

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
10:00 o'clock, Friday, September 19, 1969

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.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left where we have 80 students of Grade 11 standing of the Miles MacDonnell School. These students are under the direction of Miss Lindsay. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of - oh, the Minister of Finance has arrived. I'd like to ask him if he has furnished the House with a complete list of the income tax for the various groups. In his statement last night he supplied examples of tax increases for a married man with two children. Could he supply a list of the complete taxation range for all categories?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I think what the honourable member is requesting is a complete tax table of the size as supplied by the Federal Government, which I think is both beyond the scope of our work and I think a large accounting job which I don't think I should undertake. Let me just indicate to my honourable friend and to everybody interested, that the effect of the proposed increase will be something less than six percent of the tax which was payable in the previous year. In other words, if in the, let's say in the current fiscal year the total tax payable by an individual is \$1,000.00 then that person will be asked to pay an additional, roughly 5.7 percent of that. I don't think that we should go into the works of preparing a table because then you have to bring in many features that are federal in nature such as the - I'm sorry, for the moment I forget the term of the special social -- (Interjection) -- development tax which is federal or which is a tax super-imposed on the base tax by the Federal Government. You get into a very elaborate accounting transaction which really I don't think is our responsibility nor do I think it's too helpful because the average citizen is concerned with what is the effect on him. I gave a scale which I think applies to the average citizen, which is rough; but another rough way of calculating it - when I say it's "rough" I mean rough only in the sense that it is general and not specific and not in any other way - but I think generally if you take it that the increase is between five and six percent and certainly not as high as six percent of the tax that would otherwise be payable that that's a pretty close estimate as to how it affects the individual.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Then a single person with let's say \$1,000 of taxable income will still pay roughly six percent more; he won't be taxed any more heavily than a married person?

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, let's get this straight. Firstly, it's not six percent of taxable income; it's six percent of tax which is an awful lot less than six percent of taxable income. Secondly, that six percent - which is more than it will be, the six percent, it's roughly 5.7 percent and it could be less, depending on the application of the Federal Social Development tax which would reduce the 5.7. But if he takes 5.7 of his tax, then that's awfully close, but that's tax payable, not income. I think that's very important that that should be understood. Whether he's single, married, no matter how many dependents he has, it is still an application that applies to the tax that he pays.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Is he aware that there were 11 employees dismissed at Columbia Forest Products just recently for misunderstanding how many hours of workweek? Can he give us a report?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): No, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take the question as notice. I haven't it at my fingertips but I certainly would appreciate the honourable member forwarding me the information so that I might look into the matter which I

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... will be glad to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure who I should direct this question at. Perhaps it would be the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he could inform the House on what the fee for Mr. Cass-Beggs is for his study; and also what the fee is for Mr. Harold Buchwald for representing the Southern Indian Lake people.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, we shall take that question as notice and get the information for the honourable member, although it strikes me as being the kind of question that could be better placed as an Order for Return. Would you so do?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable First Minister would take it as notice, perhaps the session may not last long enough to act on the Order.

MR. SCHREYER: It's taken as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, several days ago I asked a question of the First Minister or the Minister of Finance whether or not they had had an opportunity to discuss the hydro-electric developments with the Hydro Board or senior Hydro officials. I ask that question again now, whether or not they have had since the decision made by the government, an opportunity to meet with Hydro officials and expand that question to include the Atomic Energy Commission of Canada with respect to possible refinancing arrangements of the transmission line.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the first question was a meeting with the Board. The honourable member probably knows that the Board has been reconstituted and he may know that the Chairman of the Board has been unwell and therefore no effort has been made on my part to ask them to meet as a Board. However, I know that the Minister of Mines and Resources has been in very close communication with the senior people of the Manitoba Hydro System. When I say close I mean pretty constant discussions with them about next steps.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In the light of that answer perhaps somebody on the government side could correct an impression left in a news report several days ago that Hydro officials had to send somebody to the Legislature the other day to receive a copy of the Cass-Beggs Report. Is it conceivable that the Hydro people would not have seen the report prior to its release here in the House?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I didn't see the report. It's certainly not correct. I mean when I say I didn't see the report, I mean the newspaper report. Hydro has been in close touch with direct discussions with David Cass-Beggs and with the interim report which formed part of the final report and the final report. The only justification for that kind of a statement might be that they sent over for extra copies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and he's not in his chair. I could also have asked it of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I'll ask it of maybe the First Minister. I was advised this morning that there's three bears walking around the streets of Dauphin. I was going to ask the Minister of Tourism and Recreation if it's an added attraction to his department.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it sort of deflates my ego that I should be the third choice of the Honourable Member for Roblin, but I can say to him that if bears are walking the streets of Dauphin, it seems to me that they have no business straying that far from Grandview and Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs. I believe I asked him a question yesterday which he took as notice. Does he intend to introduce legislation to require registration of conditional sales, lien notes and sales agreements?

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(Springfield): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did take that question as notice and I have to come forth today and tell you this is a matter of policy and that you will hear from us soon.

MR. PATRICK: Will it be this session?

MR. TOUPIN: In due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, this is such a quiet

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.)... morning - I thought we expected a very short session but it seems to be going a little longer than we thought. I wonder if I could direct a question possibly to the Minister of Government Services? In view of the fact that it is taking longer than we expected, could he now possibly have some of the clocks synchronized in this building, especially in our caucus room?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it had been the intention of this government to eventually phase out some of the dairy operations that the government operates in various government institutions, and I direct the question to the Minister of Health and Social Services of all persons because among the concerns was the ability of some of the outdated equipment to in fact produce a product that would pass its various health standards and so forth. Could the Minister undertake as notice a review of the current situation at the different government institutions and indicate to the House whether or not this policy of the past government is being carried on by this government, that is the phasing out of the dairy operations, or indeed if there are any difficulties in various dairy operations that are being carried on by the government, particularly with reference to health hazards.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that I don't associate myself with the assumptions that the honourable member has made but I'll look into the questions that he raised.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Official Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if perhaps you would call the resolution on Page 2 calling in the name of the Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in order to help expedite proceedings of the House, I would like the indulgence of the House to have this resolution taken off the Order Paper.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. May I enquire whether it is in order when there is an amendment that is under consideration by the Speaker in this regard?

MR. SCHREYER: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, that's precisely the reason why I would like the indulgence of the House to take this resolution off the Order Paper because there is another motion of the same content which has been moved by way of amendment to another resolution. It's really the same subject material; it's just that we have two on the Order Paper and I'd like to have your indulgence to take it off.

MR. WEIR: Except, Mr. Speaker, the cart's kind of before the horse. We should really have taken this one off first....

MR. PAULLEY: Notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, a member has the right to ask to have his resolution dropped. It's not properly before the House, in any case - that is, this one.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker....

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Likewise. I'm also agreeable.

MR. WEIR: .... prefer to have seen it done the other way, we won't stand in the way of it and will agree.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

Bill No. 16 - An Act Respecting The Keystone Centre;

Bill No. 27 - An Act Amending the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act;

Bill No. 35 - An Act To Amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 16 was read section by section and passed.) Bill No. 27, An Act to Amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to commend the government for being concerned about the plight of the old age pensioner in the City of Winnipeg. I feel that with all their election promises that they should do something for the old age pensioner, and I question at this time whether this is the proper method to do what they in all their humanitarianism should be doing for the old age pensioner. In effect this bill shifts the responsibility from the provincial government to the Metropolitan Corporation, and I doubt if this is what the people of Manitoba really want this government to do.

As one of the rural members of this House, I am very sorry to have to go back to my constituency and report that this bill will not assist the old age pensioners in my constituency in any way. The fact is that only in three localities in the Province of Manitoba will there be any assistance given to the old age pensioners and it will be restricted only to assistance in bus fares. I myself feel that if this government had wanted to do something for the old age pensioners, had they given them say a \$5.00 a month increase in old age pensions, they would have covered the difference between the 10¢ fare and the 25¢ fare for the old age pensioners in Winnipeg, but at the same time they would have done something for all old age pensioners across the province. I don't believe it was the intention of this government to pick out any particular segment of a certain class of our society and give benefits to one and not to the other. So at this time, Mr. Chairman, I rise to bring this point to the government and I would respectfully ask that they consider this seriously because there are discrepancies when this bill is passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, while the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell was speaking I don't think that many people in the House were paying much attention to him - and that includes people on his own side. I'm wondering if the speech that he just made is one that he had prepared to make at the last session when the former government was prepared to allow Metro the opportunity to reduce fares; because if he was I'd like to know just what he was going to work out with the former government. To speak about this as not being any real contribution to the old age pensioners from outside of the three areas that are concerned, is to me begging the question very much. If he wants to make a speech in support of old age pensioners he should certainly do so, but to use that in criticism - I believe it's in criticism of this bill which is before us and which was about to be presented by his own government in the last session - is to me trying to convert a gesture which was agreed to or is agreeable by all members of this Legislature to make some recognition of the hardship imposed on people who live in metropolitan areas and have to travel by public transit to get from one place to another, and to confuse that with the overall problem which I think we all recognize, is I think not paying attention to what was the intention of this Act which was simply to make it possible for transit users who are pensioners to be able to get around in a city when they are in need of travelling extended distances. Certainly no one until now has attempted to say that this is to aid the old age pensioners' plight.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I must add that if anybody was not paying attention, it must have been the Minister of Finance, because I rose and commended the government for this.

MR. CHERNIACK: And then criticized it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think I did speak on the matter on second reading. Certainly we do not begrudge the senior citizens of this metropolitan city the benefits that will be derived under this bill. Far be it from that, because I feel that it's coming to them. But as has been suggested by the previous speaker, what about the other senior citizens of this province? I think this is a concern that he has. Just what will the benefits amount to in the way of dollars and cents in total to the government? How much is set aside for this purpose? I think we should have some idea on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section (1)(d)--passed; (i)--passed....

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, .... the courtesy of a reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1(d)--passed; (i)--passed....

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, do I have to repeat it again? How much will the total amount or the total benefits amount to under this bill that is being set aside? Could the

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... Honourable Minister....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member should realize that this is not provincial money we're talking about. This is Metropolitan Corporation which has requested that they be given the opportunity to reduce fares in those cases where they think that it is applicable, and the cost of that will, of course, be borne by the Department of -- I don't know what they're called in Metro, I should know, I was there -- the transit cost, and it will not be a burden in any way on the provincial revenues.

MR. FROESE: ... subsidizing the Transit of Metropolitan Winnipeg?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, we are.

MR. FROESE: I take it that this is offsetting - or the contribution that we are making will be offsetting this....

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, what we are doing is paying a percentage of the gross up to a maximum and it is not known what the effect of this could be because it may well generate additional revenues from people who would now be able to use transit and who couldn't before, and therefore it would be completely unrealistic to guess at any figure. One would hope that transit will be used much more by these people paying reduced fares than they have up to now. So I must say that firstly, if there was the same usage as before it can't be very much, but I would expect that there'll be greater usage, that's the reason for it; and if that is the case then it shouldn't affect it as far as I can see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 27 was read section by section and passed.)

Bill No. 35. Section 1, subsection 60(1)--passed; 60(2)--passed; 60(3)--passed; 60(4)--passed; 60(5)--passed; 60(6)-- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On Section 60(6)(b), I have an amendment that I wish to propose. The amendment is as follows: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that the government consider the advisability of amending Section 60, subsection (6)(b)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I ask the indulgence of the member for a moment. I've jumped some subsections. I'd like to go back to subsection 60(4) and then I'll allow the member to read his motion. Subsection 60(4)--passed; (b)--

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on (b)....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you talking about subsection 60(4)...

MR. FROESE: (b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)-- 60(4)(b).

MR. FROESE: 60(6).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm talking about 60(4).

MR. FROESE: I thought you were on 60(6).

MR. CHAIRMAN: 60(4). I'm going back to that. (a)--passed; (b)--passed; (c)--passed; (d)--passed; 60(4)--passed. Subsection 60(5)--passed; 60(6)(a)--passed; (b)--

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: As previously indicated, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that the government consider the advisability of amending Section 60, subsection 6(b) by inserting the following words after the word "members" in the third line thereof: "or less than four members providing the party has been represented in two or more consecutive legislatures."

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I spoke on this particular bill yesterday and I informed the House at that time that I would be proposing this particular amendment. I feel that the bill as it stands at the present time is discriminating. It is in my opinion completely unfair and I brought the various matters before the House at that time. After all, I'm representing a party and I think this also should apply to any future parties that might come in, and I think the request made is not unreasonable in any way. Certainly it's not any fly-by-night that could come in under those rules. You would have to be a member of this House, or the party would have to be represented in two or more Legislatures before they would be recognized if they have less than four members, and therefore I think the request is one that is reasonable, that members of this House should be willing to accept.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

As I pointed out, a leader of a party has to do more work, he has to concern himself with more matters than other members, individual members have to, and under the circumstances I think this is a fair request. I certainly would want to appeal to the First Minister and the government, likewise to other members of the House, that they give consideration to this matter, favourable consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, in the light of all the discussions we've had on this matter generated by the speeches made by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, it would not even be rude if all I did was stand up and say no and sit down again, because we have discussed it. But courtesy requires that I point out to the honourable member that in the seven or so years that I have been here I've noted that he has received special consideration at all times by all parties in an informal way, recognizing his separate position in this House. As I say, all parties and the government of the time I think has always given him special attention and special consideration informally, and I don't think that he is entitled to more than that, because the fact is that although he represents a party which has some political aspirations, it has not been shown that that party has acquired the support of people of Manitoba to a rather minimal extent, and I think therefore that it would be wrong, because before we know it we will all declare ourselves, at least those of us who have had two consecutive sessions here, as being parties and we can all become opposition leaders of our individual parties, such as the Liberal Democratic Party or the Independent Party which the member for Churchill represents - the Independent Party of Churchill, and I think it's carrying it a bit far to agree with the proposal of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to simply say that it's in direct defiance of the rules of the House and as such I wouldn't even consider supporting the resolution. If there was to be any change made it would be made through the changes of the rules of the House in the proper way and we'll oppose the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I rise to also say that I'm unable to support the Honourable Member for Rhineland's motion. I think that our primary position here is to represent our constituencies and then the province, and if we have a party affiliation, that is secondary.

But I would say this in sympathy for my honourable friend that I believe that individuals if they don't have the proper facilities cannot carry out their work in this House. I would think that independent members and single or other members who are not officially designated as a Party should have the proper office and they should have secretarial help and they should have a private telephone, perhaps not during the whole year but certainly during the session. I find it almost inconceivable that a member that's sent here to represent thousands and thousands of people does not have a proper office to work in and does not have a private telephone. I think that this is something that can be done for people who do not have a Party status. Surely in this building we can find one or two more offices for my honourable friends who do not have the proper working facilities. As far as supporting his motion in this respect goes we are unable to support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I may be wrong but I'm under the impression at the present time that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is listed on a telephone separate; I'm not sure of the accommodation but I believe he's got accommodation as well. I also believe that the Member for Churchill is the same. Now I'm not positive of that. But I agree with the points in large degree that have been raised by the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party.

I also think that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge has some place by herself. But I'm sure that the members of the Assembly appreciate the difficulty that we have or -- not we have, it's been a difficulty over quite a considerable period of time as to the availability of space. I'm sure that the points raised by the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party will be taken under consideration. But it is my impression that there is space, there is a telephone listed under the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: It was my impression that the Honourable Member for Churchill does not have any facilities. I understand the Member for Rhineland does.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sure though, Mr. Chairman, if that is the case the Honourable

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... Member for Churchill will soon draw it to our attention, and I'm sure the Minister of Government Services and the rest will do their utmost to accommodate the members. I'm well aware of the fact that in Ontario there is greater provision for secretarial staff to smaller numbers of members; as I recall there every four members have a stenographer - something along that line which we haven't been able to match up with at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think honourable members should be reminded of their counterparts in other provinces. When the Conservatives had one member in Saskatchewan and the New Democratic Party had one member in Alberta, they certainly received services and were recognized and I don't see any reason why that should not apply in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we have that mike turned on please.

MR. FROESE: I object to what the Leader of the Official Opposition says, that he recalls our rules do not make allowance for this, that this cannot be considered. This House is supreme in itself and we can decide here at this point on these matters. Certainly we do not have to change the rules in order to change an Act. This is a matter that can receive first consideration and we can change the rules after so that we needn't be abided by it on it on that basis. But as the Liberal House Leader says he thinks that secretarial help should be provided. I certainly would appreciate secretarial help which I haven't received over all the years. I've got an office, I've got a telephone, and I appreciate that, and have appreciated that the previous government provided it all these years as well. But I think we should go further. I think the request that is being made in the motion before us is a reasonable one; it is one that will be provided to any Party that comes into this Legislature under those conditions, and certainly I think it should apply equally to any other Party that will come in. And on that basis I do hope that the government will reconsider and give us favourable consideration.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 35 was read section by section and passed.) Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has considered Bills 16, 27 and 35 and passed the same without amendment.

#### IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that the report of the committee be received.

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

BILLS No. 16, 27 and 35 were read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second readings.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is not present at the present time. Maybe we could just hold that for the time being. I'm sure the honourable gentleman will return to the Chamber before too long. Possibly we could call the adjourned debate standing in the name of the Premier, No. 38, respecting the Election Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister, Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Election Act. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make some comments on Bill No. 38, The Act to amend The Elections Act.

First of all I'd like to say that the Elections Act, the first part of it - the arrangements for shut-ins being able to vote, or making it easier for them to vote on an election is very good. This has been something that has been lacking in Legislation for a long time.

I would only like to say that I don't think it has gone quite far enough in this respect; there are many people who are not shut-ins but have full knowledge that they will be out of town and will not be able to make voting day and have full knowledge that they will not be able to vote on the advance polls. I think some consideration should be given to these people by having some form for them to prove that they will not be available in their constituency to vote on election day. It has been a hardship for many. I know when I was campaigning many people said I would like to vote but I will not be in town either on election day and I will be gone before the advance poll. I think that there should be some consideration given to people in this regard or in this circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, the main meat of this Bill 38, the amendment to the Elections Act, is the

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . lowering of the voting age in the Province of Manitoba to the age 18.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to say that people between the age of 18 and 21 as I know them are probably the finest group of citizens we have in this province. They're enthusiastic like they've never been before. They take an interest in everything like we've never seen them take an interest before. They have shown especially an interest in politics like we have never seen before. They will research, they will study and come up with some very fine comments or judgments on political affairs and I assure you on many affairs in this day and age. They're better educated - there's no doubt about that. The educational system is such today that a person between the age of 18 and 21, and certainly all our children, have an opportunity for better education and thank heavens they're taking advantage of it.

Now I mention again enthusiasm. Heavens we'd all be very annoyed if they didn't have enthusiasm and I assure you that the styles and things that we see boys and girls wearing today are something that is not new in history of changing in styles. I think some of you here all went through different styles in clothes and the way you wear your hair. I know I went through one where we used to wear draped pants and a key chain and what have you and got - I see the Honourable Member for St. Boniface smiling - the key chain and what have you. There was criticism of some people who were called the zoot suiters but in majority all of us at that time, we weren't bad people, we were enthusiastic people. We have the same thing today. Boys and girls styles will change as the styles of adults will change and that's very evident by the many coloured shirts you see in this House at the present time.

But I would only like to say that the enthusiasm again shown by many children, I see a lot of it. I have a good looking daughter and I see many teen-agers of all ages at my home and I can assure you they're all very fine people. If I were to say to one of them do you think the 18 year old should be voting and you know the answer I usually get from one of them is "sure I could vote but that guy down the street he sure can't." When I talk to the guy down the street he says "I can but that guy up the street he sure can't." This is not to say they're being indifferent or they don't know their own mind but teen-agers make an evaluation of one another sometimes much better than you and I can.

The fact that the education is there, let's face it, because a man is a graduate engineer doesn't make him the most experienced engineer. The fact that a man becomes learned in the vocational school in carpentry, plumbing or anything else he chooses to take when he walks out of that school, that doesn't make him experienced entirely in his vocation. The same applies to law, office workers or anybody at all going out into life.

Now again I am not being critical of the teen-ager - certainly not because I enjoy them. I'm not saying that their enthusiasm for voting is wrong, but the main thing that we should be doing for the teen-ager or the 18 to 21 year old today as politicians, should be making sure that we create an environment that they are happy to live in; that they can receive an education and to give their opinions while they are attending schools and getting experience in that age in life so that they can enjoy themselves as I said. This is our main potential.

Now regarding the lowering of the age limit on vote. When the First Minister presented the bill he stated that he first wanted to await the guidance from the Federal Government's action, but my understanding is that the Federal Government does not have it in mind to make a change in this respect very soon. So I don't see any reason why we can't wait for the Federal Government's decision to have some uniformity between Federal and Provincial Government in Manitoba.

There's another reason why - and I also think that the Federal Government is looking very closely into this situation so we can have uniformity. But what does this bill say? This bill says that we will give the person from 18 to 21 the privilege to vote provincially only. It doesn't say that he can vote for municipal elections. It doesn't say that he can go in a bar. It doesn't say that he can vote on a referendum for another school or a recreation area in his province or area that he lives. It doesn't say any of those things. It just says: (1) He can vote provincially.

Now in the interests of uniformity I think with the Federal Government, and with the voting procedures in the Province of Manitoba I really believe that we should consider the change in the age limit at the present time much more thoroughly than we have. Because I think this is just arbitrarily deciding maturity without having gone into it in very very much thought or consideration. It will put a definite strain on the voting procedures from the point of view of uniformity, and I think that the teen-agers today or the 18 to 21s deserves more consideration than just



(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . saying you can vote for one thing only.

I would also like to remind the House that a person between the age of 18 and 21 in many cases cannot be taken to court. If he does not pay for a suit or something he orders from a store, the responsibility is upon his parents or a guardian who is over 21 years of age at the present time. Now really I think that if the 18 to 21 year old is going to have the responsibility of voting for the man who makes the laws, I think he should come under the laws that exist at the present time for the 21 and up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to dwell any further on that. I'd just like to say that if this important change is going to be made in this province without taking into consideration the lack of uniformity that this Bill has, and certainly the lack of uniformity with the Federal Government at the present time, I believe that it should be decided by the voters and it should be placed before the people as a referendum to decide at this time whether the voting age should be lowered.

As I told you, I have nothing against the 18 to 21-year-olds, I think they're fine people, but this and a few other things in this House are probably very important things for this province. I don't think the Bill has uniformity; I don't think that it complies the way we should with the Federal Government voting age. I think we should wait, but if you feel the demand and the teenager between 18 and 21 wants to vote - and I'm not too sure that he does - I think there should be more investigation made with them; it should go to a referendum to the people of the Province of Manitoba to decide this issue. Thank you.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I was listening carefully to what the last member said and I just wasn't sure of whether his party is for this or against it, but I kind of think that he was dragging his heels a bit -- (Interjection) -- Well, I've seen the light. I think it's a pretty good Act. I don't think we have to wait for uniformity across the whole of Canada, because I must say to the last member that this has held back a great deal of the development of Canada because we waited for uniformity on many things and in many cases. I would say to the member he should look back and say: did it affect us because they wouldn't do something in our area in western Canada because it wasn't going to be done in some other area, it had to wait to be done some place else? I think that other provinces have showed that it can be done. I think the young fellow, as the last speaker said, is ready and wants to vote. If he wants to vote, let him vote. He is much further ahead. He mentioned that my seatmate here, the Member for St. Boniface, was in the "dew drop" area, was it? He wasn't. He was back in the "Whoopee pants" era.

But I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that I could rise at this time because I would like to go back a little further and discuss the problems of redistribution, and I am sure that there are members within hearing that were responsible for some of the redistribution in this province, and now I have an opportunity to speak and be heard as far as this is concerned, particularly in this House where he is also responsible for the elections come election time, then he'll hear about the difficulties that we do have in the Churchill constituency which I'm sure became a little larger after redistribution than it was even before.

I think that when you're talking about votes within five days, as I believe it was, where they have to be mailed and brought back to the officer in charge of the election within five days, this is utterly ridiculous in respect to the Churchill constituency which is half of the area of the Province of Manitoba. In Rupertsland, and I believe in The Pas and in all probability Flin Flon and even in St. Boniface, where you could mail something and it would take sometimes four days - it could conceivably take four days to go from one end of the city to the other.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Dog sled. No snow.

MR. BEARD: The Trudeau government. But mail service just isn't as fast as we would like to think it is and the Election Act itself has to be contravened many times - and I may as well admit it - in the Churchill area to get things done now, and the way the whole Election Act is set up there is bound to be problems and there's bound to be disparities, even as efficient as the new returning officer will probably be when he's voted in for the Churchill constituency, he's not going to be able to do it. You just can't do it on time, and when you are considering voting privileges for people, and I presume this is supposed to be for all of the province, you'll find that actually it is only good, if it's good at all, for the area of Metro Winnipeg or probably Thompson or Brandon, but it's certainly not going to be able to be conformed with in respect to the area which I represent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that while I don't feel that perhaps we should hold back because it can't look after the problems that arise in the Churchill constituency, I do say that possibly

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . the election committee should take a look at those problems which do arise in an area like that because certainly enumeration is almost impossible, if not impossible within the time limit, so it's a "by guess and by God" type of enumeration at the best, and of course in many of the communities where they do not have efficient people to not only do the enumeration but act as responsible returning officers, then of course the voting becomes more difficult and probably that's why the present Member for Churchill gets elected. So I won't go into that part of it too much, I don't want to work myself out of a job or talk myself out of one, but I would hope that in the future that we can consider some of these problems.

I don't go for deferred elections really. They're good sometimes and not so good other times for politicians, it just happens which side you're on. But deferred elections, I can say to you, do help the returning officers in that it does give them the additional time to get their work done. I don't think deferred election is the answer and I can't give you an answer, but I leave that question with members to just reflect on when they're considering changes in the future.

So we're offering an opportunity here which is impossible to take advantage of; which is impossible to do properly. Some of our communities up there do not get mail regularly and sometimes it's over a month, and if the Minister of Welfare were listening, then he would have to consider what would happen of course with the old age pensioner whose cheque comes a month late.

The members have been talking about responsibilities of voting at 18. I think that 18 age people are ready to vote. If they're not ready to vote now then maybe they will by the time there's another election. I think that along with voting though they must bring other things in line. I don't think everything must be brought in line at once. The last member said that maybe we should suggest all these things at once, but I don't think you should expect to shove all these things down a young boy's or a young lady's throat at the same time but let them learn to walk before they can run. If they want to vote when they're 18 that is up to them. I don't think that the turnout will be any better than what it is after they're 21; maybe it will be less. They tell me at the university it is less. I don't think they are any less responsible. They may change their mind as time goes by, but don't we all at one time or another change our philosophies or maybe our parties and such on.

I think that it's important that they have signing rights though. I think that some of these things should be considered by this government, not so that they can't, people can't -- they rushed into Bill 38 in hopes of picking up a few votes come the next election because I think that they'll probably get the shock just the same as the rest of the parties and find that the voting may be just distributed amongst all the groups rather than just favouring one party.

But I think to complement this that they must consider other things such as fiscal responsibilities for these people that are supposed to be voting on important matters, because there are far more important matters that happen every day rather than just once every four years, hopefully. I would say that they would have to consider the possibility of an 18-year-old being a member of this House because if he can vote for somebody, if he's responsible enough to vote for somebody to enter this House, then I think he should be responsible enough to sit in this House, and if this is the case then we've only gone half-way. I don't think we should wait till we make up our mind, but I think that maybe next year we should make a decision and say, Well, why not let them sit? Maybe they've got the answers. We don't seem to have all the answers, and as we get older we reflect back and say, Well, we made many mistakes and we haven't really profited because we still continue to make mistakes.

I think as far as an 18-year-old, if he's allowed to enjoy the responsibility of being able to vote at this time then he should have to also accept the responsibility in the adult matters such as fiscal, etc. Why should he be able to get married and then have to go to his father to get an agreement to do this or that. He's married and got two or three children, or a couple of children perhaps, and still not be able to go in the beer parlour and could get charged with drinking under age and he's accepted the responsibility of taking on a wife and children and such on. So these are the things which I believe, the real things that the boys and girls today are puzzled about, why they're sitting around wondering how this wise old adult can stay way behind in the horse-and-buggy days when they really have the answers. Maybe they do have some of the answers, and I think that if we caught up a bit then maybe they would slow down a bit. That's right.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I'll certainly be voting for this bill. I have made my

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . complaints in respect to the Churchill constituency; I hope it will be taken under consideration and that perhaps something will be done to relieve the anguish that all of us as candidates have to live with when we go to bed and wonder whether we're elected or not and have to wait until the next day or maybe the next week to be sure. If they're really going to dig into The Election Act, let's get some of these things straightened up in northern Manitoba which has been neglected for so long. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the speeches already made and particularly to the Member for Sturgeon Creek who gave us a number of reasons as to why we should not at this time support a lowering of the voting age to 18. It seems to me that they simply could be summarized as: first, wait for the Federal Government; secondly, wait because we might consider going even further; and finally, we should wait because there should be a referendum. But when you boil them all down it simply comes to the basic argument, some time in the future perhaps but not now. One definition of a Conservative is one who hesitates to do anything for the first time, and perhaps that is the basic problem of that particular member.

Mr. Speaker, I have been following this resolution and this type of a suggestion to lower the voting age for a long time, and as a member of this House I've followed it since 1966. I recall at that time that the First Minister hinted a great deal that he was going to do something and that he hoped it would meet with the favour of the honourable members for this House. It sounded to me at that time, as a new ingenuous young member, that he was in fact going to support the lowering of the voting age and I thought that would be a terrific thing, but -- (Interjection) -- yes it was. As a result, when the First Minister of that day, Premier Roblin, finally spoke it turned out that all he did was make some kind of an amendment to wait for the Federal Government. Well that was in very early '67, that was in the second part of our Legislative Session, '66-67 - that was a couple of years ago. Now we read in the newspapers that according to certain Toronto newspapers there are indications that the voting age will be lowered to 18 next spring. In other words, it's always in the future. We waited from '67 on the advice of the First Minister and now we're talking again for the Federal Government and we're talking in terms of 1970. I suppose it may be another few years yet.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not particularly impressed with the normal type of argument that we hear on why the voting age should be lowered. No one has raised these arguments yet, but I suppose if the debate continues we'll hear our sort of a traditional argument which all of us have heard in high school debates and in other discussions, since you can fight for your country and die for your country at 18, therefore, etc., etc., you should be allowed to vote at that age. -- (Interjection) -- No traditional is left on that side. -- (Interjection) -- You're all progressives. Throw up the conservative part of your label then. -- (Interjection) -- Well, there's a conservative beside you then.

The real question, the real question, Mr. Speaker, I think if you fundamentally boil down the debate that all of us must answer is as follows: Is an 18-year-old capable of making an intelligent decision? I think that's the basic premise, is he capable of intelligent decisions? If so, then it follows that he is capable of voting intelligently, because if he's capable in a broad sense, it seems to me he should be capable in the specific illustration of voting, and I am one of those who naturally support that position. I'm not talking about the so-called other reasons or irrational factors that spring into voting that are very big in how members get elected, the factors of ethnic consideration or religious grounds or appearance or factors of tradition and habit. Some of us I suppose are here for those reasons, because of patterns in our constituencies or because we look like somebody's uncle or don't look like somebody's uncle. The Hon. Member for Portage la Prairie didn't get elected for any of those reasons. -- (Interjection) -- That may be why you got elected. Nobody disliked you, everybody thought that there was nobody you reminded them of.

If we consider the youth of today, and we've had some discussion on this and I don't care to go into this portion of the debate in any great detail, surely there has been tremendous changes that have occurred in the last decade. In fact I don't think that you can fairly measure generation changes any more the way we used to in terms of 20 years. I think some sociologists and others would think that so-called generation gaps are more evident in terms of every five years or so. There's been such incredible change. Witness recently the Astronauts landing on the moon or the impact on television. We're now talking to a generation that has in effect young people who have spent most of their years sitting in front of a television set from about age one

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . on, and obviously this has an effect on their sensibilities, on the way they view things, on the amount of information they get and the way it is receiving -- (Interjection) --

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the important corollaries of this proposal of this government is that if the voting age is lowered to 18, and I think this measure will pass with the support of some of the progressives opposite who are in not only the Liberal Party but also in the Progressive Conservative Party, I think that one of the things that will have to be done, and I think one of the values of lowering the voting age is this, that the courses that are taken in high school for example will have to be geared-up to meet with this changed situation. The Minister of Education will either have to issue a directive, or it will become self-evident and in that case he will not have to issue a directive, to all the history people, to all the principals and superintendents and the Department of Curriculum, that since voting will occur at age 18 that the school programs must be geared-up, that there will have to be more courses taught in government and civics at an earlier level to familiarize students with the mechanics of voting, with the general history of our country, with how government works and so on.

This is now done in the high schools but it starts in Grade 11, and most students up to Grade 11 have only a smattering of general background in terms of their knowledge of politics and government. But in Grade 11 they start getting their first courses and their knowledge really skyrockets, and I think that if we lower the voting age, which I think will happen, then we'll have to gear-up the courses, we'll have to start about Grade 9 for example to teach civics and government in 9, 10 and 11 so that by the time a person is through Grade 11 he has had several years in terms of basic information on how the Legislatures function, the history of Canada, and perhaps more of the history of the Province of Manitoba which is very sadly lacking in our high schools in this province.

I think the advantage of doing this is that the courses will become more meaningful to our young people. One of the problems of teaching history is that young people feel that they're dealing with things in the past. A student said to me one time when I was teaching - I guess about 1960 or so in my first year of teaching - that he didn't want to learn about all the dead guys, and then he enumerated Napoleon. And I thought well, you know, he's only 16 years old so I guess Napoleon seems a long time ago. And then the second illustration he gave was Hitler, and that was 15 years after the Second World War. He thought that was passe. So one of the problems that young people I suppose have is identifying with the past. Maybe this is the problem of my friends opposite, maybe this is the reason why they weren't returned to power.

I think that one of the advantages of taking this measure would be to make the course more meaningful. This is one of the big concerns of the youth of today, that they don't feel that things are relevant or that they're alive or that there is something happening. They feel that they're dealing with sterile old information. In terms of history, I think that by lowering the voting age the interest created will exert a pressure on the schools and on the students and will as a result cause them to be more interested because they'll feel that they're now preparing for a real responsibility to go into the adult world and participate in government. More than half of the provinces, as was pointed out by the Honourable First Minister, now have a lower voting age. Six out of ten have a voting age of 18 or 19. If we follow it'll be seven out of ten, so if we're looking for tradition or pattern or if we need any moral support, if we are afraid that we are breaking ground, then the pattern is already established. We're simply following suit, we're not doing anything, this province is not doing anything radical in lowering the voting age.

I think, Mr. Speaker, to sum up my comments, I think that by taking this measure, I think that we are demonstrating a confidence in our young people which I think they too often feel is lacking, that as a result we will get more participation on their part in terms of being interested in government and that as a result they will bear a greater responsibility. Ultimately it's a matter of faith, and I think that it boils down to this, Mr. Speaker. I have faith in our young people and I urge my fellow members in this House to demonstrate their belief in the worthiness of the young people of today in Canada and in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Oh, a question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, would he also instruct the young people what the reflections are and the failure of socialism in schools?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I think that in the schools of course there would be no such thing as instruction in socialism. There would be instruction in terms of the political history of the province and the country. And I might tell my honourable friend that if he were to look

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . at the textbooks that are used in the high schools of Manitoba he would be shocked, because I think one of the deficiencies is the fact that the amount of attention paid to the CCF and the New Democratic Party and to the Social Credit Party is really shocking. The other two parties are given considerable attention, and somewhere on Page 76 at the bottom of the page and in the last paragraph there's a section which refers to - and I've seen this in textbooks - splinter parties or third parties, and a few sentences are put in about the CCF and J. S. Woodsworth and a few sentences perhaps about the government in Alberta and perhaps in British Columbia. So I would like to see a broader discussion taking place and I think that I would even get the support of my honourable friend on that.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. DOERN: Yes.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, realizing that today the courses and everything in universities being as complex as they are, and the amount that a person has to learn today, and I agree that knowledge of politics should be taught, but don't you think science, atomic research, mathematics, all at a higher level are probably more important to the young people today than many of the things you mentioned?

MR. DOERN: I certainly don't. Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the things that is needed in this country is a familiarity with our heritage and culture. That has certainly got to be placed near the top, and one of the problems that all of us as politicians realize is that people must participate in their government. Democracy presupposes an intelligent electorate, and by that I include a substantial knowledge of history and government, not just a knowledge of mathematics.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the honourable member. Are you in favour of permitting an 18-year-old to be a candidate in an election?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't made up my mind on that issue. I can see myself supporting it. I think that this is simply a question that I still have open. I suppose to be consistent I should support it, but I have not come up with a final decision on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill. There are two principles involved in the bill, reducing the voting age to 18 from 21, and the other one that the incapacitated people be able to vote by mail, which as you recall in this House for the last three to four years that I have been asking for and asking the government to amend the Municipal Act. I believe there's one other point that the government has missed in this bill and that is at the present time, which I will deal with later, under the Federal Act you can vote if you're in the constituency at the time that the writ is issued for elections. In the provincial elections, the provincial act requires people to be in the province for 12 months and this is the point that I disagree with. I will deal with that later, and if the government does not amend the bill by the next session I will bring in an amendment to the provincial act to do that, but I will deal with that a little later.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot see any point what a referendum will prove at this time as was mentioned by the member for Sturgeon Creek, because at the present time you have six provinces in Canada that have reduced the voting age: Alberta it's 19 years; B.C. - 19; New Brunswick - 18; Newfoundland - 19; Quebec - 18; and Saskatchewan - 18. So we have six provinces at this time and we're the seventh one considering, so what would a referendum prove in Manitoba I don't know. According to the news media, I understand that the Federal Government will have legislation before the next Throne Speech to reduce the voting age, so I feel that we are taking the right course of action in this House.

However, I feel that the member for Sturgeon Creek has a point in respect that perhaps it would have been better if we would have maybe had this bill dealt by maybe the Privileges and Elections Committee of this House, not to stall it but to deal with it, that we as well have produced a municipal voting age, because I would feel that the municipal level of politics is somewhat below the provincial, and surely if we're going to allow people to vote in provincial elections then I feel that we may have just as well allowed them to take an active part in municipal elections as well, and perhaps as my member says, more so. So if we would have done the two things I would have been much happier.

The other point that the Honourable Member for Elmwood has mentioned just briefly, which I asked before the Orders of the Day the other day to the Minister of Education, and what is he undertaking to do at the present time to prepare these young people and what kind of courses he'll have in schools to prepare these young people for this most important responsibility.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.)

However, I do feel that by the time an individual reaches the age of 18, I think he has acquired essentially a sound basic knowledge and it is at this age that he or she assumes full responsibilities of adulthood as he contemplates marriage and so on, and I feel that he should be able to exercise this right. Now I know that many people of this age are employed and are working, are obligated to pay tax, they're married and they're obligated to pay property tax, so I feel they should have some right to express his or her will in the fiscal policies of the government. I feel that we would discourage citizens from evaluating government policies if we not allowed them to take an active part to vote say between 18 and 21. I think we effectively promote conditions to disinterest when we exclude these people and deny them this most important right. I think that at 18 a person is beginning to undertake his rightful role in the business community, he is given some measure of responsibility, and I feel that his education has prepared him to this extent in a big way.

If a voter is to exercise his franchise judiciously, I also feel that he must be allowed to gain experience in this practice, and I feel that to postpone until 21, when at the age of 18 he has sufficient educational background, is to probably defer a basic right for no just cause, and I think it would be the right step if this bill would pass in this Legislature. I'm sure that all members in this House would agree that democracy thrives on disagreement and that we try to keep abreast with needed changes, with needed progress. I feel that we must allow for effective expression of new ideas, and surely the youth today are expressing new ideas and I think it's most important. I feel that the point that I mention is most important because you know the choice of 18 will become the legal voting age, what will happen as far as these people signing contracts? What will the effect be then? What about allowing them to go into bars and be able to be treated as an adult. This is the reason why I felt that the honourable member had some probably good points when he raised it and this is the reason why I thought perhaps it would be better dealt by a privileges and elections committee of this House and have the two amended at the same time.

I myself appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that today young people have assumed very important responsibilities in their life as school teachers, in the services and so on, and I feel this is also another point that we should take into consideration.

I would like to at this time point out some of the reasons that I feel we should. The 1911 census showed that the average 18 year old had a Grade 7 education. The 1961 census indicates that the level is now at Grade 11, so education has certainly been a great factor that's been increased.

No. 2: There are presently some 40 countries in the world that have legislation where people 18 years of age can vote and these include many States across the line of the United States; such countries as Mexico, Venezuela, Brazil, Israel and some of the provinces that I have already mentioned here in Canada.

I understand in 1964 a survey that was conducted in Eastern Canada asked a series of questions in a poll with the result that there were no significant changes of the questions asked of an 18 year old, or a question that was asked of a 21 year old or 25. So there's another indication that our people today at age 18 have fully good knowledge of the candidates that are running in the constituencies; of the policies or fiscal policies of the parties and this is an indication that I feel there is no significant difference so I cannot see what difference there is in 18 to 21.

I understand a Commission in the United States appointed by the late President Kennedy, recommended that the franchise be extended to 18 years of age after a considerable amount of study that was done in that country.

Another point, a measure to lower the federal voting age was approved, I understand, unanimously in 1964 by the Privileges and Elections Committee of the House of Commons; and at that time I understand the Conservative members of the House of Commons were in favour of that as well.

The Winnipeg City Council has asked the Provincial Government for many years to amend its Charter so that the voting age would be lowered to 18 for civic elections.

So these are some of the points that I wish to point out and I feel that we should be supporting the bill.

There are some other points that I wish to make besides the voting age but I think if we would not pass this legislation we would be creating apathy in our young people and this is

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . something that I feel we must not encourage, because if we can encourage our young people to participate in politics and identify themselves with political ideas and political knowledge at an early age I think it's a great goal and worthy of support.

The other principle in the bill was that disabled be able to vote by mail. I have for the last three or four years in this House requested this very strongly, and I appealed to the government during the Throne Speech just a few weeks ago. I've also asked this when our municipal committee has been meeting. I know at that time there was some apprehension on some of the members because they felt that something could go wrong in a certain block, or a certain group where there is old age people. I cannot see any complications or difficulty. I know that in many instances that I'm familiar with, with the wheel chair people where they are quite keen people who are taking a very keen interest in politics, they go to a voting booth or a poll and they find that they are either in a school or in a private house, there's high stairs to go up or stairs to go down, they cannot be lifted and they have to go back home without being able to exercise their right. So I think this is the right thing to do. I did deal at some length on this point when we were in the Throne Speech debate, so I will not take too long. But I am glad that the government has taken this action. I would say it is my suggestion that was recommended to this House that is taken and I'm very happy about this.

Mr. Chairman, the other point that I wanted to make is in respect to the present Election Act which I feel does discriminate. I'm disappointed that the government did not amend it; not that it affects many Canadians but it also affects many of our service people. I've had many complaints during the last election. For instance, there's many Winnipeggers or Manitobans that are away in service in Europe, away from home, when they get back to their home, to Manitoba, they have to wait twelve months before they can vote because this is how long they have to be here.

The other point is that we have many people particularly in Canada today who are transferred and probably Canadians are more mobile than any other people in any other country. The Federal Election Act states that as long as you're in the constituency at the time that the Writ has been issued for election you're entitled to vote. The Provincial Act states that you must live in the province for twelve months. To me, I think this is discrimination. People when they move into the province, they're Canadian citizens to start with, they perhaps live here for three or four or half a year, they've been paying provincial tax, sales tax, income tax, they have responsibilities and still they are denied the right to take an active part and to vote.

I would recommend to the government that they amend the provincial Election Act, that these people be entitled to vote if they are in the constituency at the time that the Writ has been issued for election. And if the government does not do this by the next session, I serve notice that I will bring an Act to amend the Provincial Legislation Act, that the Canadian citizen if he's in this province, and if he's in the constituency at the time the Writ is issued for election, he should have a right to vote.

These are some of the points.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): . . . . . and I feel that there are several remarks I should make though for two reasons: (1) I am in a professional capacity involved with teenagers, with young people who now will be given the vote; and secondly, I should make a few comments because in my constituency of Osborne there are several hospitals, collectively referred to as the Municipal Hospital. And because the hospitals are near by, many people in my constituency will now be able when this bill is passed, to exercise their franchise through the mail, a privilege which I think many of them will enjoy.

The point that I feel should be made here in support of the bill is that a political party - and I mean all political parties even the Social Credit Party in Manitoba - serve the purpose of providing communication or trials of communication between the people and the elected representatives. I think that by reducing the voting age to 18 that many many young people who some I think on the opposition benches claim might be in revolt against the accepted mores of our society, some of these young people now will be able to exercise the franchise, exercise their vote and will be perhaps a little less rebellious, a little more accepting of the existing structure of our political system because they now have the privilege of voting.

I think, too, that the Member from Assiniboia when he mentioned the raising of educational levels in the country has made a very valid point. People today, young people today, I think are perhaps more aware than they have ever been and in my opinion I think we must attribute a

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd.)... part of their awareness to the Federal Prime Minister, who I think has heated up politics to the point where many young people are now becoming involved; and becoming involved, of course, without being able to make any valid decision on the political process would be a frustrating experience. With the lowering of the voting age these people now having become interested in politics will be able to vote and I think that our society and particularly our political structure will benefit from their participation in the democratic process.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, there's a story of a young American college student in the sad days in June, 1968, immediately after the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy who was talking to his political science professor about the tragedies that had befallen the American political system, about how the lesson seemed to be that the United States system was calculated to ensure that the best men were always cut off in the bloom of their youth and were not permitted to reach the top. His professor listened to the remarks of the distraught young man for some time and then he said: "But you don't understand, the American system was never designed to ensure that the best men reached the top; it was just designed to ensure that the worst men don't." This story which may be apocryphal I think underlines the point at issue on a measure such as the one anticipated in and involved in Bill No. 38, at least insofar as this proposed legislation would lower the voting age in our province to the age of 18.

I rise in support of that measure, Mr. Speaker. I have no fears of the sincerity of our young people in their conscience and in their capability of coping with the responsibility to handle the ballot. Where my fears lie is in the area of preparation and education such as that underlined in the story I related a moment or two ago about the university student in United States and his political science professor. The point of course being that the basic underlying thrust of the congregational system, and of the American system of politics had never made itself clear to the young man who was appealing to his professor for some succour and sustenance at a time when he felt personally and individually bereaved. I think the same is largely true of most of our young people in Canada where our political institutions and our parliamentary system and some of our great democratic traditions are concerned.

I believe that in terms of his and her intellectual capacity and conscience our 18 year olds and 19 year olds are certainly capable of the responsibility implicit in the ballot. And I, as I said a moment or two ago, support the principle of the bill where the shut-in voter is concerned, and where the 18 year old voter is concerned. I am concerned, in particular, about the preparation of the 18 and 19 year old voter for his and her role in democracy, and I was particularly interested in the remarks by the Honourable Member for Elmwood because he touched on what I feel is the key aspect of this whole subject, and that is the preparation of our young people for this role that in every other way they are fully equipped to play and fulfill.

The Member for Elmwood dwelt at some length on the need for proper courses and proper textbooks and I think this really begs the greater question, Mr. Speaker; I don't think proper courses in civics and proper textbooks are going to be enough. Concurrent with this responsibility for voting comes the responsibility for understanding; the responsibility for appreciating, and in fact I'd go so far as to say the responsibility for loving. I think that it's incumbent upon those of us whose countries and whose institutions are blessed enough in this day and age to survive and to prosper while many other countries, and many other institutions are in ashes and in ruins, it's incumbent upon us to do all we can to instill in ourselves and those around us, and especially in our young people, a love, Mr. Speaker, for the great parliamentary institutions; the great underpinnings of our democracy and our way of life. I don't think that courses in civics and that specifically designed textbooks by themselves are sufficient; although I concur in the sentiments of the Honourable Member for Elmwood that these are aspects of the question that need attention. But there has to be with the textbook, and with the course there has to be the man and the woman in the classroom, in the schools, in the universities communicating with our young people with a compassion for and a love for the institutions that have made our country great. So really the onus in its original form rests probably with our education courses, our teacher training colleges and our universities where our future teachers are molded. It's there that the passion for parliamentary institutions; the passion for democracy; the passion for freedom must be fired.

In last night's Winnipeg Tribune the distinguished New York Times reporter James Reston had an interesting treatise on the spread of anarchy and a breakdown of the law and order in the



(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . world. A few of his comments, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put on the record. I quote from Scotty Reston's article in the Winnipeg Tribune of yesterday, delivered to the Tribune of course by the New York Times. Mr. Reston says: "There is now a growing pattern of anarchy in the civilized world. Planes are hijacked; ambassadors are kidnapped; vast international companies are expropriated. The trend is not yet out-of-hand but even in the universities of America, the militant minorities are using force to achieve their objectives and this raises some fundamental questions. Anarchy is the hope of the weak and the terror of the strong. The most modern technological nations are the most vulnerable to sabotage. Fifty knowledgeable and determined revolutionaries who understand the underground electrical system can paralyze New York, and this power of the militant minority is increasing. Half a dozen men can grab an American ambassador in Rio or blow up Israeli offices in Europe, and even if they are caught, the tyranny of the militant few can go on. Nations have understood the power of anarchy for hundreds of years and have patiently tried to establish rules of conduct against it but the rules are breaking down, and the consequences are alarming." Mr. Reston concludes his article by the following comment: "If the centuries long effort to create a few international rules of diplomatic conduct break down, the chances of solving any conflict between nations will not be very good."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the comments of Scotty Reston in that particular column need no underlining, need no expansion by me. They speak for . . .

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, of course.

MR. GONICK: I wonder if this is the same New York Times that the honourable member called a "communist rag" a few years ago during a discussion on Vietnam we once had.

MR. SHERMAN: I wonder if the honourable member was listening intently to the particular discussion that he has referred to because I never used such a term. I never used such a term and I unequivocally disassociate myself from that allegation. In any event, I'm talking about James Reston himself. On that occasion we may have been discussing the New York Times, in part, but I'm talking here about James Reston himself, who writes and speaks for himself and whom I'm quoting for himself in this capacity.

Mr. Speaker, the position outlined by James Reston in the article to which I've referred needs no underlining. I think it speaks for itself in its reflection of the point to which some oblique reference was made by the Honourable Member for Elmwood and which really is the nub and the substance of my remarks at this stage in this debate. The fact is that there is a challenge to law and order in the world today; a challenge to the great institutions of democracy; a challenge to good order, good conduct and safe passage for those governmental institutions which were set up to ensure and safeguard the sanctity of the individual and his freedom. I believe that it becomes incumbent on everybody from the Minister of Education down and up to insist that a greater attention is paid to and a greater emphasis is placed upon the traditions and the institutions on which this country has been built, not only in the formal classes, in the formal instruction which is given our young people in our schools and colleges, but in the whole environment, the whole informal give-and-take of the academic community.

In my brief experience as a Member of Parliament, Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to visit many campuses from one coast of Canada to the other, to talk with many university students. I was struck again and again by the apparent cynicism which many students, a vast number of students, held for the political institutions of our country, the apparent dissatisfaction which bordered on utter contempt in many cases. I think this is a tragic thing for this country, Mr. Speaker. There is no justification for any person, be a university student, be it in a formal capacity or an informal capacity, be he a business man, a farmer, a trade unionist, there is no justification for any Canadian having contempt or holding an attitude of cynicism for our political institutions. I say there's no justification for that. If there is a contempt for our political institutions, if there is a cynicism for them, it's because in that individual there is not the proper understanding and what I call the proper passion for the great trappings and underpinnings of democracy. I believe that the onus, the responsibility rests very very largely with people like my friend the Honourable Member for Crescentwood and others in the teaching and academic community who have a responsibility to acquaint the people in their charge with man's long struggle out of the darkness into the light of law and order and with what our institutions, like Parliament and the Legislatures of this land, mean in the context of that concept.

So I say that where I support the principle of this Bill and where I believe that the

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . 18-year-old is in most cases eminently qualified to meet the responsibility of the ballot today, that my only anxieties, my only fears, Mr. Speaker, are in the area of the educational institution itself and in the preparation of those young people to meet that responsibility. And I don't denigrate the efforts made by the vast majority of teachers in that respect, but textbooks and courses are not enough. There has to be this inner conviction about the value of the system, the value of Parliament, the value of law and order and the rule of law. I'm no expert in any field, Mr. Speaker, and much less in the field of sociology and psychology and communications, but somewhere along the line it behooves me and all of us to address ourselves to this problem of communicating that feeling to the people of our country, young and old and particularly those coming up to their first vote whether it be at the age of 21 or the age of 18. There is all too little respect for our parliamentary system, our parliamentary procedures and our parliamentary institutions and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is task number one facing my honourable friend, the Minister of Education, in concert with all of us. The respect and understanding and love for these institutions comes concurrent with and critically co-necessary with the responsibility of the ballot itself.

Mr. Speaker, as for the other aspects of the Bill, the opportunity being given to shut-in voters to exercise their franchise, I think this is a progressive step long overdue, to which I add my fullest endorsement. I agree with my colleague, the Member for Assiniboia - my colleague the Member for Sturgeon Creek in respect to his remarks about the absentee vote and the necessity for reforms in that field. I, too, had the experience that he had, and no doubt all of us in this Chamber have had, of encountering constituents in our various campaigns who were being deprived of their franchise because of the fact that they were going to be out of the city, out of the province, out of the country prior to the holding of the advance poll and I would hope that in the course of the life of this Legislature we could address ourselves to some reforms in that area that would make it possible for all Manitobans to have the right to exercise their franchise regardless of where they are and that this disenfranchisement of people in transit be eliminated.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address myself to the aspect of the 18-year-old vote and to place on the record my individual support for the concept. I emphasize that I am not speaking for my party, I am speaking for myself, although as far as I know my party may feel precisely the same way but these are personal and individual comments. I charge my good friends in the academic community with the tremendous responsibility that now rests upon them to help enable the 18-year-old voter to meet the responsibility which he is in every other capacity and in every other way eminently equipped already to meet, but which illustrates an area in which to a certain extent I think he's been denied his rights as a citizen and a member of the student community. Because my experience has been that there has been a great neglect of the type of education to which I've referred - a great neglect of the duty and the responsibility on the part of teachers, on the part of school boards, school trustees, all those associated with the field of education, a deep neglect and a widespread one, of this responsibility for teaching our young people what it's all about, what Parliament is all about, and why it is holy and why it is worthy of respect, and why certain things are as they are and must always be as they are because the institution is based on the inalienable right of men to disagree and to take time about their disagreements and to work their disagreements out, peacefully and constructively and without resort to force and without resort to undue haste. These are values which are sorely overlooked in our contemporary society, in part perhaps because of some of the false values that have been created by television and by the marketplace. I'm the first to admit that all of us are culpable, but that's no excuse, Mr. Speaker, for permitting the situation to continue that way and if we're going to give the 18-year-old the vote, well let's also give him the love for the parliamentary institution on which this country is built and without which this country will surely perish.

MR. DOERN: . . . the honourable member. I think that all of us agree that a bias should not be taught or promoted in a classroom. The honourable member made a case for the teaching of respect for tradition, which I agree with, but does he also agree that a critical spirit and the strengthening of the critical faculties of students should also be taught, to examine the good and the bad, the pro and the con, the strength and the weaknesses. Is that not also an integral part of what should be taught in the classroom?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. May I remind the honourable member a similar question was asked on the other side a while ago. Argumentative questions are not allowed. A question

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . . to explain a point made by a speaker is permissible but not one that gives opportunity to the debater to enter into another debate, or that in fact gives the questioner an opportunity to state his own views in an indirect fashion.

MR. DOERN: May I rephrase my question then briefly? Does the honourable member believe that a critical spirit should also be taught in the classroom?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm afraid that a question presented in that form cannot be accepted. I believe there was another one or two members that I thought had a question to ask. Has the Honourable Member for Osborne a question?

MR. TURNBULL: As the Member for Fort Garry has given us a truly Conservative point of view, the conservatism of Edmond Burke I would think, especially in his relationship to the role of tradition and the maintenance of institutions as they are. I was wondering if his conservative aspect, his passion for institutions, which I so much admire in Conservatives and in myself, if he would direct this passion for institutions, his reference to it to the Member from Sturgeon Creek who I feel perhaps is less conservative than he . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a question?

MR. TURNBULL: Yes, the question was: Will he direct this matter of conservatism about the passion for institutions to the Member for Sturgeon Creek, who I think is less conservative?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has received very wide discussion and many good speeches upon it. I do not wish to be repetitious but I would like to say a very few words at this time.

Addressing myself to the clauses which allow the incapacitated voter to vote by mail, I think it would be well for this House to recognize publicly some of the people who have led us in this field. For example, the Council of St. James which enacted this type of legislation some time back, I think should be recognized. Doctor Isabel MacArthur who has carried on a campaign directing correspondence and persuasion towards various levels of government should also be recognized for the work that she has done in this regard. I could also say the same thing about my colleague, the Member for Assiniboia, who has publicly spoken on behalf of this feature in the past.

I would also like to join my colleague for Assiniboia when he speaks on behalf of the service men who reside in this province. I know that in my own case, every election, and I've been involved in three, I have seen citizens who happen to be in the armed forces who feel very strongly that they have the right to vote in provincial elections. The fact that they have moved in from another province, or that they have come back to Canada, to Manitoba from Europe, is only because that they were carrying out their orders and they were taking up their postings as they were ordered to do. I think it's discrimination of the highest order that people are placed in the category of being a second-class citizen and deprived of their vote in a manner in which they've been deprived in the past here in Manitoba. Not only the servicemen but also the civilian people who have to move about the country because of their work. I think that it is quite unreasonable to expect anyone to wait a year when they've been here for a period of months and have been paying taxes and have become a part of the community and I support my colleague, the Member for Assiniboia, when he serves kindly notice perhaps, but served notice on the government that if they do not take steps to correct this in the legislation that he will be bringing in amendments next year to make the correction. I hope that the members of this House will see fit to support this legislation that removes the discrimination from Canadian citizens who come here, whether they are servicemen or whether they are civilians who come from other parts of the country and intend to reside here and they do not happen to have established the year's residence qualification.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I was going to adjourn the debate. Do you wish to speak? -- (Interjection) -- Okay.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I have but a short statement to make here. I rise in support fully of this bill. I have made very few promises during the election campaign but this is one that I made, saying that I would support totally a bill such as Bill 38. In the last ten years I've had the pleasure of working actively with approximately 20,000 younger people than I am. I am quite convinced that they are ready to take their responsibility and vote at this time.

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd)

I agree with the honourable member who mentioned that the government, that the society has a responsibility to inform the younger people of 18 to 21 to take a more active role in politics. Our more or less complex curriculum of today was created by a need, a need of a society. If we include in these needs the youngsters from 18 to 21, give them the power to vote, another need will be created and this will reflect on the obligations of society and on the obligations of government to inform these people. I am quite convinced that this government, that the society which we live here in Manitoba will take the responsibility and will see that all the youngsters 18 and up have the information ready to let them make sound decisions, and I must say that the decisions of the younger generation is sometimes, in a lot of cases, more sound than others.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I hadn't intended to speak on this bill, I thought it was one that would obtain the complete support of this House. However, there have been certain statements made, Mr. Speaker, that I think need to be refuted. And there's a tone that seems to be running through the debates that are taking place in this House from the other side, and especially with respect to teachers. Now we have sitting on the government side seven teachers. I'm not one, but I am a school trustee and I resent very much the fact that members on the other side of this House are inferring by one method or another that these people are not teaching our young people in the schools today proper respect for good government in the institutions of our land, because this is simply not true.

I believe the Honourable Member for Fort Garry stated that it was the lack of responsibility of municipal councils and perhaps some school boards for not instilling this within the confines of the school population. Well, for the information of the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, I introduced on the Winnipeg Public School Board about four years ago a resolution that we do allow political activity clubs within the Winnipeg Public School system. The motion was subsequently referred to the Building and Policy Committee and came back with a recommendation that we have non-partisan political activity clubs. How naive can we be. And especially when the young Liberal group of Manitoba - and I commend them quite highly - came twice in representation to the Winnipeg Public School Board and asked that they be allowed to establish within the Winnipeg Public School system partisan political clubs. These people are to be commended, but I cannot say the same thing for the members of the Liberal Party in the Greater Winnipeg Election Committee who voted unanimously with the Conservative element of the Greater Winnipeg Election Committees to kill it. -- (Interjection) -- I'll answer my honourable friend when I'm through; he can sit down.

We again, the trustee representing the New Democratic Party from Ward I, this spring introduced and we passed by motion on the Winnipeg Public School Board that this practice would be allowed, partisan political activity clubs. The Chairman of the Winnipeg Public School Board, Mr. Norrie, who is a member of the Liberal Party and a friend of those people over there, at the same meeting gave a subsequent notice of motion that he would kill it. -- (Interjection) -- I don't know what he is. And this is what they did. They killed effectively the chance for young people in the Winnipeg School Division to actually learn what politics was all about, not some stereotyped civics but to find out what politics is all about by belonging to political activity clubs of their own choice, to find out what good civic government, what good legislative government, and to learn respect, and if there's a lack of dialogue in this world today between we of the older generation and the people of the younger generation, I would say it is at least 50 percent our fault and not all theirs.

I'm very sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I feel quite deeply on this matter. I think our young people are to be commended. We just hear, unfortunately, about a very small segment of the teen-age population who are causing the rest of our young people to be tarred by the same brush. The majority of the young people that I know within the Winnipeg Public School system are good young people, law-abiding, and they have respect for our institutions of government. If they haven't, then we, and let's not blame the teaching profession, but we as parents have not instilled it in them. You cannot single out one single profession, and I want to stand here on record, I am very proud of the teaching profession that we have in the Winnipeg Public School system. They are not teaching subversive tactics to anybody; they're teaching them good government; and I think that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge should apologize for

(MR. JENKINS cont'd) . . . . the statement she made in her maiden speech in this House and she has not to my knowledge been able to verify the statement that she made. -- (Interjection) -- Watch your own blood pressure. -- (Interjection) -- I would answer questions when I'm through.

Mr. Speaker, I think I've spoken enough on the section, and I think this House is aware of where my sentiments and sympathies lie with young people 18 years of age. I had the opportunity of returning back to the beaches of Normandy in 1960 where I landed on D-Day 1944, and you walk into the military cemetery of Beny-Sur-Mer and you'll see 18, 19, 20-year-olds, and they were responsible citizens and they respected the institutions and this country and fought and died for it.

As for incapacitated voters, Mr. Speaker, fellow members, I think this is a good thing. I have some sympathy for the points raised by the Honourable Member for Churchill. I think that perhaps in a subsequent session where we have a far-flung constituency covering many miles where it is not possible by the present day mail system - which is something that was foisted upon us by the Federal Liberal Government - perhaps some exception should be made that an extended time for mailing in of votes for incapacitated voters should be made for the people in outlying areas like this. I certainly agree with him that there has to be some modification made and I am sure that in a subsequent session of this House that changes will be made.

I'm in complete support of the bill and I would hope that this House would give complete and wholehearted support to the passage of this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the honourable member permit a question? Did the honourable member hear me once, once through my entire remarks mention the pros or the cons of the formation of partisan political clubs or high school campuses?

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, no, I did not actually hear that, but he stated . . .

MR. SHERMAN: I didn't say anything about them.

MR. JENKINS: But members of the group of the Greater Winnipeg Election Committee who are members of the same political party that he belongs to have certainly not supported it in the past or in the present.

MR. SHERMAN: Will the honourable member permit another question? Is the honourable member suggesting that I'm responsible for the political stands taken by an organization to which I don't belong? And I stand by that.

MR. JENKINS: Well then I would suggest to the honourable member that he disassociate himself from the Greater Winnipeg Election Committee and from the Conservative Party?

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, this bill has opened a can of worms I suppose, but I think it's necessary that I make a little contribution in light of what has been said. It came to my notice this morning that objections have been raised to the statement made by the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge, and while I would take exception to the statement, I find myself more or less in support of the question which underlies the statement, and I have put out a press release to this extent and I would like to go on record and maybe clarify what will be said later.

I find myself in agreement with the Member from Logan in what he has said, but I think what we have to attend to is something deeper than the point that we're trying to make at the moment. Now it isn't to the bill itself that I speak but more or less the side issue which has been raised. I think it is necessary for this Legislature to accept the responsibility and re-define in the educational system that which the society can expect from the system. I think it is the prerogative of the Legislature to spell out to the teaching profession that which they expect. In other words, what I'm saying is it's a sociological responsibility to say what we teach whereas it is a pedagogical responsibility to carry out how we teach it. And if there is some side effects which are common to the teaching of what society has decided we shall teach, then it has to be resolved between the teaching profession and the Legislature.

Now I don't want to get too far off, and it's near the time of adjournment, but this is in my mind a crucial matter and it's something that this government intends to carry out very extensive research into, just exactly what we expect of our educational system, and come out with a policy which will give some direction to our educational system. But I reiterate what I said before, while I might take exception to the statement itself, I find myself in no disagreement with the question that was raised by the statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add a few comments to Bill No. 38, an

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . . Act to amend The Elections Act. While I notice that the bill itself deals with two main points, namely reducing the voting age and to make allowances for voting by ballot at home for those that are incapacitated, however, since it opens the Election Act as such because it's an amending bill, I too would like to voice a few matters that I feel are matters that are definitely of a nature that should receive attention.

Personally, I give the bill qualified support because as on repeated occasions I have mentioned that I would go along with reducing the voting age, but I don't think we should go as far as we are going with this bill to 18 years. I think we should strike a happier medium and go along with what B. C. and Alberta have, with a 19 year voting age and try to make that uniform across the country. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I think B. C. and Alberta showed good sense in that they wouldn't go as far as 18, because we find very many young people at the age of 18 who in my opinion do not show responsible in all cases. -- (Interjection) -- Well, you have to arrive at a figure and it was mentioned here of 19 1/2. Well, I don't accept that.

A MEMBER: If you had made it 23 it would have kept Schreyer out of here.

MR. FROESE: Then, too, I have mentioned that I would support and I intend to bring in an amendment increasing it from the figure 18 to the figure 19 in committee, and I do hope that honourable members will support me in my amendment. I am just wondering, the government arriving at the figure 18, how did they arrive at that figure? What research was done to arrive at the figure 18. I would like to hear from the government side of the House just why they arrived at the figure 18. The question has been thrown at me, I think it should be thrown back at them because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Members will note that it is now 12:30. Perhaps the Honourable Member could continue when this item next appears on the Order Paper. It is now 12:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.