

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 o'clock, Monday, July 20, 1970

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. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. LEONARD H. CLAYDON (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Government Services. I wonder if he could inform the House just exactly what police protection is provided in the park across the street?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Government Services) (Transcona): Same police protection as available in any other parks of Greater Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CLAYDON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are you dependent on the City of Winnipeg for this service or is this one provided by the province?

MR. PAULLEY: We have some of our own staff there but generally as far as arrest or supervision, the City of Winnipeg police.

MR. CLAYDON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could you tell us in particular than what provincial police protection is provided during the night in that park?

MR. PAULLEY: Just the same as anywhere else, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (River Heights): My question before the Orders of the Day is for the First Minister. I wonder whether he could indicate whether he or the members of the Cabinet met with Dr. Reiser?

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Yes I could indicate, Mr. Speaker, that a meeting of that kind did take place.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder whether he can inform the House as to the discussions.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, of course not.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Government Services. In view of the fact that we have many plaques around our halls commemorating many historical events, I wonder if he would consider it advisable of having a plaque made and placed in honour of our Centennial year having Her Majesty here and addressing the Assembly. I do think that if we can have a plaque in respect to wheat we should have one commemorating this historic event too.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my honourable friend for drawing this to my attention as Minister of Government Services. I think it would be quite fitting and quite proper that if we did have some plaque commemorating this memorial occasion for the Province of Manitoba and the fact that in our capitol city Her Majesty did address the Assembly, even if it was somewhat informally, in order that future generations will have this drawn to their attention. I certainly will take it under advisement and I'd be pleased to receive suggestions as to what might be the wording that may be on such a plaque.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): On the same subject, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Honourable Minister that there'll be no objection on this side; but I would also like to reiterate that the tapestries that are in the basement might very well be hung on the walls, as a centennial effort.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I wonder whether you would consider having it inscribed upon the mace as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister in reply to the question of the Member for River Heights. Can the Minister indicate that the First Minister had met with Dr. Reiser, or was it the First Minister and members of the Cabinet?

MR. SCHREYER: That's a rather unusual question, Mr. Speaker. I don't mind informing my honourable friend that there were three Ministers of the Crown that met with Dr. Reiser,

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . and that the reason that I'm not in a position to give any account now of the nature of the meeting is because whatever was under discussion at the time is still a matter of negotiation, remains current.

While I'm on my feet, Sir, I'd like to reply to a question asked me by the Honourable Member for Wolsley some time ago, relative to the possibility of having a R. C. M. Police officer uniformed in scarlet on duty in front of the Legislative Buildings. The Minister of Government Services advises me that this takes effect as of today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Will there be other meetings between either he himself or his Cabinet Ministers with Dr. Reiser?

MR. SCHREYER: That is the likelihood, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The Honourable Minister of Transportation suggests that this is none of our business, and frankly -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, he was not -- this is a question of privilege.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I don't know how the honourable member can make a question of privilege on something which is not part of the records of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPIVAK: On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister of Transportation did make a statement. If the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources wants to suggest that he did not, he's incorrect. Everyone heard him make that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that no cognizance is taken of statements for which the Speaker does not recognize a speaker and which in all likelihood don't appear on the record of the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago or a week or two ago I suppose it is, the Member for Ste. Rose posed a number of questions relative to Lake Winnipeg Land Adjustment Programs. I want to state for the record Mr. Speaker, that a policy has been developed, one which includes the acquisition of land around Lake Winnipeg up to the level of 722 feet above sea level; that the appraisals will be based on a true value of property before the damage was done as opposed to the present system; that where the acquisition is affecting only part of a farm and renders the balance uneconomic, that the whole of the farm will be acquired and that a disturbance allowance to every household up to \$2,000 will be available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Minister very much for his statement. Will there be written policy statements produced for the record?

MR. USKIW: I think it's in the record now, Mr. Speaker. It's a matter of just reading Hansard tomorrow.

MR. MOLGAT: I appreciate that the statement that he has just made is in the record, but is this by Order-in-Council? Are there a series of regulations, or how is this to be produced?

MR. USKIW: This was arrived in Cabinet decision, Mr. Speaker. There's no Order-in-Council involved.

MR. MOLGAT: Then a specific question, Mr. Speaker, if I may. The Minister said up to 722 feet. Will that then include all property up to the 722 feet level?

MR. USKIW: This includes farmlands, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas): . . . similar policy . . .

MR. USKIW: This, Mr. Speaker, is part and parcel of a continuing FRED Program, it's merely an expansion of a program that was in existence. There are no new programs at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . Honourable First Minister, I wonder whether he could indicate to

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . . the House whether Dr. Reiser was the only person present from Churchill Forest at those meetings.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, Dr. Reiser, I'm quite sure of it, does have certain colleagues and associates with him from that firm and from other firms that are in some relationship to C.F.I. of one kind or another.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister: Was anyone else present with him at those meetings?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Honourable Member for River Heights should ask Dr. Reiser.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege; on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. If the Honourable First Minister does not want to answer the question that's fine. But for him to suggest that, and by his answer that the question's improper . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm rising on a point of order now because if the Honourable Member for River Heights would reflect on his question he would realize how difficult some of them are to answer and how stupid others of those questions are. Because the question as he put it was who did Dr. Reiser have with him. With him where - exactly where? He did not specify whether you meant at the meeting or here in Winnipeg, on his arrival in Winnipeg; and insofar as the meeting is concerned I can say that Mr. Reiser was accompanied by counsel of C.F.I., but I am quite sure that he has - in fact I know that he had associates with him here in Winnipeg upon his arrival.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think if the Honourable First Minister will look at the Hansard tomorrow he will find that I did indicate the question the way it should have been asked.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I'm scared to ask a question because maybe the government will rule me out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MCKENZIE: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, the House Leader what the order will be this week in the House?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer for the week. I have advised the member previously that I'm not presuming that members in the House will not debate every section of every bill. What we are doing today is we are going to be in the Committee of the Whole House to try to deal with the bills that are on the Order Paper. On Wednesday, as announced previously, we will be in Public Utilities Committee at 9:30 in the morning.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Third readings. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The first bill for third reading is Bill No. 98.

BILLS NO. 98 and 100 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 101. The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. AL MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, that Bill No. 101, an Act to amend The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act, be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, on the Intoxicated Persons Detention Act I would like to say a few words at this time, not with the intention of making any further changes to the Act at the present time but mainly to bring to the Attorney-General's attention some problems that are arising through this Intoxicated Persons Detention Act, the possibility of possibly limiting the use of this Act to certain segments in the province, certain areas in the province, because I believe that the use of this Act, or the interpretation given in administration and the subsequent use of this Act when maybe they should be using some other Act, has in fact created problems in some areas. I know in my own constituency there has been concern expressed in some localities where the use of the Intoxicated Persons Detention Act, instead of eliminating some problems, has created some which in fact are far more

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . . serious than those that existed previous to the use of this particular Act; and I would suggest that the Attorney-General look into this matter closely before the next session and, if they have any changes to suggest, we would welcome listening to them at that time.

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

BILLS NO. 36, 64 and 105 were each read a third time and passed.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield) presented Bill 111, an Act to amend The Child Welfare Act (3), for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, before we give approval to this bill I think it is worthy at this point to make mention of proceedings in connection with the one section that caused some concern on the part of one segment of our society, in the fact that the government supported the resolution to have that deleted which I think, as it happened, is the correct handling of the situation, but I rise to discuss this particular item in the context of the totality of what has happened with respect to the legislation that has been before us in the past month.

The bulk of the legislation that has come to this session has come in the last month, and there is no doubt -- well, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says it's not so. Mr. Speaker, the bulk of it came in the last month or the last month and a half, and I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it has been extremely difficult for many on this side to deal in detail with the items that were before us. The government of necessity has dealt with this to a greater extent, or at least should have dealt to a greater extent, but there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that in connection with the section that was deleted from this bill, or the clause that was deleted from this bill, and other items that have come up before us, that there has been a certain zeal on the part of the government to try and accomplish certain results and there has been a rush to get legislation before this Legislature, and that obviously some of the consideration and thinking that should have gone behind any legislation to be introduced in this House has not been undertaken fully and, as a result, we have had a situation where we could have had, I believe, the passage of a section which would have been bad law.

Now we were very fortunate in having a counsel representing the particular group who felt they were affected by the section, who happens to be distinguished in the Civil Liberties field and who happens to be in his own way an expert in this particular area, and he gave us the benefit of his . . . , of his understanding, and he certainly, I think, cleared for many of us some of the misapprehensions and some even of the prejudices, I think, that we hold in connection with this field, in this particular item.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting necessarily that everything that he suggested was correct or that everything I would agree with, but nevertheless we were fortunate in being able to have an opportunity to have someone present, for over a period of several hours, a very reasoned presentation which allowed us to reconsider, all of us including the government, to reconsider the position and as a result we have a deletion of this particular clause.

Now, when Dr. Howe was present, he left with us an article that he had prepared on a legal, religious and medical issue on blood transfusion, and he had a quotation from Mr. Justice Brandeis from a particular case and I would like to read it into the record, Mr. Speaker, because I think it should be read into the record now because I have a suspicion that if the government continues in power for some time this is going to be a quotation that is going to have to be read over and over again to them, simply because there is a particular zeal that they show in trying to rush headlong into legislation and one has to balance that against -- yes; the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources may think I'm wrong but I want to tell him that we have a Landlord and Tenant Act that is before us that was brought before the committee and we had one solicitor stand up and he destroyed every section of that Act.

MR. MACKLING: We'll deal with that.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes I know we'll deal with that and I'm waiting for the Attorney-General to deal with that, but I'm suggesting, and I say quite frankly so that the record will show this, that the truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there is a particular zeal and no one should in any way take away from the zeal that the individuals show and I'm not in any way trying to suggest that that zeal should be diminished, but it also has to be balanced by some reason and some understanding of what is happening. And I would like to quote Mr. Justice Brandeis' statement when he says, "The greatest danger to liberty lurks in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding."

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what happened with this particular clause, because as an example, if we want to -- there was no evidence brought before the committee, none at all, that the well meaning and zealous desire on the part of the government to achieve a certain objective was justified. There wasn't one bit of evidence; because it was brought forward without any understanding; and while the government may feel that this is a criticism that, you know, is not justified and that they do not have to accept it - and they do not; it's a criticism - I suggest to you if we examine a great deal of the legislation that's been introduced, we will find this situation as well, and I say that notwithstanding the fact that there is, on the part of many on the other side, a feeling of great accomplishment for many of the things that they believe are now being done, I would suggest to you that in the litigation that's going to be forthcoming and in the amendments that are going to have to be forthcoming in the years to come to some of this legislation, that the zeal and the well meaning does not take away from the necessity of understanding and of thinking out and fully comprehending everything that you are doing and being in the position to present legislation in a proper manner.

I commend the government for supporting the motion to delete this section. I suggest as well, Mr. Speaker, that what should have been followed, as should be followed in many other specific cases, is that the people who are affected should be consulted so that in fact there is some understanding on the part of the government before they rush headlong into legislation, and the recommendations of Dr. Klass when he appeared before the committee, I think should be considered by the government in this particular case and are an example of what must be followed in the future, where he simply suggested that the medical profession, who had a particular interest in this section, should have been consulted as well as the particular minority group whose rights were being affected and who have very strong feelings in connection with this and have expressed this throughout the years publicly and have fought cases in the courts to try and uphold their rights.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is one kind of an example, and I think we can cite many other kinds of examples in terms of what has happened in this session, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the zeal, that there has been a lack of understanding and that if there is to be a lesson learned the lesson would be to at least understand fully what is being contemplated, having at least met with the groups who are affected and being in a position to adequately understand their position before a decision, even contrary to the interest and likes of the other people on the other side or the people whom they deal with, even contrary to that, are made so at least there is the communication that's necessary if we are going to get good legislation and good law rather than bad law.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with my honourable friend's remarks because he has attempted to suggest that, first of all, there is a zeal to bring legislation; secondly, that legislation is being rushed; and thirdly, if he will listen - and he won't listen, Mr. Speaker; he is a member who is so preoccupied with himself that all he is interested in doing is getting his remarks on the record and is not interested in listening to any position that is taken contrary to his remarks. He either will leave the House after he makes those remarks or he will ignore what is being said in answer to them. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the fact, and if he's talking about a pattern, if he's talking about a pattern on the part of the government, then I would ask him to look at himself for a pattern, because he is a person who will make a speech, leave the Chamber, make a speech, talk to his opponent, and not listen to what is being said on the other side. And really, that's the difference. What he is telling us is that we have listened too well; that this is a government, as distinct from the previous administration, that is willing to bring legislation and then is willing to follow the legislative process. That's really what he is saying. He is saying that we are willing to listen to what the Opposition says about the legislation, he is willing to listen what people in Law Amendments Committee said about legislation, and that we are willing to consider what we are doing, which is something that his administration never did. And, Mr. Speaker, if ever a speech was made, if ever a speech was made which would have the effect of militating against what he is asking for - and he knows it - it's the speech that he made, because, Mr. Speaker, if we were a weak group of people on this side, then we would say, well, if the Member for River Heights is going to say that by changing or altering a piece of legislation we are in fact admitting that the legislation was not thought out, then a weak group, such as I'm suggesting his group was, would say, "Let

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . us not listen to anything; let us not change anything at the instance of the Opposition, because if we do someone will say that it proves that we did not think out our legislation." Because that's what the member just did.

He didn't say to us, he didn't say, Mr. Speaker, he didn't say that the government has brought forward a piece of legislation (by the way, which was thought out, and I can tell the honourable member, I can tell the honourable member that the support of groups such as his thinking was in fact obtained) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I am telling you that it was in fact obtained. I am not going to say at what stage it was obtained, but it was in fact obtained, but unbalanced, Mr. Speaker, and because we are willing to listen, unlike the Member for River Heights - and I repeat that; unlike the Member for River Heights and his previous colleagues. Unlike them, we are prepared to listen; we are prepared to take in Opposition's suggestions; we are prepared to give effect to something that the public says on Law Amendments Committee, and, despite the criticism that the honourable member makes that this proves that we are a weak government, we deny it. We say that it proves that we are stronger than the administration which has preceded us and that we will continue to listen, and if the honourable member makes an assumption that we are in a rush, then I tell him that that is not a correct assumption.

There is nothing that has been said by any member on this side which would indicate that we are in a rush. We are prepared to continue -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member says it's none of their business - none of their business. Well I say to you that he said it, yes. Mr. Speaker, it is not on the record but he said it. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not on the record but he said it, and he, you know the Member for Swan River, the Member for Rock Lake, they say that the House Leader interrupts people, I suggest to you that if you want the prime example of the person who has been interrupting people and has been doing it consistently from the first day that this session opened to the present time, it's the member - and he's doing it now - it's the Member for River Heights, because the Member for River Heights was in the administration and has never really believed that he is out of it, and that's why he is intent on asking questions which are really part of the administrative process. He has never believed that the people have said to him that you are no longer in the administration. He'd better believe it because that's what has happened and it's up to us as an administration to now deal with these things.

But I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that we are not in a rush. If the members on the opposite side are in a rush, that's something for their own consciences to contend with, but we are not in a rush. We are dealing with every piece of legislation. We are going to Law Amendments Committee. We are hearing the public, and if the public makes sense we are yielding to them. I can tell the honourable member that that was not the case with the previous administration. I know that they went through the game of listening to the public, that they went through the game of listening to what the Opposition said, but, Mr. Chairman, they adopted the view, they adopted -- and the Member for River Heights, let the records show it, is again interrupting, and every time he does it, Mr. Chairman, every time he does it I will say that he is interrupting and then in some future date I will count the times, the length of time that I was on my feet and the number of times the Member for River Heights interrupted me during that speech, and if the honourable member thinks that that is to his credit then he can contend with it because I will show it; and he is interrupting again, Mr. Chairman, and he is interrupting again, and he is again interrupting. Mr. Chairman, a fourth time he is interrupting. That was four times, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for River Heights, who says that he is serious about legislation, he is serious about putting these things forward, four times within, I venture to say, the space of 15 seconds, he has -- and again he is interrupting, and let the records show, Mr. Chairman, that that's the way the Member for River Heights is intent on dealing at this legislative session. And I have only indicated it on this occasion; he's done it every time. But when he continues to do it I will continue to say that he is doing it, and I challenge him, I challenge him or any member on his side including the Member for Swan River and the Member for Rock Lake, to show and let them do it when I do it, and we'll see who is the one who interrupts people in this House and doesn't let them continue. And now the Member for Swan River is doing it, and now the Member for Swan River is doing it again.

Mr. Chairman, what the Member for River Heights has said is that this government has been prepared to use the legislative process to its full effectiveness. We have been prepared, when the Opposition has come up with a recommendation which may make some sense, and even

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . on occasions, Mr. Chairman, when the recommendations are meaningless but do not hurt legislation - although I don't think that's a good practice - but we have adopted several meaningless changes that the Opposition has put. In the Credit Unions Act - this is what the Member for River Heights says is not well thought out legislation - in the Credit Unions Act we changed the words, I think it was "share certificates" to "membership share certificates" . . .

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said that the Honourable Member for River Heights said that this was not well thought out legislation. I never once said that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: I'm sorry. Well, he said that we have not given -- Mr. Speaker, the interpretation that I had of his entire speech - and every member heard it - was that it proved that the legislation wasn't properly prepared before it got to the House; the proof that we were willing to make a change or that we were willing to withdraw a section, and, Mr. Chairman, I am merely giving an interpretation . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources just proves what I said; he wasn't listening to me. I did not say it.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would ask then honourable members to read his speech and see whether my remarks - this is certainly not a point of privilege - are not a proper interpretation of what he said, but the fact is that he brought -- this is the kind of amendments he brought, instead of saying "share certificates" we should have said "membership share certificates" and we acceded to that, and one of the members, I don't know who it was, said that Snowmobile or Snow Vehicles Act was not a good name for the Act, we should change it to Snow Vehicles Act and we changed it to Snow Vehicles Act, and there are certain other things that were brought forward that did mean something and we took those things into consideration and we changed that, and we heard a man present a position before Law Amendments Committee, Mr. Chairman, which the honourable member now refers to, and I may say, Mr. Chairman, that despite everything that the honourable member says we cannot accept - at least I cannot - accept the position of Mr. Howe as being a valid position. I doubt that any member on the Opposition benches could accept the views of Mr. Howe as being a valid position, because if they accepted it, Mr. Chairman, they would move for the deletion of the present section in the bill which permits the government, on the finding of a judge which I have indicated comes rather automatically, they would prevent the government from giving a blood transfusion to a child if the parents did not want that transfusion to be given, and that's Mr. Howe's basic position and the government can't accept that position; but we are willing to look to see whether the present procedure doesn't properly fulfill the needs of society in this connection, and if it doesn't, Mr. Chairman, then I suggest not only if we were in government but if the Member for River Heights was in government, he would not accept the position of Mr. Howe.

So what he is saying, Mr. Chairman, all that he is saying is that this government, unlike the previous administration, is willing to put real meaning on both the legislative process where the Opposition makes recommendation, and on the legislative process where the members of the public make representation, and to use that as part of the legislative process. And he says that when we do that it proves that we haven't thought out our legislation. And he intends, Mr. Speaker, he intends that this shall act as some sort of criticism of the government, and I say that if we were a weak group of people, which I suggest his group was, we would say that we have to stand by every word of every bill that we bring in, otherwise the Member for River Heights will say that we're shifting ground. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are not a weak group of people. We are not worried about using the legislative process to its fullest and to its best, even if it means changing to some extent the legislation as it was originally brought forward, which the whole process implies that we shall do. In this respect we will differ from the previous administration, Mr. Speaker, because I remember being here and making submissions to the Law Amendments Committee as a private citizen before the previous administration, I remember other people making suggestions to the Law Amendments Committee before the previous administration, and, Mr. Speaker, to their discredit - not to their credit - to their discredit, it usually had almost no effect on the closed minds of the members of the previous administration. We have not got such closed minds - we intend to give the legislative process its fullest scope, direction and suitability for the passing of laws and we won't be deterred from doing so even though the Member for River Heights intends to see this as a criticism against us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would submit to a question? Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would indicate in the four years that he's sat in the House along with myself and colleagues, whether he could indicate one session in which the previous government did not accept at least one or two amendments or proposals at Law Amendments or one of the committees and either changed or altered legislation? Can he suggest a particular session that this did not happen?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I can't remember the exact session, but I do know that it was so rarely done that when it was done it became a matter of major importance in the House. -- (Interjection) -- I remember, Mr. Chairman, when I made a proposal with regard to medical premiums and having them as part of the collective agreement, I can remember I made that proposal, I remember that rather than accept that proposal that the Minister of Labour or the Minister of Health as he then was, Mr. Witney, said we won't take yours but we will submit something which is better than yours or which changes yours so that it will come forward as a government measure. I remember I submitted a proposal with regard to Indians sitting on school boards. The then Minister of Education got up, even though it had not been mentioned in the Throne Speech, even though it had not been mentioned in any of the proposals that he was making vis-a-vis education during the estimates; but he got up and said, oh this is not something that the Member for Inkster is suggesting, this is something that we were going to do and therefore we are doing it in spite of the fact that he suggested it, and we really don't want his suggestion. Words to that effect. I can remember that any time that this was done - I remember that any time that this was done - I remember, Mr. Speaker, that I came before Law Amendments Committee, and I presented a position on the legal entity clause vis-a-vis trade unions, and I know that there wasn't a member of the government benches who could answer the submission. Rather than withdrawing it, what the then First Minister did was make a reference to the Court of Appeal of the Province of Manitoba to see whether what I was saying was correct, the Court of Appeal when it got the reference indicated that on the basis of the reference they really couldn't answer the questions and went ahead and enacted the legislation anyway. That's the kind of thing that was done by the previous administration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would submit to another question. I wonder whether he could indicate any other piece of legislation other than the matters that are now before us or in committee in which representation by the public have been accepted and the legislation introduced has been amended, outside of the Child Welfare Act.

MR. GREEN: Every piece of legislation where there have been representations by the public - I know in the Dental Mechanics' legislation, I know in the Landlord and Tenants' legislation, I know that in legislation that has come before us that almost every case we have taken the representations and seen if we could make a reasonable amendment. That's what my honourable friend is criticizing. In almost every case, yes.

MR. SPIVAK: Is he suggesting that it is not the previous practice . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order . . .

MR. SPIVAK: . . . and you're completely in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. GREEN: Yes, I can say that that was not the way the previous administration . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I think it's about time that the House reprimands the Honourable Member from River Heights. You have a legislative process to help the people of Manitoba and this member has made a joke of this ever since he's sitting on the opposite side. He thinks he's here to have a forum for him to start his campaign for the leadership of his party, and this has to stop. He's constantly out of order and he's coming up and down like a thorn in his seat, this is what he's doing, and I'm getting fed up, Mr. Speaker. First of all last summer he said this government didn't do anything. Now he is saying they're doing too much. I wonder if he's going to tell the people in Bill 56 that they shouldn't come here because the members of this House should not listen to what they have to say. -- (Interjection) -- Just keep quiet and shut up. I wonder what he's going to tell them? Are they coming in here just for a joke? I remember this government -- (Interjection) -- And the honourable friend that's speaking, I remember where he used to - and I say that that was pretty well close to being out of order - I remember suggesting that French be



(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . . taught in Grade 1, but they weren't honest enough to say yes, they said no, but two months after they came in by the back door. Then another motion that we passed unanimously this session - French be used as a teaching language. My honourable friend, the former Speaker, twice amended a motion that that's the same thing. They don't like these things, they never wanted to give anybody credit, and now he's complaining, he's arguing both sides. He's sure to be right sometimes when you argue both sides, and if he wants other examples, my honourable friend, of things that were changed right in the House, right in third reading, let him think back to that famous pension scheme, the daylight robbery that these fellows tried to pull to take care of their Ministers. Oh yes he was here, sitting right here, and he -- (Interjection) -- yes he was -- (Interjection) -- all right, well, if he wasn't here, let me tell him what his friends were doing, what his friends were doing. We were in committee of the House, we were in Committee of the House . . . -- (Interjection) -- Are you counting the times he's interfering again? -- (Interjection) -- All right. This my honourable friend, before we even started considering that bill in third reading, just after a few speeches, on the same day they were sending us amendments - not waiting until they came in - they were sending us amendments, and finally the then Premier had to withdraw the bill. And that's the thing that democracy accomplished.

Now, were you here for Medicare? Was the honourable member here when we passed this Medicare bill? Was he here? You listened to my speech and then finally something that you had voted down on committee, in committee outside of the House, you finally in third reading here voted in favour of it and that is something that was quite important, that was the question of the business of a doctor that opted out, the province collecting for this doctor here. I remember this amendment, and I said, Mr. Speaker, then it's all right, my friend has to go out sometimes, that this is fine, he might have some good reason. But he comes in here, makes his speech and runs out and he comes here and makes another speech and that's all we hear, he has about 17 or 18 questions every day, and I suggest that, dammit, we're not here to listen, to provide a forum, and the people of Manitoba are not spending this kind of money to provide a forum for ridiculous questions and statements like that. He wants to know who's coming, if they brought their wife and if they brought their secretary and if they got any friends, he wants to know everything.

And let's go back to when he was sitting on this side, and what kind of answers we were getting. I was here for 11 years and there's some questions that I asked. They pretended they weren't even asked. They sat like a bump on a log. They didn't have the guts to say anything, or it or even to let it come to a vote. They had to amend it with stupid, asinine amendments and I say, Mr. Speaker, that if we're going to proceed with this there are other members in this House besides that member and if he wants to fight for the leadership of his party, do it outside.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. McKENZIE: Would you mind telling me what that speech was about or which bill?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): I'm a few minutes late, Mr. Speaker. Could you tell me what bill we're passing?

MR. SPEAKER: 111.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I asked a just question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if there is a serious point of order before you or not, I'm not sure. The Member for Rhineland raises a question which on surface appears to be logical enough, but I would point out to my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland that it is not normal procedure in the House to interrupt it and at a point in time to ask Mr. Speaker what bill are we dealing with. I've never heard this done before. He has friends on the same side that he could have asked, he could have asked his seat mate, the Honourable Member for Portage or anyone here, but not to ask Mr. Speaker. For the edification of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, it was Bill No. 111, 111, but I say - and I'm just as serious about this as the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that it is not, it is not good enough, it is not acceptable procedure to rise in your place and ask Mr. Speaker what bill are we dealing with, because there are I'm sure in a House of 57 members at any given point in time, there's

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . . probably always one member at least who isn't quite sure what bill we're dealing with and so you, Sir, would be subject to continuous interrogation, what bill, Sir, are we dealing with?

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, may I apologize for my honourable friend on my left. I had informed him that we were on Bill 101, the Intoxicated Persons Act, after having heard the last three harangues.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 126. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the point raised by the First Minister of the House, I enquired from other members and they couldn't give me an answer and therefore I directed my question to the Speaker before the bill was passed as to what bill we were passing on, which was a very logical question, Mr. Speaker, and I think I should have had an answer because I was going to make some remarks on that particular bill.

BILL NO. 126 was read a third time and passed.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following bills: No. 143, etc.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. GREEN: 127. Mr. Chairman, can we go to 127? We are in the middle of a discussion on that.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . on the next several bills that may be considered?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I intend to proceed in order from 127 on, with the exception of the Optometry Act; we may want to have that one skipped by.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm informed that there is an amendment before the House in respect to Bill 127, the Age of Majority Act, and that it was made by the Member for Riel. Is that correct? The amendment is that Subsection (1) of Section 4 of Bill 127 be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof the words, "Except in the Liquor Control Act in which Act a reference to the age of 21 years shall be read as a reference to the age of 19 years." Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before you put that motion, I think that I should explain to the Committee my present position in respect of this amendment. Honourable members will recall that in the Law Amendments Committee - those that were paying attention at that time - that I had voted for the amendment which was then proposed as it is now by the Honourable the Member for Riel. I did vote in favour of this motion at that particular time, feeling that that was the proper course for me to take. However, now that the majority of the Law Amendments Committee, after hearing due representation in respect of this agreed to reject the amendment, I take the position that the Law Amendments Committee having spoken and the majority, I accept the rule of the majority of the Law Amendments Committee and will vote against this particular amendment at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, having watched the late movie on the TV last night "The Days of Wine and Roses" I have no compunction about once again exposing my schizophrenic nature and I would have hoped that perhaps the position that the Honourable the Minister of Labour took on this matter on Law Amendments would have carried through. In fact had he watched the late movie with me last night I'm sure he would have.

However, seriously, I didn't take the opportunity to speak at Law Amendments on this amendment; I just want to briefly indicate that I recognize the problems of logic when it comes to a situation that those who are supporting this amendment face. However, the problems of liquor and alcohol education are a problem all to themselves and I make no apologies for being split on this situation. I have heard more about the question of lowering the drinking age from my own constituents than I have heard on any other issue, including Bill 56. There has been no other issue and when one considers that it has not really received the kind of notoriety or publicity then I would have to put on the record that in this instance I certainly don't mind being guided by my constituents and voting in a manner that they would ask me to vote because this is a question - it's a question not of earth-shattering policy with respect to what direction

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . . the government goes or doesn't go, it's a question of morals, a question of human behaviour that I think that certainly I have to be bound by the manner and the way which my constituency would want me to vote. So I would support the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, when the debate continued on this matter on Saturday I felt that the initial debate was on a very low plane and there was a good deal of illogical arguments advanced. However, at the conclusion of that debate I thought that the Premier had presented a very logical, concise, reasoned position which had brought the debate in respect to the amendment to a reasonable conclusion. However, the other members are still indicating revelations of conscience on this matter and so on and I would like to conclude on a question of logic again. I don't know whether anyone else wishes to speak but I think Mr. Chairman, if individual members reflect and think logically about the matter, is it logical to recognize that a young person 18 years of age can accept all responsibility of any nature and kind, every nature and kind including the preparation and the passing of laws in respect to every matter over which this Legislature has jurisdiction, every conceivable type of contract they can enter into, if it is law, every conceivable type of responsibility they can take unto themselves including the right to marriage, the right to raise children, the right to make innumerable decisions affecting the lives of not only themselves but their entire society around them, and then to suggest to them that Yes, you can do all these things but you may not have the responsibility or the privilege to indulge in intoxicating liquor.

Now, what it seems to me, the honourable members who seem to speak from conscience about this question of the right to consume alcoholic beverages at the same age as other responsibilities, it seems to me what they are saying is they're against liquor. Well then, let them be against liquor, let them move for prohibition of liquor so that all people, all people are treated alike. Let's be logical, let's not say, oh liquor's all right for a 19 year old or 20 year old but it's not all right for an 18 year old. An 18 year old can do everything else; he can decide what are dangerous substances to give to his children and what are not; he can decide what are poisons he or his children or his family should not take, but he's not able to make the decision about liquor because that's another poison, it's a slow poison but he can't make that decision, that's too difficult for him. He can involve himself in very intricate and involved contractual obligations but oh that simple decision about that demon liquor he can't master.

Now it seems to me that it's the prohibition conscience that is talking and if that is the conscience that is talking then that conscience should have been manifest at the time the debate was taking place in respect to the Liquor Control Act, but not in respect to the age of majority. It's purely illogical to suggest that a person should have all of these rights, all of these responsibilities but in respect to that one decision, that's wrong.

Now the question about young people going down to the pub or going to the tavern and drinking during perhaps during their breaks at school, during recess, during the noon hour, I choose to consider this sort of argument, Mr. Chairman, as very demeaning of our young people. Our young people, the overwhelming majority of young people are tremendously responsible young men and women and to demean them in this way is a disgrace to this Assembly. So let's recognize what we're doing. We are now according to young people at a responsible age the right and the privilege and, at the same time, giving them the responsibilities in respect to the matters which they have been exercising in the absence of the law for many years.

We all know that many young people have been buying property, that have been entering into involved contracts at ages under 21; they have been consuming alcoholic beverages; they have been marrying; they have been raising families; they've been doing all these things without the sanction of law and other jurisdictions have recognized the farce that's existed in the law for these many years and I suggest to this Assembly, it's only logical that you're either for the Age of Majority Act in its entirety and if the amendment had been to change the age of majority to 19 - across the board - well then there might have been some logic to the argument. But there isn't any logic to the argument that you change the age of majority, the Age Act, just in respect to liquor at 18. It's wrong, Mr. Chairman, and therefore I appeal to the logic of the members all assembled that they get on with the passage of this Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): . . . regarding the age of majority in dealing with the Liquor Act and I agree with the Honourable Member for Lakeside when he

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) . . . . . mentions about the number of people that came to him regarding the reduction of age in dealing with liquor, the drinking of liquor. I think it's right. I've had more people come to me in the last ten days, two weeks, at various Centennial celebrations, concerned about this very reduction in the age of drinking and we don't need to be lectured. If what the Attorney-General says, why not drop the age altogether, why not drop the age altogether because maybe a child at 16 could be just as good as a child of 18. This could be logic. But what I am concerned with, what I am concerned about is the very thing that the Attorney-General was speaking about, was the high school student. I agree that they will have trouble, I will agree they have trouble. Some of them will have trouble. I agree that 19 -- it should be left the same as Saskatchewan and B.C. and Alberta. The other three provinces have the age of 19. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if I had my way it wouldn't change at all, that's my answer to the whole thing.

We have many social problems, we have many social problems and we're not going to help the social problems in our community by lowering the age, I can tell you that. We're not going to help it at all. In fact one of the worst problems that occurs in rural Manitoba is the drug problem right now and here we are saying that we are going to help the problem by giving the children more liquor. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. Oh, hit your head on the desk, it will be a lot better, it'll make more sense.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to vote for this amendment. I think it makes logic, I think it does. You look at the problems they've had in Saskatchewan, look at the problems they've had in B.C., look at the problems. -- (Interjections) -- Your problems haven't been too bad in Manitoba because the Liquor Act's enforced very good, very good. -- (Interjection) -- Yes. -- (Interjection) -- that doesn't make you a better man for it. No, not a bit.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to convince the people that are on the government side. I don't know if I'm convincing the people on my own side. But all I'm doing is speaking for myself and the people I represent. And I would want to inform the members here that in the rural areas they are concerned about this problem, they are concerned and they support me, if it's going to be reduced, reduce it to 19 only.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The remarks made by the Attorney-General on this particular subject intrigue me considerably. I have always been one that maintained that if we're going to lower the age to 18 that we have to be consistent right across the board and I have supported that stand before but I must confess that I have had considerable representation in the past couple of weeks because my constituency is one that is adjacent to the Province of Saskatchewan where the age for liquor is 19. And it's been brought quite forcibly to my attention by the men who are charged with the responsibility of administering the law that the problems that became apparent when Saskatchewan lowered their age a few months ago and the problems that were then predominant in the Province of Saskatchewan will now be reversed and we will be getting the problems in Manitoba that they have had in the last four to five months. I'm surprised that the Attorney-General was speaking against this amendment because most of the people that made representation to me were people that were charged with the administration that comes under his department. However, Mr. Chairman, I have stated before that if we must use the arbitrary figure of 18 for voting and all other matters I think it should be consistent and the age of 18 used in drinking as well.

Now we can argue the point of why we use 18. The Member for Rhineland tried to amend it to another figure and I'm not arguing against his choice of another figure for being the age of majority throughout but I do think that we have to be consistent. Whatever figure we do use has to be consistent right across the board and even though I've had much representation against the lowering of the drinking age to 18, if we are going to use 18 for other figures, I think we have to be consistent in this way. I realize that we're going to have problems, we'll have many problems because when we say we're going to lower the drinking age to 18, we're not just dealing with 18 year olds, we're then actually coming down to the age of 15 and 16 because they are going to be many young people 15 and 16 who look to be the age of 18 and will try and use their size rather than their age to take advantage of the sale of alcohol in licensed premises. It's going to cause a problem. Those in the hotel industry themselves question whether the age should be reduced or not because I don't think they're too concerned about losing a potential customer, it's just a matter of waiting and they'll get their customer when

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . . . that age arrives.

However, if it is going to interfere with the program of the Department of Education, if it's going to cause serious problems in the Attorney-General's department, I would say that after we have tried it for a year and we find that the problems are sincere and manifest then maybe we should not just close our eyes to the possibility of an amendment at a later date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill. Were you going to ask a question?

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I don't know whether I should wait for you to go or . . . Mr. Chairman, it rather amazes me that some members still haven't accepted the fact that there's a magic deadline in which you become able to handle liquor because their isn't. Every year we have a birthday until we get to be a certain age and then we decide we don't want to have any more birthdays and most of us maybe have come to that age where we don't want to have any more birthdays, but the age of 18 - you've struck off the magic age of 18 - and one day, one day of the year you're 18 years old and the next day you're 19 and you're going to go into a beer parlour legally to have a glass of beer because you're 19 years of age. You did it when you were 21 and I doubt whether there's one here who didn't try and celebrate his 21st birthday by going into a beer parlour when he was 21 years of age to have that beer except the Honourable Member for Rhineland. -- (Interjection) -- The front door. So really I can't see where we're trying to get hung up on 19 years of age because if this bill had come before us two years ago I doubt very much if you would have got the age lowered to 20 and we all know that it sat here for that length of time that two years ago you couldn't have got it down to 20 and we'll all admit that. Today they've gone to 18 because they've found a logic in it that if you're going to be able to sign a loan to buy a \$25,000 house or a \$20,000 house, you're 18 years of age, your dad can't do a thing about it, not one thing about it. You can go and get married, your father's not going to be able to do a thing about it. You're going to be able to run as a politician, your mummy and your daddy is not going to do a thing about it. They can't do a thing about it and you're going to be able to do everything and mummy and daddy -- (Interjection) -- yes, they can vote against it, but mummy and daddy can't say a word to you once you become 18 except they can kick you out, they can make you pay board and room and they can say - but you can't go in the beer parlour, you can't go in the beer parlour, son. So where's your logic, where's your logic? The Honourable Member said he sat up and watched the late TV last night. I saw that same show a few years ago and I enjoyed it at a drive-in and I enjoyed the drive-in and I had a show but the point was there but it had no more relevance to 18 than it would 19, not really. If you are going to get relevant at all I say to those who said you shouldn't have it in hospital, or you shouldn't have it in old folks' homes and I say raise the age to 65 so that you can't start drinking until 65 - you get into the old folks' home, and you can't drink after you get in there so you are safe. That's the only way you are going to be the salvation of all people.

Did we have any representation from 18 year olds or 17 or 19 or 20 year olds in Law Amendments? And there were lots there. Nobody came and spoke against it. Did we have any representation from teachers? Did we have any representation from teachers or The Teachers Society saying we will not be able to deal with it. The people that deal directly with the children -- (Interjection) -- I don't know what the . . . the member from Rhineland can tell me afterwards - but I can't recall that teachers got up and said that there should not be drinking, that the kids are going to slip out at recess and have drinks, that they are going to go home and have a liquid lunch or brunch. Somebody can be married, it's ridiculous; can be going to vocational school at 18 years of age, have children, and for the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge have family allowance and that can't be cut off by mummy and daddy, because they are already mothers and dads, but they can't go to the beer parlour. They are not going to use it any more than anybody else. If they have had four drinks the discretion is not going to be any better than the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney or the Member for Churchill or anybody else. Once you get loaded, you are loaded, whether you are 18 or whether you are 25 and the sooner you learn that you have a hangover the next day, the sooner you learn how to drink properly I suppose but I think the drinking starts, the learning how to drink, is at home and it's the parents that have to have the logic to teach children and it's their responsibility and they still have the responsibility if, as the Member for Sturgeon Creek was very careful to call the people at 18 who are going to school boys and girls. If you will notice in his speech today when it's on your desk you will see that it was boys and girls, 18 but they are adults when they are out of school but at 18 when they are in school, they are boys and girls

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . and this just isn't right. It isn't right. When they are in one school, whether it's high school, whether it's vocational school, whether you are not going to school at all, whether you have been working since you are 12 years of age - and I guess that's against the law now - but anyway, there is no difference, but I would like to see it just uniform. As the members said if they wanted to raise the whole thing to 19 I don't think I would have been too much against it, but if it was uniform, the whole thing and let it stay at that. I don't know where they found 21 in the first place, because I don't think anybody at 21 is any smarter than they were really at 20, not at that magic date when they became 21. On your 21st birthday you are no smarter than you were when you were 20 on the last day, so at 18 I don't know, I don't think there is that much difference except a few years' experience and I suppose with TV, the news media we have today and such on, we will all agree that kids are a mile ahead of us that grew up in the days when the news media wasn't what it is today, when there wasn't TV and the education facilities that we have outside of our schools so I say that I think that it should stay at one age throughout the whole thing; if it's 18 then let's make it 18 for the whole thing, not get hung up and say you can do everything except one thing, drink, because if you say that - and I'm warning those people who have spoken on this - if you say to the kids and I'm calling them kids because we are dealing whether they are children or adults, if we're saying that you are adult enough to do everything but drink, you are going to chase them to drinking. If you make it illegal for them to do everything but drink legally, then boy you are just going to dig a hole that you won't be able to live with. They are going to drink, they are going to drink just to show you that they can drink at 18 years of age, so I suggest to you to consider it carefully and don't make it an exception because it's just like prohibition. You just say you can do everything else but you can't drink until you are 19 years of age and I think that's one thing that you have got to be very careful of.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to make particular reference to remarks that have been made by the Member for Lakeside and the Member for Souris-Lansdowne and the Member for Sturgeon Creek who is not here relative to this problem. They want to divide the Legislature or to divide the thinking on this subject in this category, that those who are in favour of the age limit being 18 instead of 19 and want 18 year olds to drink, those who are against it, or those who are in favour of the law making it 18 are in favour of it because they want 18 year olds to drink; those who are against it, against the law are against it because they don't want 18 year olds to drink and, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it perfectly clear that if I thought the passing of the law would mean that less 18 year olds would drink I would vote -- that is passing the amendment -- would mean that less 18 year olds would drink, I would vote for the amendment.

So I -- (Interjection) -- well, the Member for Rhineland - he says that's what is going to happen. I happen to, Mr. Speaker, have different experience in this area. I want the Member for Rhineland to know that for ten years of my life I worked with adolescent and pre-adolescent children with all age groups and I want to tell him that if he will listen for a moment and think this thing through, he will recognize that what the Member for Churchill said is very valid, the issue here is not that the passing of a law will prevent drinking but how do you encourage moderation? How do you encourage what the Premier was talking about? Mr. Speaker, if anybody here thinks that the passing of a law which says that 18 year olds shall not have the right to decide for themselves whether or not they will drink - because that's what were doing - we're not passing a law telling them to drink as the Member for Rhineland appears to indicate, we're passing a law that merely says that they will now have the power of deciding for themselves whether they will or will not drink and I, Mr. Speaker, for one, believe that this in the long run will do more towards achieving moderation in the consumption of alcohol than all of the laws that we have had up to now. And if I didn't think so, I would vote for the amendment though I want it to be perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side who are supporting the amendment do so first for the sake of consistency yes, but secondly, and what is more important because we know that the Member for Rhineland's thinking, the Member for Lakeside's thinking, the Member for Souris-Lansdowne's thinking have not worked with regard to young people and the drinking problem and they have not worked with regard to old people and the drinking problem. The Member for Lakeside said that he saw a movie last night and this has convinced him of his thinking but, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that this movie involved people who are over 30 and this movie described circumstances which are presently the case with the laws that you people insist on wanting to pass so that if the circumstances

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . that are described are circumstances which are created from the laws that my honourable friend is talking about, why is he so insistent on passing those laws?

Does the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, who seems to suggest that banging one's head on the table is the way to create good sense - and I suppose that that is the system that he used for himself, and when we hear what he says we may know now how it got there but I would urge honourable members not to follow his example - that if the Member for Souris-Lansdowne thinks that drinking is not a problem now amongst young people then I just say that he has less knowledge about human affairs than even I accredited to him, and I didn't give very much credit. But if that's what he thinks then he just doesn't know. -- (Interjection) -- That's right, you don't. And, Mr. Chairman, let it be recorded that the Member for Souris-Lansdowne is now interrupting, that he interrupted twice in the last ten seconds so that we will know for all times as to who interrupts in this House because -- (Interjection) -- now he's interrupting again Mr. Chairman. Let Hansard show that he has just made two further interruptions -- (Interjection) -- and another one, Mr. Chairman, -- (Interjection) -- and another one, Mr. Chairman, because these members on the opposite side seem to suggest that the interruptions come from the House Leader and we are now going to count them and see where they do come from and the Member for Souris-Lansdowne has now interrupted -- (Interjection) -- and again, Mr. Chairman, let Hansard record another interruption because that's what they are doing and then they distort the entire proceedings in this House by saying that they come from another direction. But if that's what he is saying then I suggest to him that he is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give a practical example. What the members are really talking about is trying to give parents a crutch upon which to rely because they are not able to handle their own job. And what the parents want is to be able to live in an adult atmosphere where people see the consumption of alcohol and yet be able to tell their 18 year olds or their 17 year olds that you can't have it not because it's wrong, not because there is a proper way of handling it but because the law says that it's wrong. And if that's what they're told, Mr. Chairman, that is no answer and the Member for Churchill is perfectly right. It's that kind of thinking that drives a young person to say that here the entire adult community is doing it, here they tell me that I am supposed to be a responsible adult because that's what you tell the same 18 year old - there isn't a parent who doesn't say to his 18 year old child that you are a responsible adult and you should start behaving like one - but here my parent is telling me that although I am a responsible adult I don't have the reasonableness, the maturity not "to drink or not to drink" but to make the decision as to whether I shall drink or not drink, and if that's what they're telling me then I won't listen to that advice. And, Mr. Chairman, they are perfectly right - if that is what the parent is telling the child, the child is going to ignore that advice and that's why you will have a greater drinking problem amongst young people if you try to follow this through than you will have in the ordinary case.

Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate through a practical example - and it will be somewhat personal - that this is not what happens, that there are many places where the consumption of alcohol is treated as a normal part of the every day life of the family and, Mr. Chairman, in those families you don't have a problem with alcoholism. You don't have a problem of immoderation through alcoholics. I know that in my own religion and in my own culture - it might not be the same now because the cultures change and we get enveloped in entirely new situations - but in my own religion and my own culture from the very time I was an infant I can remember alcohol as being part of the normal life, in moderation, and I know that my parents gave me alcohol and I know that I give my children alcohol in moderation and, Mr. Chairman, I know, and statistics will show that within this group of people alcohol has not been a serious problem because the responsibility of dealing with it has not rested upon the Legislature and has not been shifted to the Legislature and the buck has not been passed to the Legislature but we have had to deal with it and as long as we tell our society that each family is going to have to deal with the problem of moderation and the problem of over-use of alcohol then we will have a far greater opportunity of success than if we tell those families that they can tell their children that it's against the law and they shouldn't do it which is what you want, and it just won't work, it hasn't worked. All of the problems that you've talked about relative to alcohol consumption have happened under laws such as you are now proposing. You had better start thinking about that because I on this side of the House and I know my colleagues are not in agreement that the reduction of the drinking age will mean that more young people

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . . will drink. If we thought that we wouldn't be in favour of the law. That is not the purpose of the legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think the previous Minister's remarks need a reply. Certainly I won't accept what he says. First of all I should probably say it because of other members, I have never been drunk and I've never had a hang-over, I don't know what it means to have a hang-over but other people have said here that this is something that young people like to experience. Well, I have never had the desire to have that experience. Maybe one of the reasons for that might be that I was converted in my youth and I had no desire for drinking.

However, I would like to speak to the amendment that is before us to raise the age for those that will be legally allowed to drink and I feel I've expressed myself previous to this that I felt the reduction from 21 to 18 was too drastic, was too big a step at one time, and I also stated that I would like to see the age of majority set at 19. When I moved that amendment in committee it was not accepted and therefore I will certainly give my reasoning for this. We have heard that the other provinces to the west have 19 for drinking age. B.C. and Alberta also have 19 for the age of majority. Certainly we must accept the premise that as you grow older you get more mature, and therefore a 19-year-old should be on the average more mature than an 18-year-old is. This might not apply to every individual but on the average this certainly must be true. I've stated previously my objection to lowering the age of majority to 18 because the responsibilities that these young people will be accepting through contractual arrangements and agreements, and I feel that we are putting too much responsibility on these young people at too early an age and this certainly will mean that there will be temptations that heretofore were not there, and many of them will likely get into trouble financially. I know from experience of too many cases where this has happened. If I didn't know, I wouldn't be speaking on this subject, but I've seen it and I've had to deal with cases, so this is true and this is the case.

Then, too, the parental influence will certainly diminish because we are reducing the age of majority. The influence that parents have on their children will be diminishing as a result, because many of the youngsters, once they know that they are of age, they don't have to listen to their parents any longer, listen to their admonishments and so on, and will go their own way. Some no doubt will leave their home and will take up residence elsewhere and probably take a job away from home just in order to be away from parental influence and discipline. I am certainly not saying that this will apply to all cases. Not in the least. But there will be cases and I think there will be more cases, because we are setting the temptation and especially in drinking. The Honourable Minister said that this would not necessarily mean more drinking but we are setting the temptation and young people will entice other young people to come along and go drinking, have parties and so on. The temptation will be much greater, and many of our young people are not in a position to resist temptation at that time, so for that very reason there will be more drinking as a result. I don't say that all of them will become drunkards or that they will become addicts, but the temptation will be greater and as a result you will have more young people trying liquor at an earlier age.

Then, too, as far as the age of majority goes, I would like to have seen it raised to 19 and not set at 18 because many of them would by that time have had a job, they would have had some experience of making a living. Today, most of them go to high school and continue through high school. Many continue on to university but many terminate their learning at that stage. Then, too, we know that once young people start paying taxes they have second thoughts about much of the money - where it's spent and how it's spent and so on - and they get a different attitude toward life as a result, so that this also, I think, would certainly give support to raising the age to 19. The matter of discipline is not only feared by many parents; we have a good example of what the Winnipeg School Division said in committee, and I would like to read two paragraphs from their presentation into the record just so that when other people will be reading Hansard on this point they will also know what the Winnipeg School Division had to say; and I'm quoting:

"There are presently some 781 boys and 402 girls, or a total of 1,183 students, 18 years of age, attending the various schools in the Winnipeg Division. It is felt that lowering the drinking age to 18 will encourage young people to take advantage of this additional freedom and will consequently have an effect upon the administration of the school. Students will be



(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . permitted to indulge legally in alcoholic beverages during the noon recess and prior to extra-curricular activities, and it is felt that they could become a disruptive influence in the school. The introduction of this unnecessary influence will carry over to the younger students, adding a further unsatisfactory dimension to the alcohol problem.

"The Federal Government youth allowance is paid to parents whose sons and daughters remain in school up to and including the 18th year. This legislation is designed to keep boys and girls in school. It is interesting to note that at age 19 this Division has 288 boys and 87 girls for a total of 375 students, and an additional 115 who are 20 or 21 years of age as compared to 1,183 who are 18-year-olds. A substantial drop in the school population occurs in the over-18-years category."

Mr. Chairman, this, I think, is a clear indication that we are and will be subjecting many of our younger students, students who are less than 18, probably 16, 17, those who are attending high school, we are subjecting them to this influence of the older students, who will now be able to drink and provide drinks for these younger students, which no doubt will occur too, that those who will now be able to get drinks will supply them to the younger ones, and this is what our parents object to. I have had a number of calls in connection with this, not one in favour; all of them were objecting to this. And I also feel that this government has no mandate to come forward with this proposition at this time. I think this should have received discussion previous to this session another year to argue at election time so that people could have expressed themselves more on this matter. We are talking about committee meetings where people come as representation, but how many of our rural people know about them? Very, very few. And right now they are busy; they are busy in the fields; there is so much work to be done owing to various crops and so on, so that people haven't got time to come to these meetings, and on top of that the majority doesn't even know about it, that they are on. And because children are compelled to attend school, there is nothing they can do to avoid having their youngsters subjected to this disruptive influence, as the Winnipeg School Division Board calls it. Therefore I take thorough exception to lowering the drinking age to the 18-year-old level. I think, as far as saying that there will be no more or no greater amount of drinking by the younger people, I think this is foolish. This is wishful thinking on our part if we think that way, because the temptation will be greater and no doubt, as a result, the amount of drinking that will be done by more youngsters, I think, is inevitable.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are my arguments on this point and I feel very strongly about them. I certainly will support the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, the arguments that are presented on this primarily come from the government side and I didn't catch all the remarks of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources but what I did catch indicates the same thing as has been presented previously by members on the government side that have spoken on this, and the logical conclusion of their arguments is basically that, if you take it to the logical extension, is that there should be no age set with regards to drinking - and this might be a valid point. I think probably many people would agree with this, and that you could reach that logical conclusion. But we are faced with, presumably, setting an age for drinking, and the question arises of the minimum age that we're talking about here, so we seem to be taking the easy "out" in saying that since the age of majority is 18 then the age at which alcohol can be consumed legally by a person should also be 18. I submit that there's no particularly strong reason why these two ages should be the same.

There's probably, if the government wanted to -- pardon? -- Well, this is the strong argument of the Attorney-General that he has been presenting, that these two ages should be in agreement so we are going to set them both at 18, but I submit if you are trying to get uniformity that it's a wonder that the government didn't come in and say that they were changing the driving age to 18 from 16, because between 16 and 18 you're giving someone the legal license to go out and kill by the most effective method of killing people there is - on the highways; and in that age area, 16 to 18, they do not have the legal responsibility imposed by the Age of Majority Act. So if you're going to try and use the age of majority as a yardstick by which you are going to establish ages for all things, there's as much logic behind the argument that has come from some sectors of the government as it applies to the drinking age as there is to the legal age to drive a motor vehicle on the highway. I only ask the question; I am not in the least suggesting that it should be changed, I am only asking the question as to if you are

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . going to use that argument, why not apply it to other areas as well?

Now I agree that the argument before us and the question before us is: if we must set an age, what should it be set at? And this amendment simply says that, in light of the facts as I see in moving the amendment, that if you're considering all things, one of the things you should consider is the effect in the all-important institution of our public education system and that a significant portion of your high school population in the final year are going to be 18 years old and going to be changing age during that latter part of the Grade 12 year, and therefore, if the drinking age is an arbitrary one, then I say it should be 19 - and that's why the amendment. And that's the essence of the argument and there's no point in complicating it further. That's all there is to it, and I suggest that people on both sides of the House have feelings on this.

This is basically, I think, pretty much a non-political decision, and that people are pretty well making individual decisions with regard to this and I trust that it will be a free vote on it. We know that most of the jurisdictions that have changed their drinking age lately have set it on at 19 in Canada - I can't talk about Europe. The First Minister has used the argument that in Europe it's different. Also, the ages of beginning school in Europe are different, so I don't think you can carry the argument logically over to Manitoba in that respect. If you look at Canada, the provinces to the west of us that have changed lately are, I think, uniformly at age 19 on the drinking. The Yukon Territories, which has been making fairly drastic changes in their liquor laws in recent years, have effectively wiped out many of the restrictions with regard to the consumption rules on alcohol and imposed very restrictive rules about the abuse of alcohol, and in that wide open and free-for-all type of society that they have in the Yukon, which is a much more rapid-moving one than Manitoba's, they have seen fit there to set it at 19 and the reason for setting it at 19 is the same reason I'm asking you here, and that is that, again, at age 19 they are basically assumed to be out of the high school system, and that is the reason I'm given by a member of the Yukon Legislature, I guess it is, that was in this House, sat here and listened to some of the arguments, and he was asked that point. I asked him, why did you set it at 19? - and it was the same reason. So this is the essence of the argument, Mr. Chairman. I don't think it's all that complicated. It's a judgment, a subjective judgment by individuals who, rather than the argument of uniformity, it has to be one as to what should be the age if you have to set one. And I say it should be 19.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few remarks I'd like to add to the debate on this amendment. It's as the Member for Riel said, in many ways a personal opinion in many cases and political in others. There's one thing about this bill, this Age of Majority, that alarms me, Mr. Chairman, and that of course is the youth. There'll no longer such a thing as youth. I think all members of the House agree that those were the most exciting days of one's life from 16 to 21 when you could roam at will and sort of free-lance and do your thing the best way you knew how, and you were not too responsible for the world that was around you, you just had a good time; and those were very exciting days in my life and I'm sure most of the members of the House will agree. However, the world has moved on and now the youth will be a thing of the past in most jurisdictions, and, of course, here we are with an amendment and all as to what to do with the liquor section of one's life. And I'm alarmed that the government have not come out with a program of alcohol education with regard to this legislation. We dealt with legislation earlier on the Liquor Act and I proposed an amendment with regard to alcohol education, which was accepted by the Attorney-General and one . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hate to interrupt the member but I do think we are on the question of Age of Majority and he's straying a little off the topic at the moment.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well Mr. Chairman, I'd just say bear with me. I . . .

MR. GREEN: On a point of order, it's in accordance with the rules that something that has already been discussed and decided shall not be re-raised, so -- I know that the argument is an interesting one and I myself am intrigued by it but I think we have other things to do.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: The amendment specifically mentions the - or refers to the Liquor Control Act so he's quite perfectly in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In respect to age I would point out to the member for Rhineland, not

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.) . . . . in respect to education or anything else.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, the subject matter is one that must be looked at from many angles and while the House Leader now has become very touchy on the matter of interruptions since his confrontation with the Member for Ste. Rose the other day, I hope you will let me finish my remarks.

MR. GREEN: On a point of order I have never said to any member that he could not rise on a point of order and I have no worry about my confrontation with the Member for Ste. Rose. If there is a point of order arises, I have the right to rise and make a point of order.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Chairman on the same point of order, a few moments ago the Member for St. Boniface made a great to do about what I did in 1964 and I didn't notice you interrupting him then when he was talking about languages.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the one that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources did raise was one. I would say the Member for Roblin should proceed.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well basically, Mr. Chairman, what I was trying to get around to is that I am surprised that the Minister of Education hasn't spoke on this particular bill because . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . on the same point of order and indicate to the member that the subject of alcohol education and the subject of his amendment which he is now going into was dealt with by the House and decided upon. My understanding of the rules is that once an issue is decided upon it shall not be re raised that's all.

MR. BILTON: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, I wonder why the Leader of the House allowed the Honourable Member for St. Boniface to go at great lengths as he did on Bill No. 111.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member thought that I was doing something wrong on Bill No. 111 then it seems to me that he shouldn't raise it on Bill No. 127.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . that that question was under the jurisdiction of the Speaker and he didn't take cognizance at that time but we will not debate that issue because it's challenging what the Speaker was doing at that moment. Would you proceed, the Member for Roblin?

MR. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll rephrase my remarks and ask the Minister of Education to give us some idea as we are voting on a matter here of lowering the age without any new programs of alcohol education and maybe the Minister of Education will give us some guidance as to what we can expect from the Department of Education. If in fact, we pass this legislation because I, Mr. Chairman, am going to vote on the matter and before I vote I certainly would like him to give us his views as the Honourable Member from Riel has pointed out, that the logic of course is that we are lowering the age to 18 and there will be some repercussions in the schools.

I basically have no quarrel with the lowering of the age of drinking. I think that, like many, I could support no age limit at all. It's a matter of personal logic and personal opinion but in the main I think that with the drastic change that's before us in this bill and this amendment, that there is a problem in some jurisdictions and some parts of our society with alcohol and let's not anybody kid ourselves, the consumption of alcohol is increasing rapidly and here we are exposing young people down from 21 to 18 without some type of program to help them understand basically what the problems of alcohol are and I would hope that before we vote that the Minister of Education would maybe introduce a new program into the school program. I think it would be an excellent suggestion for some of the young people that will be exposed to it. It's a matter of 18 or 19 that we are looking at Mr. Chairman, so the age is going to be lowered either two years or three years from what it is at the present time.

I am also concerned in many ways Mr. Chairman that we, as the members of this House are responsible for the jurisdictions that we represent or are responsible for the legislation that we are bringing before the House and are responsible for the effects of such legislation so I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Education, before we vote would give us some idea of what he anticipates might happen in the school system.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. The amendment before the House that we are having a division on is by the Member for Riel on Bill 127, The Age of Majority Act and the amendment states that subsection (1) of section 4 of Bill 127 be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof the words "except in the Liquor Control Act, in which Act a reference to the age of 21 years shall be read as a reference to the age 19 years."

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas, 11; Nays, 31.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment lost.

4(1)--passed. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I move that Section (1) of subsection (1) be amended by deleting the word "18" in the second line thereof and insert the word "19".

MR. CHAIRMAN: I regret to inform the member for Rhineland we have already passed that section; we are on Section 4 sub (1) now.

MR. FROESE: Saturday we had passed Bill 109. We were on the last page. The Minister of Mines and Resources brought in an amendment half-way in the bill. It was accepted; there was no question. Because we were dealing with the previous bill, page by page, I wasn't ready to get the bill out and to present my amendment at that time so I . . .

MR. GREEN: We'll give leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you are accepting the amendment, then I want to briefly speak on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. SPIVAK: Just on a point of order, I really don't think that the Honourable Member requires leave because I think he really related the procedure that's followed in the past and I think just as a matter of record it should be that he's . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . this point was raised in the past I think that there is a problem here, because if the point was raised in the past it had to be by leave and if anybody objected to it, it would have been stopped because I don't think it is that we should create a practice that at any stage of the proceedings any member can create any amendment, so let's just proceed with it on the basis.

MR. SPIVAK: Just on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I am informed that the last time this occurred it was by leave and I am saying that this time it's the same procedure because leave has been granted. I would like to suggest that we do not set a precedent of doing it without leave. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I did speak on this matter in committee. Now that we are in the House, Committee of the Whole, all members can now participate in the vote and therefore I thought it should be brought forward once more. We also debated the matter in resolution form and I indicated to members at that time why I felt that the age of majority should be set a 19 and I don't propose to put all the arguments forward again. I have just finished debating the previous amendment to which those very same facts apply. I feel that 19 year olds are and will be more mature.

I feel that the step that we are taking from reducing it from 21 to 18 is too drastic, is one that should have been taken up with the public much before this, so that they would be acquainted with the matter that we were going to change this. Certainly just by allowing an 18 year old resident of this province to vote, did not imply at that time that this would be changed to the Age of Majority Act and that from here on the 18 year olds would be accountable under the law, so Mr. Chairman I feel, too, that the responsibilities that are being shoved on to 18 year old people in this province are too great at this time. We have had, at least I have had no representation come forward from my area requesting that this change be made. In fact, I rather fear the contrary is the case, that because of reducing the age to 18 many of your younger people will be in trouble because of contractual arrangements in connection with finances. This is one of the big dangers that I see. They will now be subject to pressures from the automobile agents, from many other sources, from many other areas where people are in the selling business, they will be subjected to this. In too many cases we will find the resistance will not be there to counter this pressure and as a result we will find many of our young people getting into trouble at a much earlier age and much faster and I really have a concern for these people in this connection.

Then, too, I have already mentioned the diminishing influence as far as parents are concerned. We know that at a certain age, and normally at that age, there is a resistance on the part of the young people to resist parental influence and if we are now going to make it legal under the law that they no longer have to listen, that this too will bring about a reaction in general. I think we will have more trouble enforcing laws in this province, certainly now that the drinking age will not be increased to 19 as has just been voted down and if this

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . resolution, if this motion if it is not passed that means that 18 year olds will be allowed to drink that this in itself also will present a greater problem and therefore I feel that members should really give more consideration to this. I think we should have had more time to acquaint these people in the province with this and to get the reaction of the people.

Certainly as I pointed out before, this government has not had a mandate from the people on this very matter. None of the parties put forward that they were going to propose an age of majority of 18 as far as I can recollect. None of the literature that went out contained this to my knowledge and therefore I feel that this certainly should have had greater discussion and allowed the people more time to make representation. I realize that we've had very little representation in Committee and I already pointed out that a lot of this is because of the people being too busy and not even knowledgeable that these committees are being held and that there is a chance for them to appear.

So, Mr. Chairman, I really wish that honourable members would give consideration to this matter. This would also bring us in line with Alberta, B. C. and I think Newfoundland who have an age of majority of 19 and certainly the people of that age would be more mature in taking on these responsibilities.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. John's): . . . to the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Has your constituency given you the mandate to move to reduce the age of majority to 19?

MR. FROESE: No, but Mr. Chairman, I have on different occasions, when speaking in the constituency, have mentioned the Province of Alberta and B. C. having the age of 19 for drinking purposes and also that they now have the age of majority there as 19. This is not something that I have not mentioned to the people in my constituency, so those that did attend the meetings are knowledgeable of this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . Mr. Chairman, that if all the terrible things that happen to 18 years old if the member can guarantee that they won't happen to those as soon as they turn 19, I'll support has amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've already spoken on the matter similar to this but the amendment that's now before us really makes it mandatory for me to say a few further remarks. And really . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ENNS: . . . I thought my remarks earlier were such that would not have, you know, got us into any great serious debate, but I do want to explain this one situation. I think that many of us from time to time ask ourselves when do we represent our direct constituents' feelings and when do we look at legislation or think out legislation as to how we view it or how caucus or what our government position is on it and I would suggest that probably in most instances we take the responsibility seriously as entrusted on us, we hope that we have been perhaps elected for some reason or been pointed out by persons in our community as having some leadership in certain areas and for that reason through various means find our way into this Chamber and are expected to use our own judgments and our own talents after due deliberation and listening to debates and equipping ourselves with the various matters that can make us to some extent expert on these many subjects.

However, there are a few instances that come up where as far as I'm concerned I'm prepared to take the direction of my constituents, particularly where I have no great personal hang up one way or the other. Now as I said in the outset, I'm not prepared to try to explain any schizophrenic position that I take on this matter; I'm simply responding to numerous requests within my constituency with respect to the matter of lowering of the drinking age. And while I have had an opportunity to do that by means of the last vote, I would have to indicate to you Mr. Chairman, that I would not be able to support the Honourable Member for Rhineland's amendment before us as it is now constituted in the sense that I do not take the same position with respect to the entire Age of Majority Bill that is before us. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the Question? The Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Just briefly, I'd like to indicate that this is an

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) . . . . . interesting and far-reaching amendment. I did not support the previous amendment because it did make an exception to the rule in the area of alcohol only and I am not that concerned about people consuming alcohol before they reach the age of 19. However, I realize that permitting people of 18 or 19 to become of age of majority is to give them not only privileges but to make them assume responsibilities as was already pointed out. I think it would be a wise step to proceed gradually and a wise step to go to 19 this year; if we should wish to go to 18 I think that the future will permit us to do so.

One other indication I would like to make is that I would hope that the government will not force a partisan vote on this kind of issue because I think it's a little too important for this kind of thing. I wish that the will of the few will not be imposed on all of the members as has been in the past and has been obviously the case in the past. I would implore the Premier and the front benchers to permit an open vote on this kind of issue and I think in that case it would carry.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Member have support? (Agreed) Call in the members. Division is in respect to amendment by the Member for Rhineland. For those members who aren't aware - Section 1, subsection (1) be amended by deleting the word "eighteen" in the second line thereof and inserting the word "nineteen".

A COUNTED VOTE was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas 2; Nays 40.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sections 4 to 15 of Bill No. 127 were read and passed.) The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: . . . government could give any indication when they intend to proclaim the bill or what the reason is for delay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No answer. Preamble passed. Title passed. Bill be reported. Bill 134 An Act to amend The Election Act (2). Section by section or page by page?

MR. SPIVAK: Section by Section, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1(a) . . . The Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I rise at this point because I feel it's probably appropriate in dealing with this particular section to make a few comments that I have not had the opportunity of making in connection with this debate because of some difficulty in being present when it was debated in the House and in turn in the Committee, and for this reason I'd like to, if I may, make a comment as a contribution to the debate and attempt to try and assist the government in arriving at the conclusion that is desired by the legislation. Because it was my feeling that the amendments themselves do not fully take into consideration some of the requirements that must be fulfilled if the Act is to be enforced properly and if the ultimate objective is to be achieved.

Mr. Chairman, I've had the opportunity in the last few months to head one of the main party's in this province and as a result I've had an opportunity of examining its organization and structure and of examining a party's function in opposition as opposed to government. I've had the opportunity of being on the government side and although I was not the head of the provincial party I was in a position at least to know the resources and facilities that are available to a political party when in government that is not available to them in opposition. The honourable members opposite recognize the difficulties that I'm going to express that one finds themselves in, or a political party finds themselves in.

We've already had reference to the fact that it is the government's intention, and we'll be dealing in a few minutes with the Legislative Assembly Act, with the ability to be able to use some of the members on the opposite side to carry on some of the functions of government and to make their contribution along with the government ministers in carrying out the overall functions of government. We have already had reference to the number of political executive assistants that the government has appointed -- which is nothing new, which is following the procedure in the past and which is not in my opinion, an incorrect procedure. But we must recognize as well that the responsibilities and activities of those people are in fact paid for out of the public purse, and this is an accepted practice. Now there is no procedure set up for opposition and there is no procedure like that set up for an opposition party. This I think becomes extremely relevant because a great deal of the work -- (Interjection) -- I beg your

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . . pardon? I think that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has said by way of interruption that he is not going to interrupt. So that's number one, Mr. Chairman. Well I think as maybe the months go by we'll be in a position to make a record or at least keep a record. Possibly this will interest the Member for St. Boniface, will keep him busy doing something anyway. -- (Interjection) -- As usual you weren't listening.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of a political organization in opposition is extremely difficult to be able to fulfill its function. The Leader of the Opposition, and I now speak in connection with the Official Opposition's position, I believe that the Liberal Party's position and the position of the independent members who are in this House are -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . question the validity of some of the arguments or points being made by the honourable member, but it seems to me that they would relate more properly to the bill that is before us relating to the Legislative Assembly Act. The bill before us now is the Elections Act and I would ask you Sir, to consider the honourable member's remarks and rule whether they are in any way at all relevant to the subject matter of Bill No. 134.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order and for the real purpose of trying to have an intelligent debate - and this is up to the government as to whether we're going to proceed this way or not. I'm dealing with Section (a) (a. 1) which deals with "central political party organization" meaning the permanent continuing office and staff of a recognized political party. Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what I'm going to deal with and this is exactly what I'm talking about. Because the permanent continuing staff of a recognized political party if it is not in government must include researchers and assistants, who if they are not paid for out of the public purse, must be paid for and funded by contributions to be made to the political party as a result of the political party's activity, and I suggest Mr. Chairman, that in examining the sections of the Act in the amendments that are proposed in this Act with respect to the existing legislation, that what has happened is that there has been a failure not to consider, or the government has not considered the necessity and the cost involved. And I can tell you Mr. Chairman, that it is . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I wonder if the members could confine their little meetings outside of the Assembly.

MR. SPIVAK: There are substantial costs that must borne by a political party in opposition and the honourable members opposite are aware of this, that in fact, if this legislation is to be introduced should be borne of the public purse in the same way as a great deal of the political activity of the government is handled through the executive assistants and other assistants who are political assistants appointed by the government to carry out the function of government and the function of the party.

Now I'm dealing in an area that I think everyone understands. It's a question of whether it's appropriate now, not just in terms of the debate, but it's appropriate now if we're going to amend the Election Act to not consider seriously some way in which the funding that must occur and the staff that must be established, which must be part of the central political organization, should not in fact include researchers and assistants assigned to the political parties in opposition.

Now again I'm going to repeat something I have said before in this House. We have dealt with a lot of legislation, important legislation in a short period of time; and it requires considerable assistance and help, and we have been fortunate as a political party to be able to find a research director and to be in a position to have him assist us, but we have had to raise this as a result of public subscription of funds, and I suggest Mr. Chairman, that with respect to what is being contemplated here, which is to limit, limit the expense allowance and the manner of funding of a political party - and I'm not quarrelling with the principle involved - that there is a corollary that must be established here which is the funding of the legitimate requirements of the political parties to fulfill their function in opposition through the public treasury - and we're not talking about a great deal of money. It would seem to me Mr. Chairman, that it would be -- (Interjection) -- my recommendation? The Premier asked my recommendation. My recommendation would be that the Leader of the Opposition be given a political executive assistant to be paid for out of the treasury; that the official opposition party be given a permanent research director, that in fact, there be another research director made available to the other opposition parties and to the independents and that this be funded

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . out of the public purse. This is my recommendation. If this was followed through I think that a substantial sum of money that must be raised by a political party during the off-year periods of election would in fact be met. -- (Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. SCHREYER: I would just like to ask the honourable member whether he is proposing that this sum of money should be allocated to the political party office, not earmarked but leaving it to the judgment of the party or whether it should be earmarked specifically for research assistants or whatever?

MR. SPIVAK: No, I would suggest that it be earmarked specifically. I have no objection to that and I would suggest that they be categorized and paid in the same salary range and scale as others of comparable positions within government.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): . . . member be opposed to the motion of extending these research assistants to the back bench of the government side?

MR. SPIVAK: Well I must say that my understanding, and I think this is correct, is that the people on the back bench of government usually have access through the ministers to many of the executive assistants and to the source of government - it doesn't follow, but by way of accident somebody put in my box a speech that was prepared for one of the back benchers by one of the government employees. I see no objection to that, it was done. I recognize it was done. I think it would be silly not to admit that it's being done, but I would -- (Interjection) -- It may not be good practice but this is the procedure and I have a suspicion that the Honourable Member from Crescentwood probably has greater access than many other members to the sources in government -- well certainly greater sources than the opposition have.

MR. GREEN: Does the honourable member not recall that sometime in the first session of the Legislature there was serious questions raised as to whether this facility should be made available to government back benchers and at the time it was indicated that the same facility, that if the members of that side wanted speeches written by our executive assistants they could ask for them.

MR. SPIVAK: The only problem Mr. Chairman, is the executive assistants I have dealt with, all of them who are nice persons, nice people at least, have very closed minds. This I found as a result of my discussion with them.

MR. GREEN: . . . holds true of my executive assistant who was employed by the previous administration?

MR. SPIVAK: As a matter of fact I am not sure which executive assistant you now have -- (Interjection) -- I really have no contact with him. However, and I'm not in a position, I said I think in a general way. But Mr. Chairman, I think that my proposal is a reasonable proposal and I think I speak with some experience as one who attempted to try and organize a political party that was not in opposition and now found it itself in opposition, to be able to perform its function. I know that what has been contemplated here has not considered this aspect of it and I think it would be very reasonable to consider it and I would hope - I have no particular amendment because I assume that it could possibly be amended in the Legislative Assembly Act rather than in the Election Act, and I recognize this, but it would seem to me that the government should entertain this and consider it and it would be a worthwhile contribution to the debate and we probably would finish the session a lot earlier than we are at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1(a) sub (a-1) passed --

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, was the Honourable Member for River Heights - did he indicate that he expected an answer now or when we deal with the Legislative Assembly Act?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly appreciate it if the government would give some expression of considering this seriously so that in fact there could be amendments introduced. I think it would be appropriate, we are still talking about the political organization in this section particularly and it would seem to me that if there was some indication of this it would certainly satisfy me, with respect to what is contemplated, the intent of what is contemplated in the Act. Otherwise it makes it difficult and I think extremely difficult.

What I'm expressing by the way was expressed by the former leader of the Liberal Party when he was leader of the opposition. I listened to it at that time. There were some changes that were made -- well the Honourable Member from St. Boniface is laughing now -- (Interjection) -- Let me say this, Mr. Chairman. I speak now as one who has sat in opposition and in government, which is now the experience of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, and in turn as one who now heads a political party, I have some understanding of the structure and organization and the responsibilities involved and I believe that I therefore can at this time, speak properly. Now if you want to . . .



MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman would the honourable member give further definition to his use of the phrase that he "heads the political party", his rather intriguing statement that requires more definition?

MR. SPIVAK: Well I think as president of the party I head the political party, I'm not the leader of the party; and I think, if I'm correct, Bill Hutton has expressed many times to me that he heads the NDP party, even though there are many members on the opposite side who really are of the opinion that he doesn't head very much. But nevertheless, I would seriously hope that there would be some expression of opinion now, that this would be considered and possible amendment introduced.

MR. SCHREYER: Is the honourable member aware that in the short time that we have headed the administration that arrangements have been made for the providing of a secretary on a year round basis to caucus opposite, in a way that was not done up until now?

MR. SPIVAK: Again, I think it's very commendable. I do not think it serves the function the Leader of the Opposition requires of an executive assistant to fulfil his function, because he does have a particular function in our democratic system, and I think the honourable First Minister recognizes that; and secondly, I do not think the secretarial service fulfils the research function which I think is just as important. -- (Interjection) -- It's a start, but on the other hand we are making a fairly dramatic change here, a dramatic change in Legislative Assembly Act it would seem to me that if we are going to do it, at least do it in the full matter and provide this as well. -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . if I may, is whether the executive assistant research staff are to be used for election purposes or to fulfil the functions in opposition? If it's the latter, then surely all this discussion belongs under the Legislative Assembly Act or under the rules rather than in dealing with elections.

MR. SPIVAK: Well Mr. Chairman, I've tried to point out - the honourable member is correct - but when you talk in terms of a central political party organization, when you talk in terms of staff for a period of less than six months, you are talking about a staff that includes of necessity, because of the need to hire personnel and to raise money to run a political office, of the necessity of having people who will fulfil the research and executive assistant function, along with the political function, and I think they should be separated in the same way that they are separated. I'm not denying that there will be a political function to the executive assistant just as there is a political function to the executive assistants on the members on the opposite side. We recognize this. And when governments change, the executive assistants, the appointments are terminated immediately. Now we know this.

But what I'm suggesting Mr. Chairman, is that the amendment is more appropriate in the Legislative Assembly Act and I would hope that this would be considered. If the government is not going to consider it, we can introduce the amendment but nothing's going to happen in this area. I'm suggesting that if we are going to deal and try to accomplish the objective in the Election Act the other part should not be ignored and I would hope that it would be considered and brought in at that time. But it's appropriately discussed at this time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise the honourable member that it's true we have had these discussions for many years and I recall in our own group of which I was the president of the party, I never headed the party but I was the president of the party, and the fact is Mr. Chairman, we always had this type of discussion. I remember discussing the elimination of deposits and our people at convention used to say, we have to have this because the deposits are costing us money and we need research assistants because research assistants are costing us money. I always told them and I still said - don't say that we want it because it's costing us money, say that we want it because eventually it's going to cost the opposition money, the Conservatives and the Liberals, and on that basis it makes a great deal of sense and I'm happy to see that our prophecy in this respect has come true, that the real reason that this will come in - and by the way I'm not expressing the merits of it at this time - the real reason that it will come in, is because it's going to be of assistance, not to the New Democratic Party people who said we need this because we need money, but because suddenly people on the other side have seen the need for it. Now I'm not suggesting that it's going to happen but if it does happen it will be because of the kind of speech that was made by the member who now realizes that this is something that's needed for all administration and he only sees the need since he has been in opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman for the record, I think that I can say that I have publicly

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . . expressed this opinion since the time that I entered into government. I don't think there's any inconsistent position. I think I've also said it privately to many of the members opposite when they were in opposition. As a matter of fact when the leader of the Liberal Party made his position known, I agreed with this position and I expressed that agreement. So that there's no inconsistency. That's No. 1.

No. 2. The reason this becomes pertinent is the limitations on the ability, not of spending money but of raising money. There's a distinction. It's not the question of the limitation of spending the money, it's raising the money. I would say that if you are going to now put the limitation and make the provisions, and I think the provisions are reasonable and I think that they are workable and I think, you know, the Election Act can work successfully under these amendments, and I've had an opportunity of reading each one of them and understanding it fully, at least I think fully. Nevertheless, having said that it would seem to me that there is a basic expense that a political party must absorb, and whether you call me the president or the head in the terminology that you would like to use, nevertheless I say that charged with that responsibility where the function of caucus and the leader, whether he is the leader of the opposition or a leader of the party, has to be determined along with the organization and structure of the party, that there is a separation that should be made, that should be clearly understood, and that it should be borne by the public purse, and we are not talking of a great deal of money, and then I would think that this Act would be complete.

MR. GREEN: Having tried on two occasions and have been willing to be the head of the party, I know the difference between the head of the party and the president of the party.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Honourable Minister it's unfortunate that the terminology was used in such a way that we are concerning ourselves with this particular aspect. But lest there be no misunderstanding on the part -- (Interjection) -- No, no there was no Freudian slip. As far as I know . . . --(Interjection) -- I don't know what? Well I wonder if the Minister for St. Boniface would go to his chair and then I may be able to deal with him. The reason I promoted him, the reason I promoted him is that the Minister of Government Services is not here and I think he would be rather angry if he saw who has replaced him. In fact he would be more than angry, he would say balderdash and poppycock as well.

Well Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is any point in dealing with this; I only hope that the government will entertain my suggestion and will come through. I would though, Mr. Chairman, wonder if there is a possibility of the government indicating a position on this at this time. I reckon they do not have to but it would be interesting if the First Minister would be in a position to make a statement on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman I have been interested in this part of the presentation up until now. I do realize that it does really fall between this one and the Legislative Assembly Act and it's very difficult to separate the two, but I think that if the government could settle down to taking a good look at it that they could use the library and the facilities for a research staff which could do the whole program rather than allocating moneys to certain parties in respect to the size, etc. because this is going to change with each election. I think that I would agree that when sitting on the government side, that as a backbencher you don't just always get all the research material that you require when you are trying to look into something; so there is a need for all members outside of cabinet for some type of research material assistance.

We want to get away from duplication. I could foresee the point where one bill would come up where if you had two strong parties in opposition and you've got your government backbenchers, then you are going to require research staff for three groups of political parties looking into the same thing, to come up with the same types of answers, and that is just facts; and if research is what you really want, and that's facts, then I think one group could do it. They would be bureaucratic in nature, they would be appointed, they would work, I suppose, along with the library and use the library resources and you would file with them those things which you require and they would come up with the facts that you asked for; and often in one person asking for facts, then probably that card file could be passed on to others that want the facts on the same bill or the same type of project that would be considered.

So I think rather than trying to, on this part of the research anyway, "assistance for opposition", I think it could be joined with government and all people in general in that if there was some type of assistance in the library, more of a political nature in which the facts could be made available; then once that system is set up, then probably it would help university students in the future, it would be available for their use; not necessarily would they find maybe

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . new facts for them because this would require a great deal of staff, but they would at least have available to all people that research material that is required.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. These questions . . . by previous speaker but is it not true that this Act deals with the election expenses and Election Act and there will be an opportunity under the Legislative Assembly Act to deal with exactly the kind of thing that the honourable member's raising.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, just on the point of order . . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, it is true, that I put this to my honourable friend the Member for Churchill and if he wished to continue, I'm not suggesting that he can't, but I'm asking him whether - and I think that he should be the judge not the Member for River Heights as to whether he wants to continue in this vein or not.

MR. BEARD: It doesn't make much difference anyway, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . not on a point of order, but again in connection with the debate. We're talking of permanent staff of a political party. This means people who are involved in research along with other things, and therefore it really is as pertinent as I've indicated in the beginning. The opportunity for the freedom of discussion now I think is very real, so therefore I don't think that the Member from Churchill should be prohibited. If he wants to that's his decision, but I think he certainly should be allowed to -- and I know the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said that to him exactly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Sub-section 1 to 6 (c) of Bill No. 134 were read and passed.) (d) (n.1) -- passed. (n.2) --

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on subsection (n.2) I would like to ask the First Minister what criteria he used for the arbitrary figure of five percent of the popular vote to recognize a political party. He could of used 5 or 10 or 1 or 15. I just wonder why he would choose the figure 5.

MR. SCHREYER: That's a good question, Mr. Chairman. I can tell my honourable friend that in an effort to give some definition as to what constitutes a recognized political party, we looked at whatever the electoral law had to say in this respect in other provinces and in other countries in the western world and after having done so and in an effort to have the most liberal interpretation of "recognized political party," we took the lowest figure rather than a high figure and the lowest figure that we could come across was five percent of the electoral vote at the previous general election. We felt that if we had a, let us say, 10 percent figure that it would be, obviously would be more restrictive, and we thought that if we were to err we would err on the side of liberality here. The intention is obviously not to exclude a political party from having its name included on the ballot which might have been the case if we had set it at 10 percent. In a group of candidates running under a party banner in the previous election, they've got only 8 or 9 percent, then they would have been excluded. We took it down to five percent feeling that it was really not logical to take it any lower than five percent. I admit it's arbitrary in that sense. One could always argue why isn't it set at four percent or three, but there does come a point where it is a bit silly I suggest to argue that it is a meaningful political force, a party in the fullest sense of the word if in the previous election it garnered only five percent of the vote.

My honourable friend is aware I'm sure, that in other countries in the western world they do have this five percent figure in terms of right to representation in parliament or their equivalent of parliament. I know of no other province or country that has a level of less than five percent of the popular vote giving rights of representation in parliament or on the ballot.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you. This poses another question though. In reality the reason then is not so much for the ballot itself because Section (e) of 62(6) covers that anyway. It's more for the organization of the party headquarter structure, is it not, than for the balloting?

MR. SCHREYER: The member is quite right because even with the provision of the section now before us, there is no exclusion of a candidate having the name of his political affiliation on the ballot even if his political affiliation got less than five percent of the vote at the last election because the provisions of sub-clause (e) of Clause 62(6) provides, this is at the very bottom of Page 2, that even where a political group has received less than five percent, the candidate of that group may have the name of his party opposite his name on the ballot. I suppose that being so Mr. Chairman, I must say to my honourable friend that the provision of (n.2) which is presently before us is really not all that crucial, not really that important.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, getting the answers to those two questions this then poses

MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . . quite a serious problem, in my estimation anyway, in that any political party which has not been recognized can then go out and spend any amount of money in the organization of their party structure within the province - and I'm thinking in terms of maybe say the Communist Party or the Social Credit Party if they got less than five percent, and I'm not too sure and I hope the member forgives me for using that name - but they can spend any amount of money and they do not have to record how much they have spent, they are not responsible in any way in that manner as far as reporting to the Chief Electoral Officer the amount that they have spent in an election. I think that this could in fact set quite a dangerous precedence where the recognized political parties are curtailed in their expenditures and any party that is not recognized can spend any amount of money that they want. I think that there's quite a danger here and I would suggest that this matter be considered very carefully.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I get the point that the honourable member is making. I can assure him that's not the intention that we had in the drafting of this legislation. I'm not sure that his interpretation is correct; however just to make very sure of it I'd like to be able to consult with the Legislative Counsel on it. Perhaps we can hold this and go on to the next item, yes. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPIVAK: Correct. I would suggest that the Section 8 be examined because I think this is where it's relevant. I would point out to the First Minister that he may find a Social Democratic Party could spend one million dollars in an election without having to account to anyone.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, . . . . Oh!

MR. SCHREYER: In as much, Mr. Chairman, as it's two minutes to 12:30, perhaps we could just . . . .

MR. GREEN: I move that the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has considered Bill No. 134 . . . . .

#### IN SESSION

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister for Cultural Affairs that the House do now adjourn.

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