing out under this motion right now that could wait for another day.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have said on many occasions both in and out of the House that I thought that you had served the Legislature well and had been most considerate and allowed a great deal of freedom in debate, and I want to thank you very kindly for taking this liberal view - liberal attitude.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell did say that we did have a propaganda machine that was second to none, and surely that it could be used, the Information Services Branch could be used - I hate to say this or to suggest it - but probably it could be used more than it is at this stage of the game in selling the five percent sales tax. I know that a lot of this could have been saved, as has been said, if we had let the Bill - let Bill 56 go to Law Amendments. We'd have got all the free advertising from the press; there'd be people there every day, the dry cleaners one day, the shoemakers the next day, and they'd all be there and we'd get free publicity from one end of Canada to the other. It wouldn't have cost us nothing. Even if we'd only been in there for a week or ten days, look at all the money we'd save.

There's one thing that I want to find out, and I hope they'll include this in the Order for Return, is the length of time that we are going to have this sales tax imposed on the people of the province. --(Interjection)-- Forever, someone suggested. Surely not, because my honourable friend the Minister of Highways said at a meeting in Neepawa that it was only going to last -- well, a very very short time. Oh, there he is over in the back row. You know how long he says it's going to last? He suggested that a provincial sales tax -- oh, here they are

A MEMBER: What paper are you quoting from?

MR. SHOEMAKER: "Questioned further about the sales tax," my honourable friend the Minister of Highways said "that the sales tax would be dropped as soon as the provincial debt is paid off and that wouldn't" -- was only going to last a couple of days. So these are the kind of things we want to find out and we hope that they will advertise, when they go about advertising the sales tax, tell the people like my honourable friend was good enough to do, the Honourable Minister of Highways, tell them it's only going to be short-lived; that it's only a matter of days till you'll have the debt all paid off and then we'll be done with it. My honourable friend had the courage to tell them this. Now let's carry this kind of a program out when you introduce this selling job that you have to do, and I'll admit you will have a selling job to do.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Certainly.

MR. BEARD: As I was listening to him, I understand that he admitted that some of the questions in the Order for Return which were submitted by his Party could not be answered. Which ones were those?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Question No. 6, Mr. Speaker: The total amount the government intends to spend on this advertising campaign. Can they tell us right now what they intend to spend? That's what I'm questioning. Probably the Honourable Member for Churchill could tell us what he intends to spend up there.

MR. BEARD: A subsequent question. Why would you ask it if you knew it couldn't be answered?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I didn't hear you. I didn't get the question. Well, I can't answer a question if I don't get it. What's the question?

MR. BEARD: Why would you ask the question if you knew it couldn't be answered?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I didn't ask it my dear friend. It wasn't my Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not going to allow this debate to get into an argument between two honourable members. I'm calling the question on the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, you'll be glad to know that I adjourned the debate for my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, like my honourable friend from Gladstone, as he so often remarks, I hadn't really intended to get into this debate, however, the Honourable the Premier's amendment prompts me to take some interest in the resolution that is before us; namely, the original resolution was to require the Province of Manitoba to lower the voting age to 18 years, and as I examine the amendment proposed by the Honourable the First Minister, he is seeking agreement of the Government of Canada to reduce the legal voting age to 18 or such other age under 21 as may be deemed appropriate. Perhaps I could remind my honourable friend that other provinces who have taken this action previous to this time did not see fit to seek agreement from Canada.

He also asks in his amendment that our public school system should partake in democracy and better prepare the youth for this, and I would suggest to him that this is a matter for the school boards and school boards themselves have dealt with this question of political education in past years and I think they can still do it.

And then there's the final paragraph of the amendment that Manitoba consider the advisability of instructing the Youth and Manpower Agency to undertake a wide-ranging study. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think many members in this House will agree that this is a time-honoured dodge to stall the original resolution.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that end, I have an amendment to propose, and I would move, seconded by the Member for Birtle-Russell, that the amendment be further amended by deleting everything after the words "sought" after the seventh "whereas" in the resolution and adding thereto the following: "Whereas this being Canada's Centennial Year, with much emphasis being placed upon the young people of our country to assume their increasingly important place in Canadian affairs; and whereas most legislators of Manitoba have advocated the assuming of a more active part in the political scheme of things; Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba be urged to take immediate steps to institute the voting age at 18 in time for the next provincial election in Manitoba."

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Pauley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 23; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would wish to say a few words on this resolution dealing with the subject of voting age of 18, and to begin with I can't but feel that the Honourable the First Minister spoke true words when he said in his amendment that the status of youth in modern society is a matter of concern to this House. To that I would add that the status of youth is of concern to the nation; the status of youth is of concern to youth; and we should recognize that concern and act on it positively so that our youth, in this instance represented by those who have reached the age of 18 years, may have a place in determining the destiny of this country. We should stop playing around with stalling tactics and take the positive action of giving the young people a voice.

It has been said statistically - I don't recall where I saw these statistics nor who it was that gave them but nevertheless it was given as an authoritative fact - that the youth of this country out-number the so-called adults, that is those who have passed the age of 18 years or 21 years. People who are under the age of 25, I believe it has been said, out-number those who are beyond the age of 25, and it is therefore my very strong feeling that where there is such a large number of young people, all with their own individual and collective destinies dependent upon what this nation is or does, that they should be given a voice in determining what that destiny should be.

It has been pointed out by other speakers that young men of 18 years of age are eligible for the armed services; that 18-year-olds can marry - they can enter into a marriage contract; that youths of 18 years of age are job holders - they are helping to bolster the economy of the country by working and by earning a living and by buying goods that they need. Eighteen-year-olds, by the same token, are taxpayers and will increasingly become taxpayers as the proposed tax, if it goes through, is levied on the goods that they will become consumers of.

I have enough confidence in our young people to believe that given the responsibility, any responsibility, they will rise to that responsibility and prove themselves. By mollycoddling our young people, refusing to give them responsibilities, we do not give them the proper preparation for life as they will be called upon to face it. In the pioneering days of this country the 18-year-olds and the 16-year-olds, and even those who were younger than that, took their places beside their fathers and they helped to build this nation. They shouldered the responsibility of earning a living for themselves and for the families of which they were members. They worked; they had a share in building the first roads that were travelled across this country through - I don't have to describe it - through swamp and bush and muskeg, through forest and across the prairies. They cleared the land, they sowed and they harvested; and the fruits of their labours became a part of the economy of the nation that was spread across the land to the benefit of many others, others who also were playing their part in the building of the nation. In a real sense the young people - those of 18 years of age particularly because I'm speaking of them - 18 years of age and younger, can equally with their elders be named and described as the builders of this nation.

As a boy, I lived in Saskatchewan. My father moved to Saskatchewan in the early days while areas west of Yorkton were being pioneered, and I know of at least one instance - I am not the one concerned, I just know of this - in which a 12-year-old boy was given a team of horses hitched to a wagonload of grain and was sent off across the prairie for a distance of 10 miles with this grain to deliver it to a neighbour who was to use it for his own purposes or for sowing in his land. A 12-year-old boy did this. There were many other boys of an age that was greater than that but still under the age of 18 who carried equal and far greater responsibilities in the early years.

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd).....

There was little hesitation in those days to give responsibility to young people because they accepted the responsibilities just as the adults did. They were part of an adult world and they reacted as adults in that world, taking the work that was given to them to do and doing it, and I don't think that our young people, the youth of this country, has deteriorated in any way or any respect. I feel that they are equally able to carry the responsibilities when the responsibilities are given to them, but if they are denied responsibility then they gain little practice in carrying out or in recognizing what a responsibility can be or how it should be handled when they are faced by it. Give the youth responsibility and they will rise to it and be better prepared, better able to bear their later responsibilities as citizens, as leaders, as heads of families, as knowledgeable individuals able to lead on into the future that beckons the youth of this nation at the present time.

Just a few days ago - a few days ago there was an editorial that appeared in the Free Press making reference to this very subject, the subject with which this resolution deals, and there among other things it says about our government which is now attempting to stall the vote on this or the acceptance of the idea of giving young people the vote, the editorial says: "When in opposition, the Conservatives professed themselves eager to have the age at which people can vote lowered from 21 to 18." And then it goes on a little farther on down the column: "The Premier's latest delaying gambit is to do nothing until Ottawa does something at the Federal level." And it says that this is a gambit that can be recognized for exactly what it is, simply - and this is the editorial language - "a stall. Other provinces," it says, "have not hesitated to lower the age to 18. Quebec, Saskatchewan, Newfoundland have done so. Prince Edward Island intends to do so." This was recently mentioned in the Speech from the Throne in the Prince Edward Island Legislature. And the question is asked: "Are the Manitoba youth between the ages of 18 and 21 less responsible, less worthy of a vote than the youth of other provinces?" And it urges strongly that the vote be extended to young people of 18 years of age. And then in closing the editorial says, "The government has been successful in beating down the Opposition's demands for a lowering of the voting age. It may have won this battle but it has not strengthened its position in the war. The voting age in Manitoba will be lowered some day. By delaying that day the present government is only making itself look slow and reactionary."

Now as we all know, and as has been suggested in this Chamber during this Session and other Sessions, the world is changing. To many older people the world in which we live is becoming a strange world, but to the young people it is their world and they react to it as to a thing that they know and are a part of, and they should be given a place in it so that they may help to direct its ultimate destiny. And the question may properly be asked: if we do not act now to do that, then what is it that we are so afraid of? Why do we distrust our youth? I don't pretend to try to answer that; it is for those who distrust them which I do not.

A few days ago it was my pleasure to hear a radio address by Jessica Swail - it was on the CBC station locally - and she is dealing about the subject of youth although she does not touch upon the subject of voting age, and it was there that I must have seen the statement that youth by far out-number the adults. She says, "They out-number us and this is a democracy, and trying to stop youth from having its way is like trying to stop the world from turning. There are too many among us who would like to do just that. With closed unsympathetic minds, we interpret every breath of change as a malodor of doom. In our smug complacency we seem arrogantly to assume that no change is necessary, as though the world we've created is indeed the best of all possible worlds."

I'm going to take the liberty, Mr. Speaker, to read a few paragraphs. I would like to permit myself the pleasure of reading the whole article but I'll refrain from doing that. It is all good. There are some passages in it that are a little better than others and I would wish to present these to the House. She says, "In our smug complacency we seem arrogantly to assume that no change is necessary, as though the world we've created is indeed the best of all possible worlds."

And then she says, "What a delusion! If this is the best of all possible worlds, our offspring want no part of it. They're bright, these youngsters. They're ahead of us in every way. Better food has helped to mature them physically and mentally at an earlier age. Easily available education has helped them to learn to think. They know more than we do and their minds are better than ours."

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd)...

"They can see through us and they're appalled at the mess that we, in our superstitious world of guilt and shame and pious prescriptions have created. They're not shocked by such things as sex; what does shock them is a generation of people, their parents, who express horror at frank sex talk but appear to have no opinion on the use of napalm gas by the world-leading Christian democracy. It disturbs them that pictures of healthy men and women in the nude arouse public protest from pulpit and parliament while photos of starving Asian children go unnoticed.

"They're appalled that 2,000 years of proclaimed belief in the institutionalized teaching of the brotherhood of man produced, among other things, Nazi Germany, the Republic of South Africa and the American south. They can't understand a world where more moral energy and legal resource is spent checking sex, liquor and gambling than is spent on checking war, widespread hunger and religious and racial discrimination."

And so it goes on and continues in a later paragraph, "They are sick of watching us preach humility and practice arrogance; sick of leaders in every area of endeavour who use gimmicks, lies and halftruths to win support while invoking the aid of Deity. They are sick of a school system that seems in its every manifestation to be anti-life, a system that forces a curious energetic 16 or 18-year-old to sit still for hours on end listening to unimaginative presentations of boring material."

The other day a 13-year-old girl visiting the Manitoba Legislature remarked, after watching members reading magazines and wandering about and holding discussions while a fellow member addressed the House, "My gosh, these grown men can't sit still for one speech and we have to sit still all day in school." This is the reaction that children have in watching the antics, I think I can say, of adults.

Now on in a later paragraph - I've skipped a whole page or more - "If we can't understand our youth, it is very certain they can't understand a generation of human beings who spend billions of dollars trying to get a clear picture of the moon while tolerating the most distorted image of their own environment here on earth. In a world of canned laughter, boxed violence, cynical advertising, conniving businessmen, organized crime, corrupt officials, devious politicians and clergymen, whose greatest attribute is their ability for elaborate rationalization, what is there for youth to understand or to admire. How can we expect them to understand a people who talk about 'bombs for peace'. Bombs are for war and they know that. How can we ask them to understand a nation of adults who use totalitarian methods to 'safeguard our democracy'. A democracy that uses undemocratic methods is no longer a democracy and they know that. They know that if we try to fool them once, to give them a 'snow job' as they put it, we'll do it again and so they don't trust us.

"Probably the strongest unifying force among young people today is the single thing that they have in common in their distrust of adults. The phoniness of our TV shows and our advertisements bolster this distrust, but it goes deeper than that." As one group said to me recently, "You adults are always talking about loving your neighbour and all that, but all you do is fight." The interesting thing was that by questioning them I found out it wasn't the fighting that bothered them so much as the dishonesty and the hypocritical way we go about it, like saying God is on our side while mowing down our enemies with machine guns.

"The voice of youth" - in the concluding sentence - "The voice of youth is the rumbling of the future. It's time we gave up our 'tongue-tsking' " - it's a word unfamiliar to me but she says - "It's time we gave up our 'tongue-tsking' and listen." And to that I would add that it is time we gave up attempts to hold back a tide of an eager youth ready and willing to take its place in the modern world in the continuing growth of this country with their voice and their vote and their work, as they gave it with their strength and their energy during the days in which this nation rose to the status that it now holds on its hundredth anniversary among the nations of the world. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs: Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir and Witney; Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd).....

NAYS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 28; Nays, 24.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment carried. Now those in favour of the main motion as amended.....

.....continued on next page.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to close the debate. Mr. Chairman. I'll be very short but I think that we should explain why we have voted against this amendment because this amendment is not an honest amendment.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, my honourable friend is not permitted in this House or in any other Parliament to say that an amendment is not an honest amendment. If he will just use parliamentary language perhaps he can find the means within that kind of language to express himself properly.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this amendment departs from the truth and I will show my honourable friend the Crown Prince what I mean. We have had a situation here, Mr. Speaker, where all the members of this House, including my honourable friend, voted in favour of what I am going to read. Every member of this House voted for this:

"Whereas the young people of the country constitute a most important human resource;
and

Whereas young people at age 18 are considered fit for military service in times of war;
and

Whereas young people between the ages of 18 and 21 are considered mature enough to participate in the economic, social and athletic life of our country; and

Whereas it is in the interest of good government that young people between the ages of 18 and 21 participate in the political life of our country;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Province of Manitoba grant its citizens, 18 years and over, the right to vote in elections over which the Provincial Legislature has control; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Government institute a more intensive program of instruction dealing with the structure, function, and operation of all levels of Government in Canada; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Canada be requested to consider the enactment of legislation to reduce the age of qualification of Federal electors to 18 years.

Every single member of this House voted in favour, including the Attorney-General, voted in favour of this, and if we vote in favour of something it must mean that we favour it normally, I would say. And every single one of us voted for this; and now, after voting for it, after the First Minister standing here in this House and saying that he is in favour of this, making a big play out of this and telling the newspaper reporters and so on that he favours this; we have all, every single one of us present, voted for this and now this is completely struck out. I ask you and I ask the Attorney-General: is that an honest motion? If this government was interested in bringing in a certain study, something that has nothing to do with it, especially after they accepted this principle by voting for it, why didn't they bring in other legislation? Why didn't they bring in other -- why? I ask you. Feels that I am not using the right words.

Now, after saying that we wanted this, we want to have the people, give them a chance to vote at age 18 for the next election, this is what -- and I'm just reading the "Therefore" of this amendment that was presented to us today: "Therefore Be It Resolved" -- that's the only therefore -- "Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba be urged to take immediate steps to institute the voting age at 18 in time for the next provincial election in Manitoba." For the next provincial election in Manitoba. It could have asked for a study. This is all it says; and my friends voted against this. They voted for it on February -- I don't know what date -- then they are voting against it here and they bring in an amendment that for the life of me, Mr. Speaker, has very little to do with this. Now the First Minister wants to wait to see what's going to happen in Ottawa.

In Saskatchewan they vote at 18; they're not waiting. In Quebec they vote at 18 and they're not waiting. Prince Edward Island, they've got the same legislation this year, they'll vote at 18; Newfoundland at 19; British Columbia at 19 and Alberta at 19. Now is there any reason in the world -- and they have their problems there. They have their problems about liquor and so on. Those are certainly something else. If we wait until we feel we can settle everything all at once, we'll wait a darn long time. We'll wait a long time and this is what this government is saying, and when I say that the motion is not -- maybe some of my friends are touchy. I say this motion is not honest and I cannot find any other words. I cannot find any other words but to repeat that this motion, this amendment is not an honest motion, because nobody can make me believe or anybody else in this House that you can go ahead and vote for something on the 6th or 7th of February, and then turn around and with an amendment that you can very easily, you can very easily have brought in another resolution, especially the government. It would have been very simple to bring in something else. Well, simple -- maybe not politically

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) for some of them that might have ideas of going a little further in politics or another level of politics, but why doesn't he stay out of the House? The Premier who's so worried is never in the House anyway until we vote to reduce the salary of the Cabinet Minister. This is when he flies in, Mr. Speaker. Now this is not right. If we bring anything at all, we are told, "You are anticipating - it's in the Throne Speech," then they come in with the Throne Speech and they say, "Well it's not necessarily. It's the Minister and it's mentioned in the Throne Speech but it's not necessarily, the government will not fall on this," but in the meantime you can't say anything about it. And then they are bringing in amendments like this.

I'm not saying that they have no right to bring in a proposition like this. I daresay that most - I can't speak for all the members on this one, but I daresay that most of us would vote on the suggestion, would agree with the suggestion of the First Minister if it was used properly, if you really meant it, if this is what he wants; but why use something that might be good to defeat something that you can't face? My goodness, we're here, day after day in this House; why the Cabinet Ministers should be paid such a sum; why they should get this money because it's so difficult for them. They have such a responsibility. Well, Mr. Speaker, we can see the way they accept their responsibility. They accept their responsibility by farming out work - such as they do with the president of their association - different commissions - this government is governing by boards and commissions. Mind you, they make sure that they have the right people in there. And then at least -- then they have the Throne Speech, and they're playing around with this rule. They're stressing this that we are anticipating on the rule of the Throne Speech.

MR. LYON: I rise on another point of order. My honourable friend has only been in the House nine years; I realize that obeying rules perhaps comes difficult to him. But I suggest that we are debating here a resolution having to do with the age of 18. We are not talking about or casting implications and we are not able, under the rules, to cast implications upon rulings that are made by the Chair. If my honourable friend wants to go out and talk on some street corner about that subject, he can do it, but I suggest that he cannot do it under the rules of this House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well now that Rufus had his say, Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything about your decision at all and he knows it. He knows it too well. I am talking about the lack of courage of this gentleman and his frontbenchers, his friends. This is what I am saying, and if he can prove -- it's very simple; if he wants to prove that he has courage, let him bring any legislation that he wants, anything that he wants, let him bring it in, but not try to obstruct the work of the rest of the members. We certainly must have some privileges in this House, Mr. Speaker. We must. The members of the Opposition, the ordinary members, must have something to say. We know that the backbenchers of the government side have nothing to say, but we at least on this side must have a chance, and as I said when I was so rudely interrupted by my friend out there who cannot take this, I said that they are

MR. LYON: I rise on another point of order to tell my honourable friend that he will continue to be interrupted so long as he breaks the rules.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have your ruling on this because I think it is breaking the rules if you interrupt anybody when you are not in order yourself.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe it's been rather obvious to the House that all afternoon I have had a problem in this direction and I have been hesitant to interfere with the honourable gentleman when he was speaking in the hopes that he would get back to this voting age. I felt that he would. However, there was a discussion from across the floor, a question from across the floor, and I am sure he will agree with me that I don't want it to become an argument between two honourable members and I wondered if he would co-operate with the Chair on this occasion.

MR. DESJARDINS: I certainly will co-operate with the Chair because I think you are doing your best, Mr. Speaker, not that I wouldn't welcome an argument, especially when I am on such sound ground, with my honourable friend but I certainly thought that I was in order in speaking why, giving you the reason why I cannot support this although I do agree with some of these things, and I just thought that it was in order for me to show the members of this House and you, Mr. Speaker, how difficult it is if the minority in this House are not granted their rights, and I again do not say, do not suggest that we're not granted these rights by you, Mr. Speaker, but we've had, as I've said before, this government have used the Throne Speech telling us that we're anticipating, and now they're bringing these kind of amendments because they do not wish to stand on their own two feet and say that they voted Because they're right;

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) they're right. They voted. I read the motion and every single member in this House voted for it - even the Attorney-General. He voted in favour of this, and today again he voted for an amendment that would destroy all this work; everything that has been said, everything that was approved; he voted against this so he's on the safe side. He can go and tell the people 18 years old in the next election when he's going to try to be the Premier of this province, he can say: "Oh yes, I voted for this. I voted. I wanted you to vote at 18 because I have confidence in you. I know that you people are right, that you'll do the right things; you're the coming citizens." But then he can go and see somebody else and say, "No, we're not going to let these reckless little bums vote at 18. You know what we did. We sure scuttled that, eh?" This is what he wants to say. Mr. Speaker, that's not honest.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would kindly, before you call for the vote, put to the House the motion that we will be voting on, as amended twice.

MR. SPEAKER: We're voting on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface as amended by the Honourable

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but my request is of you to read out to the House the motion on which the vote will be taken, which would be the complete motion as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: And you wish the amendment too?

MR. PAULLEY: I would like you, if you would, Mr. Speaker, to read out the proposition that we are going to be faced with in this vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface as amended: Whereas the young people of the country constitute . . . -- (Interjections) --

MR. DESJARDINS: correctly, I think the Leader of the NDP is talking about what we're voting on now.

MR. PAULLEY: I want the motion as amended, Mr. Speaker, and I think when you read it you'll find it quite interesting.

A MEMBER: You'd better check your books, Rufus. You might be out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry for delaying the House for this few moments but I'd better be right.

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

WHEREAS a common electoral franchise is desirable; and

WHEREAS an improvement in education for democracy should be sought;

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

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of instructing the Youth and Manpower Agency to undertake a wide-ranging study of the Status of Youth in Manitoba, with particular reference to legal responsibilities and rights.

MR. CHERNIACK: With all deference, may I suggest you have not completed the reading of this resolution as amended, because you now should go back to the operative portion of the original resolution and read that, carrying on with "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Province of Manitoba grant its citizens, 18 years and over, the right to vote . . ." etc. Because you'll note, Mr. Speaker, that all that was deleted by this amendment were the words in the preamble, and the operative portion was not deleted, so that I for one, Mr. Speaker, believe that we are voting on the preamble presented by the Honourable the First Minister, the operative portion presented by the Honourable the First Minister, and the operative portion presented by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and Burrows. All that was deleted in the preamble, Mr. Speaker. The operative portions remain. It's clear to me. It says: "In the Preamble, delete all the words after the first "Whereas" and substitute the following!" So all that has been substituted are the words of the Preamble, and I believe that that is what we are voting on and that the operative portions of both the resolution as amended and the amending motion of the First Minister are the matters before us.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I don't think that the resolution makes sense at all.

MR. CHERNIACK: If I may answer that, Mr. Speaker, this is the resolution of the Honourable the First Minister. If it doesn't make sense I suggest that's his responsibility, but we are voting on what is before us.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking on a point of order because not only do I subscribe completely to what the Honourable Member for St. John's has just said, but I suggest to you that in addition to that, that inasmuch as we had passed the operative part of the original resolution as amended, that the amendment moved by the First Minister substitutes a different conclusion which is at variance with the one that this House has unanimously passed, and is therefore out of order.

MR. LYON: speaking to the point of order, I would suggest that my honourable friend has a very fine, a very narrow legal point that he raises. But my honourable friend is aware of the old legal injunction, as well aware of it as am I, and you yourself Mr. Chairman, that the law does not permit an absurdity, and I'm sure that this Legislature wouldn't permit an absurdity either, -- (Interjection) -- I know, we tolerate my honourable friend from St. Boniface and that comes pretty close to following that injunction out, but in any case I suggest that the point, while an interesting one and a very interesting procedural one, is not a valid one because in order to be valid it would then have to say in the Preamble: "Delete all the words" and then it would have to pick up the operative part to ensure that those words were left in, because there is no end. It says, "Delete everything after the first Whereas," and everything after the first Whereas takes out everything that was in the amended resolution. So I believe, Sir, with the greatest of respect, that the resolution which you read to the House a few minutes ago before my honourable friend raised his interesting point, is the correct resolution.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, following the Honourable the Attorney-General, I don't know the fine points of law but I do know what I read and I can understand resolutions and amendments. Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside raised a very interesting point as to whether or not the matter that has been under debate for some considerable time has been in order, and I suggest that it has never been challenged as to whether or not it was in order and of course it stands. But I - not being learned in the law, as my honourable friend the Attorney-General is, may I, in all due respect, Mr. Speaker, ask you to take another very close look at the motion, and it was for this purpose I asked you to read it before we voted on it, because all that was deleted by the proposition of the Honourable the First Minister was the words in the Preamble. The original "Resolved" part of the motion that was adopted by this House still stands as a single proposition, and because of the fact that the amendment did not refer back to the Resolved part of the original motion as amended, the motion proposed by the Member for St. Boniface as amended by the Member for Burrows, that stands; and by the deletion, the deletion of the words in the Preamble, it's only through inadvertence, I suggest, on the proposition of the First Minister, that he did not then re-institute the Resolved part which was unanimously accepted by this House.

So I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the actual motion that we have before us would be worded: "The Status of Youth in modern society is a matter of concern to this House, and Whereas" and so forth - the three following "Whereas" - and then we come to the Resolved portions of the amendment proposed by the Honourable the First Minister, and then should be included in the Resolved part of the resolution we're now voting on, those resolved portions of the motion as amended and which were not deleted, I respectfully suggest, by the proposition of the First Minister.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might add one thing in response to the Honourable the Attorney-General who spoke about an absurdity. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is no contradiction between these two which would create an absurdity. I think the draftsmanship is deplorable but I do not see that there is any real contradiction, and although we're not responsible for the draftsmanship - that's the First Minister's - the fact is that in all conscience I am able to vote on this resolution as amended by the First Minister, even though the wording is awkward, redundant - most redundant - and, in some words, strange. Now it seems to me that nevertheless that's what we have before us; the majority of the House put it in; and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we must deal with it as it is. Had it been intended otherwise, then clearly it would have stated: "Delete all the words after the first 'whereas' in the preamble" or indeed "in the resolution." The insertion of the words "in the preamble" must be given meaning to, and the only meaning you can give to it is to delete the words "in the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) "preamble." It would not be necessary to have those words in at all, anywhere, if the contention of the Honourable Attorney-General were correct. Well, they are there; we're bound by it; we can't change it. Debate has been closed. We must now vote on it, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it's clear we must vote on it with both operative portions in it.

MR. LYON: There's very little new that I can add, Mr. Speaker, because I think the point really disposes of itself, because the words really "in the preamble" do not bear upon amendments that take place to the operative part of the resolution, because once you strike out everything after the first word "Whereas" in the preamble, there's nothing left. There's nothing left whatsoever - nothing left at all. There's absolutely nothing left so I think that the point disposes of itself, but if Your Honour is in any doubt about it, you might well reserve, but I see no doubt at all. I think the resolution as Your Honour put it to the House is the correct resolution that we're voting on.

MR. HILLHOUSE: a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the only interpretation that you can place upon this amendment of the First Minister's brings about a complete absurdity and a nullity, for the simple reason the language that he uses "In the Preamble delete all the words after the first WHEREAS in the Resolution." Now there's no "whereas" in the resolution at all. -- (Interjection) -- No. The resolution part of the resolution is the operative part -- (Interjection) -- I know, the whole thing, but you're dealing with the preamble and that is what he intended to do. He intended to mark out all the words after the first WHEREAS in the preamble. Sure. And the operative part states

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. There seems to be some confliction in the legal opinion of the House and I'm sure that several of the other members will be as confused as I am, and let it not be said we did the thing wrong so I'm taking it under advisement and will report back to the House.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might be able to point out that when I give a legal opinion I expect to get paid for it. I did not give a legal opinion today.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if he's not being paid for occupying the chair. To continue, gentlemen. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia; the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, this resolution on minimum wages has been debated in the House at some considerable length so I'll try to be very brief. I don't think that there's anything new that I could add to this resolution at this stage. However, I would have wished that the Leader of the New Democratic Party would have probably introduced a new resolution to what his amendment says and I would have been quite happy to support it. However, I'm going to support it as well because I -- well, I feel that we could have got more action and much quicker action on the resolution as it was before, because I think it's quite important that the minimum wages are established at \$1.25 immediately, and this is what the resolution said: that the minimum wage be established immediately at \$1.25.

As I said before, there is a considerable amount of dissatisfaction in the ranks of the working people in this province, and the reasons are, to some extent I'm inclined to believe, our low wages. So I would be prepared to go along with an amendment to the resolution because it doesn't change the resolution in any way as I read it. I know that there must be some formula that the Minimum Wage Board uses to establish the minimum wage. I know that the Department of Welfare must also use some kind of formula to establish what they pay for welfare people. So in view of the increased cost of living that this government was so concerned about at the beginning of the Session - the First Minister made a speech - I think it would be in the interest of the people that this government demonstrate its good intentions and increase the minimum wage immediately to \$1.25, and go along and study, or have the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations review the minimum wage, which I think would be of interest to this House as well.

Perhaps when the sales tax is imposed on the people in June with increasing cost on the people of Manitoba, it would have to be increased above the \$1.25. At this time we don't know it, but this is the reason that I think we should study and find out if this will be necessary, because at the present time, Mr. Speaker, \$1.00 minimum wage which an average working week of forty hours gives you a weekly wage of \$40.00, is certainly a very low minimum wage. As a matter of fact, I would be safe to say that it is dangerously low. I don't think it's enough for any girl working but I think that there's a lot of people who are married and have to raise a

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) family who are also receiving the minimum wage. I would like also to know from the Minister how many people in Manitoba receive the minimum wage, because it appears to me from the amount of phone calls that I have received this Session alone that in many instances the minimum wage becomes the going wage in quite a few areas. So I think it is most important that we act immediately and I will be supporting the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. STANES: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, 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 Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us proposes the appointment of an Auditor-General for, among other reasons, that at the federal level - and I quote: "it has proved of great benefit in controlling waste in government and has provided savings to the taxpayer." This is not true, Mr. Speaker. It has not been substantiated. The federal Auditor-General has not been of great benefit in controlling waste in government nor has he provided savings to the taxpayer. It is true that in his Annual Reports he gives lists which year after year seem to be longer than the year before, of errors made with regard to government expenditures, and he gives us these lists and he does his checking long after the money has been spent. Evidently, what the Federal Government needs is a system of audit that we have in Manitoba where the Comptroller-General pre-audits the expenditures of the government and checks all the government expenditures before the payment is actually made. That the Federal Government Auditor-General has not been very effective in keeping down wasteful expenditures is shown by the report made by the Glassco Royal Commission on Government Expenditures, which concluded its work in 1963 and which made 450 findings with regard to outdated procedures, uneconomical operations and wasteful practices relating to Federal Government expenditures.

It is not necessary to set up a second government audit department in Manitoba. This would indeed be a wasteful expenditure of taxpayers' money. This would be a needless duplication of the work now being carried out by our Comptroller-General. They have a staff today of 72 employees. The work of the Comptroller-General is governed by our Treasury Act which was revised and passed in 1933 with the help of the Institute of Chartered Accountants, and the fact that there has been no major shortage in government funds since the Act was passed at that time is a good indication that the Department is carrying out its job and is doing a good job for the people of Manitoba.

The government operated under the present Act, the previous government operated under the present Act for some twenty-five years, and during that time the Honourable the Member for Lakeside for some time was the First Minister, for another period of time it was the Provincial Treasurer, and the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was a member of that government for some five years, but they didn't deem it fit that they should set up a separate audit department, an additional audit department, an Auditor-General as is now asked for by the resolution before this House. Surely, if they deemed that it was such a good idea to have an Auditor-General, they would have made the change when they were in power.

The resolution asks, and I quote: "for the establishment of an officer known as the Auditor-General of Manitoba, that he be empowered to make independent spot inspections and running audits of all government departments, boards, commissions and utilities, and to report to the Legislature." Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what our Comptroller-General is doing today except with respect to the Manitoba Telephone System, the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, and the Workmen's Compensation Board. The Auditor-General makes spot inspections, running audits of government departments, and he reports to the Legislature.

With respect to the last clause of the resolution, while the Legislature doesn't appoint our Comptroller-General I am sure that over the years the members of all parties will agree that the Comptroller-General that has been appointed has been an excellent man. But he is, as the resolution requests in respect of the new Auditor-General, he is responsible only to the Legislature and he may be removed from office only by a two-thirds majority of votes in the Legislature. It is quite true that he can be suspended by the President of the Executive Council, a committee composed of the President of the Executive Council and the Leaders of the Opposition Parties in the House, but it is only the Legislature itself that can remove him from his position, and he would stand suspended until the Legislature acted if a committee, as I said,

(MR. COWAN cont'd.) decided that he should be suspended.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in his speech inferred that our Comptroller-General does an internal audit and that we should have an Auditor-General who would do an external audit. The Comptroller-General pre-audits disbursements before money is paid out. In addition, our Comptroller-General does an external audit for the people of Manitoba. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition refers to external bank auditors with approval. He states on Page 1391 of Hansard, and I quote: "They are responsible to the shareholders. Well this is what I want to see done in the Province of Manitoba." Mr. Speaker, this is what is being done in the Province of Manitoba. The Comptroller-General conducts an external audit and he is responsible only to members of this Legislature, and, like the auditors of a company who can only be removed by the shareholders, the Comptroller-General can only be removed by the members of this Legislature and this must be by a two-thirds majority.

If an Auditor-General in Manitoba is necessary, as stated by the Leader of the Opposition, surely some of the other adjoining provinces would have adopted the proposal, especially Ontario and Quebec with their very large budgets. During the coming year the Province of Quebec will spend almost 2-1/2 billions of dollars and Ontario will spend over 1,832,000,000. These are very large budgets compared to the budget of this province.

There seems to be some degree of confusion as to the responsibilities and duties of our Comptroller-General. The Comptroller-General is an officer of this House to carry out an audit of the accounts of the province within the terms set out in the Treasury Act. Each year he presents to the House the public accounts with his certificate attached thereto. The Comptroller-General is required by law to include in the public accounts specific information. He is also required to report upon his audits to the Ministers concerned and to the Provincial Treasurer. Our Comptroller-General is a professional auditor assigned to audit the books and reports and records of the province. As an officer of this House he is independent of the executive body and would report to the House any matter which he deems necessary to do so. There has been no reason to assume that this has not been carried out by the Comptroller-General over the years of the various holders of this office.

The question as to whether or not the Comptroller-General acts in the manner of an external or internal auditor has received the attention of this House in the past. As indicated, he is responsible to audit and report to the House. As an officer of the House he acts definitely as an external auditor. Within the narrow definition of an internal auditor, he does indeed report to the Ministers and to the Provincial Treasurer such items and areas that should receive the attention of management. This is following exactly the same procedure that any shareholders' auditor would advise management of a corporation. In stricter definition there is a difference. The Comptroller-General is indeed the same as a shareholders' auditor. The one is responsible to the House and the other to the shareholders, and can only be removed from office by those employing bodies. Neither is responsible to or removable by management. It is not the function of either to direct management in its actions. The Comptroller-General in particular is instructed by the House as to his duties and responsibilities while the executive, within relative legislation, is responsible for the decisions regarding operation.

The Leader of the Opposition consistently makes reference to the report of the Auditor-General. I am sure that he is aware that our own Comptroller-General, this official, is directed by legislation to report to this Legislature. I do not feel that it would be in the best interests of Manitoba to have a report similar to the report of the Auditor-General at Ottawa issued here, as it would tend to downgrade in the eyes of the public the Civil Service of this province of whom we are all justifiably proud. I further feel that it overlaps on the function of responsibility of management. The onus for departmental policy and administrative direction rests with the executive, and there it should remain. The reports of the provincial auditors of our adjoining provinces do not cover items similar to the items referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, and I must reiterate that I do not feel that any benefit would be derived by this House from such comments.

It might be well to review generally the type of audit performed by the Comptroller-General. As he himself is a Chartered Accountant and many of his staff are Chartered Accountants, they have the same -- they follow the same type of audit, techniques and procedures as are used by Chartered Accountants who do external audits for corporations. After all, each Chartered Accountant has been trained in the same manner and has passed the required examinations of the Manitoba Institute of Chartered Accountants. Each is subject to the discipline of the Association and must comply with the minimum standards set up by the Association.

(MR. COWAN cont'd.)

I feel certain that every member of this House agrees that each Comptroller-General of this province has lived up to the high standards of his profession. I wish to stress the fact that the Comptroller-General is indeed an officer of this House and reports to this House. Some may feel that the designation, the Comptroller-General, does not adequately describe his function and that he might be more adequately called an Auditor-General. The fact is that we are receiving a professional, external audit in the same way as shareholders of a corporation have an external audit made on their behalf, and I see no reason to alter the present system and have an unnecessary department added to the Government of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

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

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

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Could we have this matter stand please?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to close this debate I would like to indicate my disappointment at not having been able to make the majority of the Legislature, members of the Legislature, understand the position that is being put forward by this resolution, and I say that they have not understood it because of the attitude that has been taken from various quarters in the House.

The Minister of Labour, in dealing with this resolution, had very little to say but what he does say indicates that he thinks that this resolution means that the members of this Party wish to give a licence to members of our population, citizens in our population, to go about and engage in violent acts and in acts of intimidation, because in speaking to the resolution he says on Page 1456 of Hansard, "I suggest, Mr. Speaker," - and these are the words of the Minister of Labour, "that legal picketing is not hampered. It is when picketing becomes bothersome; it is when picketing becomes a hindrance to trade and commerce; it becomes a bother when it is indicated that picketing may be injurious to the individual. Well, if intimidation and violence is not an indication of what happens in some areas and on some picket lines, then I guess there's nothing to worry about illegal picketing."

And so the Minister of Labour, despite the wording of the resolution and despite the fact that he knows that in Manitoba intimidation and violence need not be enjoined against, that nothing in this resolution would permit intimidation and violence, and that if there were, in fact, intimidation and violence it could quite easily be stopped by the administrative officers of the government; despite his knowledge of all those facts he seeks to not have this resolution passed, and the only way in which he can muster a negative vote to the resolution is to suggest that it refers to intimidation and violence. And the Minister of Labour has a habit in discussing labour relations. He says, "Well this thing works. My honourable friend has never been able to show any cases where people have suffered by virtue of the resolution or of the existence of the state of things which his resolution now seeks to correct." Well I put the same charge to the Minister of Labour. Which trade union, under what circumstances, had to be enjoined in Manitoba because of intimidation and violence? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that he can't point to a single case to assert his position that this resolution should not go because it would tend to permit intimidation and violence, and in using that language I would like, Mr. Speaker, to point out some very interesting remarks that were made by the Provincial Treasurer.

The Provincial Treasurer took a very self-righteous position - let's put it this way; he took a very righteous position - in dealing with the question that was asked by the Member from Brokenhead. The Member from Brokenhead on Page 1541 of Hansard - and I'm not going to read the whole question - suggested that certain companies had suggested to certain retail people that they would have to get cash registers or their businesses could be closed by the Minister on thirty days' notice, and he used the word "intimidation", and the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer said the following, and I commend these words to the Minister of Labour: "I don't think the Honourable Member should use such terms as "intimidation" when he is

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) referring to a commercial organization without either naming them or making specific charges."

Now if that language is appropriate for a commercial organization then it's surely appropriate for a trade union, and I think that if we just insert those words that the injunction that was given by the Provincial Treasurer applies to the Minister of Labour, I don't think the Honourable Member should use such terms as intimidation and violence when he is referring to a trade union, without either naming them or making specific charges.

But this is not the conduct that we've seen the Minister engage in in dealing with this resolution. This resolution doesn't license intimidation or violence. It licenses the right of a citizen to walk down the street carrying a sign, and I suggested to the Minister - and I don't think that I have to belabour it - that if an injunction was necessary to enjoin violence I would be in favour of it. I don't think that people should be permitted to commit violence. I don't think people should be permitted to commit intimidation. I don't think people should be permitted to prevent access to and egress from property, and any such act, if they are stopped by the Attorney-General or through the Minister of Labour, I would not oppose them, because I don't think anybody has the right to commit them, but let him cite those acts instead of trying to defeat this resolution, which doesn't in any way inhibit such acts, by referring to the resolution as being something which is designed to license violence or to license intimidation.

And we get the same thing, Mr. Speaker - and I'm almost happy that the members of the Liberal Party also see this resolution as a danger, because I often have a great deal of difficulty explaining to my Liberal friends how the policy of the New Democratic Party differs from the policy of the Liberal Party. They always say, "Well you're with us," and then they take a position on a resolution which deals with nothing but the permission to engage in freedom of speech, that that may interfere with business. and "if free speech interferes with business, we won't hear of it. We will present rules, we will present a set of rules, as to when free speech is permitted and when free speech is not permitted," and I find that I haven't been able to make myself understood to the members of the Liberal Party because when we present this resolution an amendment is put suggesting that they believe in picketing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, whatever picketing means in their terms, this resolution is not designed to deal with picketing. If picketing means that members of a trade union can prevent access to or egress from premises at any time, we in this Party don't intend that this resolution would permit that. If picketing means that people are able to congregate in such a way as to prevent that access, or to try to interfere with people using the normal rights of the streets, we don't intend this resolution to do that, and if that's what the Liberals mean when they say picketing, we're against it, and that's apparently what they mean because any other type of conduct is conduct which should be permitted without any resolution defining the right of when a person can picket and when a person cannot picket, and we are not dealing in this resolution with pickets.

I listened, Mr. Speaker, to all of the arguments of different members of the House, wondering if anybody from any political party understood what I was saying, and, Mr. Speaker, I admit - well the members of our group understood it and I'm thankful for that, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that without this type of resolution - and I say this perfectly seriously - that we of this political philosophy can be just as susceptible to stamping out free speech in the way in which the government party is now behaving as any other people in any other political philosophy. I say that this war has to be fought every ten years, every twenty years, every hundred years; it will never stop; because there are always some people who think that it's in the interest of society that certain people not be permitted to say anything whether they constitute a majority or a minority, and whether we constitute a majority or a minority there will still be people who have this opinion in all parties, and I'm suggesting that the only way in which we can preserve this freedom is to consciously know what we're doing when we vote against a resolution of this kind. But I said before that I felt very frustrated; I felt very inadequate in that I wasn't able to get across to any of the members of the political parties, apart from our own, what we were talking about. But, Mr. Speaker, a ray of light shone through. I did get to somebody, because the person, whoever he is (and he is a treasure to me) who prepared the index to Har-sard, he didn't list this resolution as the Intimidation and Violence Resolution; he didn't list it as the Picketing Resolution; he listed it - and God bless him - as the Free Speech Resolution, and that's all, Mr. Speaker. I don't know who does it, but, Mr. Speaker, I've reached somebody, and maybe, maybe the fact that I've reached somebody should be sufficient compensation, but I never cease to try and I'm going to make a few remarks in closing this debate in the hope

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) that maybe we'll reach a few others. I know that it appears dark for the moment but, Mr. Speaker, there'll be other sessions and lots of time for people to think this over -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): You're a fine fellow.

MR. GREEN: Thanks very much, Dr. Johnson. Well then, the way you can prove that to me is if you vote "aye". Otherwise your thoughts are of little value.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have here a newspaper, a Winnipeg Tribune, one of the only two newspapers in Winnipeg - (his one that I take (I take them both) Wednesday, March 8, 1967. Top right hand corner of the page, we have: "Reverend Ray Stokes of the Anglican Synod Office in Winnipeg has started walking the downtown area with a sandwich board to promote the noon hour Lenten service at Holy Trinity Church. He'll be on the street from 1:00 to 2:00 p. m. daily, unless it's bitterly cold, he said." And what it says on his placard is: "Attend Noonday Lenten Services, Monday to Friday, Holy Trinity Church" and then it lists who's going to appear at the Church. Now, Mr. Speaker, would anybody suggest that the Roman Catholic Church could enjoin that picketing because it might bring people away from the Roman Catholic Church to their church? Would anybody suggest that the Rabbis in Winnipeg could say that maybe some Jews will see this sign and be attracted towards this synagogue," or still better, let's not deal with changing of thinking because this is what the Minister is permitting when he doesn't pass this resolution; he forbids people from saying support the Union movement rather than supporting unorganized labour. This is what he is doing. Well, he hasn't suggested anything else and he's had the opportunity to speak on it; but there is business affected and I'm sure that the Liberals will become very shocked now, and maybe they'll run out and get an injunction. Noon hour services! Just think of all the restaurants that could be affected by people going and maybe spending their noon hours at these services rather than in restaurants which are employing people, even union people; and does anybody suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that man should be prevented from walking down the street with that sign because first of all people will behave in a different way than they are now behaving? And I assume that's why he's doing it. He's not walking out there because he doesn't want people to come to his services or because business will be affected as a result of his walking down the street. This is what the failure to pass this resolution condones because this resolution doesn't say anything more. This resolution says that people shouldn't be prohibited from acting in a manner which is not contrary to law, and if it is contrary to law the Attorney-General will get him. He'll get him very quickly. He's very efficient in that way, I'm sure. And if it's not contrary to law then it shouldn't be prohibited, but that's what the courts are now doing. I'm not going to repeat the incidences. They are now doing that with one individual, committing no violence or any other unlawful acts, they are now preventing him from walking down the street with a sign.

Mr. Speaker, the Americans have had these growing pains. The old country, the British Isles has had these growing pains, and they've come out of it, thank goodness. The Americans are now coming out because they, too, prevented that kind of picketing or use of free speech, and I read now from a U.S. News and World Report dated February 4, 1963, which is headed - and this is not a friendly paper to people who are employees - and the headline is: "When pickets are used to scare away customers." And what the article deals with, Mr. Speaker, is that certain trade unionists have walked in front of certain unorganized businesses and have done nothing except to say this plant, this store, whatever it is, is unorganized. The National Labour Relations Board had previously ceased or prevented people from behaving in that way, but the truth emerges and I in the long run think that right triumphs and will triumph in this province as well. The National Labour Relations Board has now changed and they have said that this amounts to nothing more - and I commend the article to you; it's not friendly to my position - but the Board says that this is nothing more than an exercise in free speech which we not only treasure in our competitive society but say that it is a prerequisite to the continued existence of our competitive society.

MR. SPEAKER: I would remind the honourable gentleman that there are five minutes to the half hour.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, am I correct in thinking that if I need more than five minutes that I can speak when the resolution comes to the floor at the next stage? I'll do the best I can in the five minutes but I may not finish.

Well, let's see where the resolution contains these abhorrent features that are being voted against by the members of the government side, unless they change their minds in the next five

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) minutes -- well I hope you do. I don't like to speak for nothing and I hope maybe I am having some effect.

I'll use the Attorney-General's technique. "WHEREAS it is contrary to the principle of the rule of law that persons be prevented by Court Order from doing acts which are not contrary to law." Nobody disagrees with that, that the act if it's to be prevented should be specified as an unlawful act. 2. "WHEREAS this House intends that all citizens of Manitoba be permitted to advance their interests provided that they employ means which are not contrary to law." Nobody's against that. They say that the status quo is not crystallized; it's not fixed. If you can work your way up to the top and do nothing illegal, that avenue is open to you. We are not trying to perpetuate the economic status quo which is now in existence. So I don't think anybody disagrees with that.

"WHEREAS this House recognizes the lawful right of all citizens to the peaceful use of the public streets and the right of all citizens to persuade others by the use of free speech in all form." Well, Mr. Speaker, all that says is that we recognize the right of the public to ride down the street or walk down the street, which includes the sidewalks. To those people who may be worried about that word, "street" includes the sidewalk. If the Honourable the Minister of Highways was here I think he would confirm that to you. So that if you walk down the sidewalk we don't object to that. We think that Reverend Stokes is doing what he has a perfect right to do. -- (Interjection) -- Except, as my friend the Member for St. John's points out, that you may not be able to walk down the streets and sidewalks in the Legislative Building complex, but that's an exception, Mr. Speaker, which the Minister of Public Works has given us some reason to think will be changed. But nevertheless, if anybody suggested that a person can't walk down the street, let's say an employer, walk down the street in front of the Union Centre, saying "Don't join the union," would they be able to get an injunction against him? Would we even get an injunction against the Chamber of Commerce, who ?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): If it's an illegal act we will.

MR. GREEN: Well, does the Minister intend that to be an illegal act? That's the question.

MR. BAIZLEY: That's for the courts to decide.

MR. GREEN: You say that that's for the courts to decide and not for this House to decide? You won't have this House decide whether the Chamber of Commerce, walking in front of the Union Centre, constitutes an illegal act. You say that's for the courts to decide. I say that's for this House to decide. If you're going to deprive them of that right, deprive them by the elected representatives of the people, not by the courts, and if that's your thinking then you've proved you're wrong. If they do something contrary to the Criminal Code my honourable friend knows that he can get a policeman to stop him.

MR. LYON: Are you asking us to the law?

MR. GREEN: We are asking you, Mr. Attorney-General, to assure the citizens of Manitoba that they have the right of freedom of speech which has been taken away by the courts; which has been demonstrably taken away by the courts. And I put it to you, that the Minister has just said that in his opinion that if the Chamber of Commerce had men walking in front of the Union Centre with signs saying "Don't join the Union," that he thinks that the courts should decide whether that conduct is legal or illegal. I say that we should decide. That's what my constituents, in any event, have elected me to decide. They don't elect the judges but they elect the legislators and we should legislate.

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House declare that no citizen shall be enjoined from exercising the right to the peaceful use of the public streets." That's all we want. "... and from the peaceful use of free speech for the purpose of persuasion, even though such persuasion may result in a loss of trade . . ." - like what Reverend Ray Stokes is doing, interfering with all the restaurateurs in Greater Winnipeg, by telling them to come to the Church during the noon hour rather than to go to the restaurants and have their lunch.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's now 5:30. I wonder if the honourable gentleman has leave to continue his speech at another time.

MR. GREEN: I'd like to have the matter stand, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? It is now 5:30. I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 this evening.