

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 50 pupils of Grade 6 standing from Butterworth School under the direction of Mr. Ericson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

We have 10 students from the Basic Education Course at Red River Commercial College under the direction of Mrs. Bruce. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

We have 23 students of Grade 6 standing from Central School under the direction of Miss Mitchell. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Transcona.

We have 4 students of Grade 9 standing from Immanuel Christian School under the direction of Mr. Hoogerdijk. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Transcona.

We have 45 students of Grade 1 to 12 from Grafton School under the direction of Mr. Penner. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, the Member for St. Johns requested that the government provide the tax comparison tables which had up to this date been an internal document prepared for the Finance Department. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, at this time, in reply to that request, table a copy of these tax comparisons which, Mr. Speaker, are very detailed and go into much more depth in terms of comparing provincial taxes for Manitoba with other provinces, other states and other jurisdictions, and a whole host of fees in addition to direct taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I have also made arrangements to provide copies for all members of the Legislature because I think this document will be of substantial value to those that may wish to do a little research into it.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, to the Acting First Minister or to the Minister reporting for EMO, with respect to Monday's tornado damage in southeastern Manitoba, can the honourable gentleman indicate approximately by when they hope to have a fairly definitive estimate or quantification of damage sustained?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister I expect will be here shortly and perhaps he can deal with the question when he arrives. The Minister in charge of EMO is the Attorney-General who is not here at the moment. I don't know whether he is expected later in the Question Period but at any rate I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. Yesterday I raised with the Minister the matter of the bulletining at the Children's Hospital of operating routine and schedule at Children's Hospital for the period June through to September which indicates that because of budget matters there will be a discontinuation of hot breakfasts and hot dinners. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether in that regard, and also with regard to the matter at the Misericordia Hospital where hospital linen is being changed once a week, for the most part once a week, whether the Minister will make a detailed investigation of both matters to ascertain whether such changes are indeed acceptable in terms of our traditional standards in health care institutions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I will assure my honourable friend that I will make such an investigation, particularly with respect to the latter part of his question having to do with linen changes at the Misericordia Hospital. I will undertake to initiate such an investigation.

With respect to his first question which relates to a question he asked me yesterday, that investigation is under way, Sir. Yesterday the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked me if I had received a letter from pediatric residents at the Children's Centre expressing some grievances they had with respect to the hours in which the Children's Centre cafeteria would be operated during the summer. I replied to him that I did not have such a letter at that point which was correct, but I now have the letter, Sir, and I want to confirm that to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I'm looking into the grievances that are stated therein.

I might just point out for the edification of the House that they do not relate to patient services, they relate to the operation of the public cafeteria in the Children's Centre as distinct from the services provided patients and as distinct from the cafeteria in the Health Sciences Centre generally. I will be reporting fully as soon as I've completed my investigation.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister reporting for the Civil Service Commission, would the Minister indicate in reply to my question of last week, whether the former full-time Commissioner of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Doug Duncan, is being notified of all meetings being held by the Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of one meeting that he was called to attend. He expressed his disinterest in it and said that any dialogue would have to be between the Civil Service and his lawyer, that he wasn't interested in speaking to the Civil Service Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to ask the Minister whether the regular kind of due notice of meetings of the Commission are being sent to all those who are members of the Commission, including all those whom the Honourable Minister has referred in this House as being still members of the Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: I will have to take that as notice, Mr. Speaker, to see if Mr. Duncan precisely was included in them. I know the others have been, but he did express his disinterest in it.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the Honourable Minister agree, if she has not already done so, to table letters pertaining to this matter, one letter of December last which was addressed to Mr. Duncan by the department, which included an attached cheque in lieu of notice, and also a letter of January or February of this year by Legislative Counsel to the Secretary of the Civil Service Superannuation Board?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, I was requested to do so in my Estimates and I said that I would.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I understand that letters have been tabled, but I have asked them specifically for a letter from Legislative Counsel to Mr. Worosz and a letter from the Department of Labour to Mr. Duncan, which letter indicates payment in lieu of notice. I believe that the two have been perhaps tabled, but the other has not.

MRS. PRICE: I had a request come across my desk today with regard to the latter and it will be forthcoming.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could the Minister advise me whether or not he has any information indicating that Electro-Knit (Canada) Ltd., an employer of some 150 employees in the textile industry in Manitoba, is in the process of arranging for a transfer of the major portion of its operations to Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye): No, Mr. Speaker, but I will check with my staff; I'm sure they're involved in any negotiations and will report back to the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct a wrong statement that I made in the House the other day, for which I apologize to the House and in particular to the engineers concerned. I said, in asking a question of the First Minister, that flooding in Tyndall Park was due to negligence of the engineers in not providing a proper storm sewage system. I have been advised, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it to be correct, that that particular program was proceeded with against the specific and strong recommendations of the engineers, that they have not been in any way negligent. I apologize to the House and I particularly apologize to the engineers concerned since it is a matter of their professional capacity that was involved and I indicate, Mr. Speaker, that any negligence that took place, and it appears that there was, is entirely attributable to the members of the City Council who proceeded in direct contravention of the specific instructions of their engineers. I ask, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister whether, in view of the fact that a group of citizens were encouraged by a political body to proceed to a development when that political body knew, on the advice of their engineers, that the project should not have been proceeded with, which is the advice that I now have, whether there can be any difference with regard to provincial assistance and compensation with regard to these people as against people who have, and probably will in the future, suffer from basement flooding by virtue of heavy rainfall.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in response to my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster, he may recall that, as I remember it, the other day I was one of those who perhaps did not accept his allegation not knowing, not being seized of the facts myself, as he has now informed the House he has different information. But I really don't think that the additional information that he has provided would change the quality of the answer that I gave in response to his question the other day or indeed the letter that was sent by the Minister of Urban Affairs to the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster with a supplementary.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have another question, if I may, to a different Minister. Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Education. The Minister took as notice a question that I put to him as to whether or not the public of the Province of Manitoba are going to be asked to spend taxpayers' money to finance a separation of schools on an ethnic basis or on the basis of teaching particular ideologies. The Minister took the question as notice. May I ask the Minister, has he found out from those who he took as notice to find out the answer to this question, whether his department and he, as Minister, is going to do what I have just said?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would hope that very soon I would be able to answer the honourable member's question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In the aftermath

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

of the tornado in southeastern Manitoba, reports have come which throw some questionable light on the ability of the provincial organizations to respond to disasters like this. I'm wondering if he has received reports or had undertaken any investigations of the allegations that the Emergency Measures Organization could not be contacted after 5 o'clock on the day on which the disaster happened, there was no one to answer the phone and that the provincial telephone operators, when they were contacted by residents of that area, were unable to locate or contact anyone involved with the Emergency Measures Organization.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in response to my friend, the Member for Fort Rouge, I have not heard directly or indirectly the allegations which he repeats in the House but I will be quite happy, of course, to look into these allegations to see whether in fact calls were placed which could not be answered because it is my understanding that the Emergency Measures Organization or staff of that organization are on call and are available for such calls on a 24-hour basis but I will certainly inquire.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, as a supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the First Minister that in those inquiries he also examine exactly what the time period was between the request for assistance from the Emergency Measures Organization were received and the time that they actually responded. Again, reports coming from the area indicate, particularly from those involved with the Mennonite Disaster Service, that it was 16 to 20 hours after they first contacted EMO for some form of help or co-ordination before any kind of activity or action or even any appearance of officials in that area was first heard from. It would seem to me that that is a serious time-lag under the circumstances.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in further response to the Member for Fort Rouge, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Member for Emerson and myself were present yesterday morning in Aubigny with the Director of the Mennonite Disaster Service, who were doing, as I related to the House yesterday, an outstandingly good job, and none of that information was conveyed to us at that time.

Now that does not suggest for a moment that what my honourable friend has heard may not be accurate, but in the heat of the moment, when we were there, there was no such information conveyed to us, but I will be quite happy to look into it, remembering always, of course, that the principal obligation and responsibility of the Emergency Measures Organization is to co-ordinate and act as an overall co-ordinator for government services.

The information we did receive on the ground in the areas where we travelled yesterday was to the effect that Manitoba Hydro, Manitoba Telephone System and the RCMP were Johnny-on-the-spot immediately after the tornado had hit and did, like the Mennonite Disaster Group, did an exceptionally fine job. So those three provincial agencies certainly were involved, and not only were they involved, words of commendation to them were passed — I know certainly to me and I am sure to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Member for Emerson, as well, because of the involvement that these arms of the provincial government, Crown corporations and so on, had contributed.

But I will be quite happy to look into the further allegations that he makes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would share in the appraisal of the work of those three agencies, but my questions are directed toward the operation of the EMO as being the primary agency to respond to these disaster problems in the province. I would ask one further matter to be examined, which perhaps is not anyone's fault, but perhaps more of simply not being prepared for the frequency of these disasters' and that is that when weather warnings are given or when there is actual announcement made that serious tornadoes are about to appear in a district, there seems to be no information provided through the media or by any other organization to residents as to what to do in the circumstances. Therefore people don't know exactly what steps to take under those kinds of conditions.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the First Minister if they could not arrange perhaps through the EMO or other organizations to meet with media and others who are involved in communication so that when weather warnings that predict or carry with them severe storm warnings or tornado warnings, that there would be a very clear enunciation of what people should do under those circumstances, that they should be announced and not just simply — I believe that the extent of the announcement was some, on television, transmittal of certain printed words, but

there was no information given as to what to do or how to conduct oneself under these circumstances. While we escaped a lot of damage there seems to be fair warning that better preparation is required in the future.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend points up a situation, I think, which would concern every member of the House and indeed every citizen of the province faced with the kind of catastrophic act of God that the citizens of southeast Manitoba were faced with the other night. I suppose it is easy for any of us, myself included, in an armchair capacity after the fact, to sit back and say, "Well, now wouldn't it have been better if this had been done or that had been done?" and to enumerate a number of things.

As I attempted to indicate to the House yesterday, without knowing in detail the kind of advice or information which is given by the Emergency Measures Organization — I will take notice of that question on behalf of the Minister who is not here today — but without knowing in detail what kind of preliminary advice they have given out, I do know personally, as a fact, the following:

(1) That on the day of the storm in question, I personally heard on the radio on my way home from this building, the warning of the weather watch or the delineated area in Manitoba which information I think has been given for approximately the last year, roughly, which I think is excellent information for all citizens of Manitoba to have. So I don't think that they can be faulted on that count. As a result of that information, I'm sure that if my honourable friend or others were to inquire, they would find that citizens of the communities who were ultimately affected did take protective action, parents went for children and so on, as one would normally expect in such circumstances.

(2) Speaking in a more general or hypothetical sense, can anyone, or can any provincial or federal or local government agency at any time, with that degree of certainty that one would wish to have in printed publications or in announcements that are given over the air, say that in every circumstance one should, in a house with a basement, go to the basement. Now normally, that's what I would think as a citizen faced with a wind storm should do. The only problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is that yesterday when I was in Aubigny, I happened to see a home — and I think I mentioned it to the honourable members yesterday — where, if the members of the family in that home had gone to the basement, they would have faced serious danger of injury or death because of the fact that the house was moved off the foundation and indeed objects came into the basement from across the road which could have caused damage to anyone in the basement.

As a contra to that, let me indicate that I was in the home of another family, where they took precisely the action of going into the basement which, in their case, unquestionably, in the words of the heads of the family, the mother and the father, saved the lives of their children and of themselves. So you're into the kind of situation where it is, on the basis of just what I saw yesterday, extremely difficult to give information that is going to be 100 percent accurate in all circumstances. I suppose one could liken it sometimes to the arguments that one hears about seat belts where probably 90 times out of 100, it's better to have a seat belt on but you'll always find the person who said that if I had one on, I wouldn't be alive today. So what the proportion is as between going to a basement or not going to a basement, I don't know. By and large, common sense would seem to indicate that that would be a good thing to do. But one must always remember that there is no universal rule that can be applied with complete certainty or with complete guarantee that the people who are observing it are going to be thereby saved from the catastrophe of an act of God of this nature.⁵

So I merely say to my honourable friend that, without being able to say to him what information is given by EMO, that you will find varying opinions. Indeed, if he watched television last night, Mr. Speaker, he would see that a speaker was on television talking about tornadoes — he was an expert in tornadoes, but he was unable to give categorical advice as to what action should be taken in all circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I should like to thank the Honourable First Minister for a very lengthy answer to a question. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my question is somewhat related but I believe that the First Minister will be able to give a somewhat shorter reply, not suggesting that a lengthy reply was not called for in the light of allegations about the disfunctioning of EMO or the alleged disfunctioning.

My question to the First Minister is to ask whether he has received advice as yet as to the time or date by which it is likely that we will have a definitive quantification of tornado damage sustained. Also, as part of a related question, to ask the First Minister if he will cause a review to be made in retrospect to see if what, if anything, can be changed with respect to EMO procedures to ensure that complaints with respect to their effectiveness need not arise again.

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is no. The answer to the second question would be, one has to be satisfied as to the validity of the complaints before one could answer.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the First Minister if he can confirm, as I believe was implicit in his answer, but I would like him to confirm if he can, whether with respect to telephone service, hydro service and the making of arrangements for alternative habitation by the Mennonite Central Committee, whether in these three respects most, or all, of the work has been done, the restoration of phone and hydro service, etc.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in response to the Leader of the Opposition, I am going only on the basis of hearsay and that not too recent. The reports of a general nature which I had this morning were that that work was proceeding extremely well and that the hookups on hydro and on telephones were well under way and were near accomplishment.

As to the question of habitation and whether people are back in their own or in other homes, I could perhaps refer to my colleague, the House Leader, who was in the district last night and in his own constituency. He may have more up-to-date information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, as near as I could get, all those people who were displaced as a result of the tornado had found accommodation, or accommodation had been found for them. As a matter of fact, Mr. Reimer who is the co-ordinator for the Disaster Committee in this area, said that they were not leaving until they were sure that everybody had been taken care of.

With respect to the return of services, as I drove through the area last night, the hydro and telephone crews were still working, but it would appear to me that their work had almost been completed because it looked as though all the lines that had been torn down had been replaced; what they were doing at the moment that I drove by, they were just simply connecting to the insulators on the poles.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wm Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that the Winnipeg School Division's costs have risen 132 percent over the past six years, has the Minister been approached by the Winnipeg School Board to provide additional assistance for the special programs that it provides?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Member for Elmwood, I have had representation from the Winnipeg School Division in regard to different programs that they offer.

MR. DOERN: Well, could the Minister indicate the nature of his answer to the Winnipeg School Division?

MR. COSENS: The answer in most cases, Mr. Speaker, of course is that we are studying that particular program as to funding and will report back when that study is completed.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to a number of programs that are in place in the Winnipeg School Division and would ask the Minister that if he is persuaded of the need for special inner-city programs in this fiscal year, 1978 to 1979, would he be prepared to obtain the funds necessary to underwrite or cost-share those costs?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the honourable member is aware, or I would hope that he is aware, that Winnipeg School Division No. 1 receives \$1 million as a special grant towards particular programs that are unique to that division.

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

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to you, Sir. On June 6th you took under advisement a matter of privilege of the House that I rose in regard to an undertaking by the Minister of Agriculture to table letters that he used in his debate, introduction

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

of Bill 25 on May 12th. He read excerpts of this letter and you took under advisement to advise the House what your decision would be. I wonder when we could expect that decision?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that it's highly improper for a member to direct a direct question to the Speaker.

The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was asked by the Member for Brandon East whether there was ever any funding involved with regard to the Tan Jay plant, and I am informed by department officials that there have been no funds advanced during the past 12 months. I am also advised, though, that some staff people have been speaking with that particular company trying to get them established in their new premises and will be providing assistance along that line.

Also, Monday I was asked a question with regard to lifeguards from the Member for Rupertsland, and I would like to inform the member today that Birds Hill Park on June 17th had 10 lifeguards on, on the 24th now we'll have seven; St. Malo had five on duty on the 17th and will have an additional one on the 24th; Grand Beach had six on the 17th of June and will have an additional three; Winnipeg Beach did not have any lifeguards on duty and will have six on duty on the 24th; Hecla Island will have three on duty on the 24th; West Hawk will have three on duty on the 24th; Falcon Lake will have three on duty on the 24th and an additional two on the 29th, bringing the total up to five for the summer months. Spruce Woods had two on duty on the 17th and will have another one added on the 29th of June; Asessippi will have three lifeguards starting now on the 29th of June; Adam Lake had two lifeguards on the 17th and will have another one on the 29th; Norquay will have three on this coming weekend on the 24th; Stephenfield will have three on duty on the 24th, and both Clearwater and Paint Lake, which have not to date had lifeguards but will have lifeguards on duty on the 29th of June, bringing a total, Mr. Speaker, of 71 lifeguards and one co-ordinator, and I understand there are an additional, about eight lifeguards which are on duty in case there is heavy usage experienced at any particular site, there are another eight that we can draw on from the Red Cross.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, rising on a point of order, Sir, bearing in mind your admonition that it is not proper to direct questions to you Sir, but then again, on a question of order and procedure it is difficult to avoid, so I should like to ask whether, with respect to the matter which was taken under advisement for a later indication of intent or ruling, if that cannot be indicated by you, Sir, then to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the letters which were asked for back in May and which I believe the Minister indicated he would table, whether those can be expected soon before resuming debate on Bill 25?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES . DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in regard to the letters that the Member for Ste. Rose is referring to, I believe it was, if my understanding is correct of the question, that it was letters referred to by certain organizations, if those are the letters, I will further review the situation in that regard and will check with the individuals and will further indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, my purpose, whether I will proceed to table them or not.

However, I will answer, when I'm on my feet, a question on Friday, June 9th, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked. He enquired about what is being done about the problem facing the Manitoba farmers in regard to grain handling and transportation, with the problem of congested elevators and the problems with the terminals being empty. In reply, I stated that representation had been made to the Federal Government in regard to this problem and that I was considering a further look into the problem by my department. However, I have further stated that the Federal Government had announced that they were going to carry out an investigation into the transportation system. Last Friday, June 16th, the three provincial Agriculture Ministers met with the Honourable Mr. Lang and the federal staff and the Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board and some of the senior officials. Several aspects of the grain marketing were discussed including the future and present prospects. Repeated concern was expressed by myself and the other provincial Ministers in regard to the transportation situation resulting in the slow movement of grain and leaving the elevators congested and large stocks on farms.

I further pointed out the problem that it was causing the farmers in regard to cash flows required for their present operations as well as cash flows that were required for harvesting this year's, which appears to be a good crop which is now on the fields. The Canadian Wheat Board representative stated that the major constraint in moving grain was due to the lack of available boxcars and the

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

Honourable Mr. Lang stated that the Federal Government would be carrying out a systems analysis . to evaluate the use being made of cars and the equipment at every stage. He further stated that if the turnaround time could be cut to fewer days and better use made of the hopper cars during the season by upgrading some of the West Coast port facilities, could help this problem. I urged him that there was an immediate need for some action and I was not assured that there would be, other than the emphasis put on the transportation system.

In other words, the Federal Government did not put forth any immediate solutions or proposal to solve the present problems of the transportation resulting in the congested elevators.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Speaker, respecting takeover of Versatile Industries by Cornat Industries of Vancouver which I now understand has been approved by the shareholders involved. I'd like to ask the Minister whether his Department of Industry and Commerce has been monitoring the situation and whether he can assure the House that normal levels of employment will be maintained at Versatile.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member that the staff has been monitoring that particular transaction. I understand from reports that have been made to me that it is intended to keep the staff level at the complement and it is hoped that by more aggressive marketing and finding dealers in the mid-western and eastern states that not only will the levels of employment remain at what they are now but that they will eventually increase.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister. I thank the Minister for his answer. Can he advise us whether there will be any loss of administrative or executive personnel from Versatile in Winnipeg to a Vancouver location?

MR. BANMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I can neither confirm nor deny that. Since Versatile is a company which is involved in manufacturing exclusively farm equipment and the other company is in several other fields of endeavor I would imagine that the majority of office work and that dealing with particularly Versatile's responsibilities would remain in Winnipeg.

MR. EVANS: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. With regard to another farm equipment manufacturer, namely, CCIL, which the government is supporting through some financial guarantees, can the Minister advise whether his department is also monitoring this particular industry and whether normal employment levels are being obtained by CCIL at this time?

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the department is also watching that and has been in contact with representatives from CCIL. I understand, and I haven't got the latest report on that, but I understand that right now they are trying to reduce their stock levels of certain machinery products and are anticipating in gearing up. To date, as far as I'm aware, they have not started rehiring people but that is of course the intent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, last week the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge asked a question concerning the use of a chemical known as Fenetrothion in Manitoba's Provincial Parks, that chemical having an alleged connection with the disease, Reye's syndrome. I'm advised that that particular chemical has not been used by any department of government and that there is no intention to use it, Mr. Speaker.

I also took notice last week a question from the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet concerning whether or not we had laboratory facilities that were capable of distinguishing between bacteria originating from humans and those from cattle or horses. The information that I have, Mr. Speaker, is that the McAdam Laboratory has tests that are able to identify certain bacteria that come from horses and from cattle and that tests were made in 1978 of both surface drainage and contaminated wells in the area of East Selkirk and that those particular organisms were not identified in those samples.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for questioning having expired, the Honourable Member for Kildonan with a change in membership.

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

MR. PETER FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. On Municipal Affairs we have the change from the Member for Selkirk to the Member for Ste. Rose. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been proposed by the Honourable Member for Kildonan of changes in the Municipal Committee. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would call Bill No. 39, followed by Bill No. 38 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

GOVERNMENT BILLS — ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 39 — THE FAMILY MAINTENANCE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) Sherman (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I must say I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate on this legislation and feel rather that I've come full circle in my addressing of myself to the particular legislation before us and the principles embodied in it having had the privilege of serving on the House Committee in 1976 and 1977 which led to the initial legislation in this field, which was passed through the Legislature in 1977 under the guidance of the previous administration.

I want to speak in particular on this piece of legislation because this was the bill of the two dealt with in 1977 that I voted against and I've been very vividly reminded of that fact by the Honourable Member for Selkirk who, as Attorney-General in the previous administration, was of course the pilot of the Family Maintenance Legislation and the Marital Property Act. The debates at that time as all members who were then in the House will recall culminated in a vote on the Marital Property Act which found some members of the then opposition, now the government, voting in support of that legislation along with the government of the day, but the then opposition, now the government, united in its opposition to what was then Bill 60, The Family Maintenance Act, in standing against that legislation. I was one of those who voted in favour of The Marital Property Act, Bill 61 of that Session, and against The Family Maintenance Act, Bill 60 of that day. As I say, in his remarks on the legislation now before us, a few days ago in this Chamber the Honourable Member for Selkirk pointed out that I had raised a particularly strong objection to Bill 60 at that time and had placed myself firmly on the record as being unhappy with that legislation for a number of reasons, one of which, I highlighted in particular in the last and waning hours of the 1977 Legislative Session.

One of my main objections to Bill 60 last year, and the one that I focused on on the evening of debate in question, and certainly the primary weakness that I spoke to, on that occasion, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that that particular legislation, The Family Maintenance Act, Bill 60, of the 1977 session, lacked any provisions for the strengthening of the machinery to enforce maintenance orders, to ensure that maintenance is paid when ordered, and that it gets into the hands of the wives and children needing it.

I made those remarks on Friday evening, June 17, 1977, Page 3931 of Hansard.

Mr. Speaker, I don't back away from that position, that is a serious weakness in our whole system of maintenance. My posture on that point remains the same. I remain committed to the conviction that we have a recognizable and an unarguable need for proper machinery to enforce maintenance orders, to ensure that maintenance is collected. And I have not changed in that view.

To be sure, the legislation that's being proposed by our government, Bill 39, The Family Maintenance Act, falls similarly short of providing the answer to this difficult challenge of enforcement and collection of maintenance.

When speaking in the debate a few days ago, the Honourable Member for Selkirk took me to task with, I would say with some justification, Mr. Speaker, certainly I can't object to it, for having taken the position that I took last year and voted against the legislation and then indicating — and I want to assure him of my intention — that, of course, as a member of the day this year, I will be supporting the legislation currently in front of the House. But the Honourable Member for Selkirk, when he was speaking on the subject, Mr. Speaker, rested his entire case against me on what he perceived as that major inconsistency in my position. I opposed the legislation last year, I'm supporting it this year, while the precise weakness that I identified last year remains. I don't deny a seeming inconsistency on that level, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Selkirk described it, I

believe, as a flip-flop, but I think that the honourable member takes a particularly narrow tack, and I think he takes a very incomplete one — so incomplete as to be insupportable — when he suggests that that was the whole burden of my argument and my concern about Bill 60 last year, when he suggests that the only thing that ever bothered me about it was the fact that it failed to strengthen our existing enforcement machinery in the maintenance order field. That was the point that I zeroed in on during the particular evening of debate, Mr. Speaker, but I had, and I had expressed much concern about both previous pieces of Family Law legislation, through some eight months of study, in late 1976 and the first half of 1977, as a member of the committee in the Legislature dealing with the formulation of those two pieces of legislation.

That particular speech to which the Honourable Member for Selkirk refers was, in fact, only five minutes in duration — it was probably the shortest speech I have ever made since I was elected to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that members opposite were relieved at the brevity of it, on that occasion . . . —(Interjection)— Not to mention my own colleagues. My colleague, the Government House Leader, asks me for that particular page in Hansard, I'm sure he wants to enshrine it in his records as a five minute speech by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, who usually finds it difficult to get through anything more than his preamble in five minutes.

Anyway, that's what is was, Mr. Speaker, it was five minutes, and I had been dealing with that particular legislation in concert with the Honourable Member for Selkirk under the distinguished leadership of the chairman of the committee, the Honourable Member for St. Vital, for some eight months, and I had certainly said a great deal more about the legislation, and at much greater verbosity than I said in those five minutes that evening.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I think we should examine precisely what I did say that evening, and I submit for the Honourable Member for Selkirk to suggest that that constituted the whole burden of my opposition to Bill 60, was incomplete, to say the least. I said at that time, Sir, and I'm quoting from Page 393I of Hansard: "I believe Bill 60 can be made to work. I believe that it can be made to work with some more intensive work on it over the next few months, and with the creation and establishment of the type of enforcement machinery that has been referred to by previous speakers, it would guarantee payment of maintenance orders. Because it lacks that at the present time, I believe, Sir, that it is essentially meaningless legislation. What matters in maintenance is that the maintenance cheque gets into the hands of the person, the spouse — it's usually the wife — who is supposed to be receiving that money. If you can't put that money into her hands, then all the fine, high-blown, high-sounding phraseology that we develop and enshrine in statute in this House is nothing, it means nothing and is totally meaningless."

Those are my words, I have to live with them, I do live with them, I do live with them, and I have no hesitation in repeating them, reiterating them, placing them back on the records, circa 1978, along side what I said and what I have just quoted circa 1977. That position remains in my view unarguable, Mr. Speaker. That doesn't say that there cannot be some improvements in imperfect legislation.

Let me add what I also said on that occasion, in that historic five minute speech — and I use the term "historic" not in the terms of self-compliment, Mr. Speaker, but for the reasons I have already expressed, because of its unusual brevity. I said this, Mr. Speaker, and again I quote:

"I suggest, Sir, that until we are able to improve the system, the bill counts for nought. Now it's not easy to improve the system, but that is the challenge that this legislature, that government and the opposition should be working on, and that is the challenge, a target that was entirely missed by the bill in front of us. I'm not laying that at anyone's doorstep as blame, I simply suggest that

that is what happened. We got off track on family maintenance, and started pursuing objectives that are far, far down the list of priorities to the top priority essential job that has to be done."

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is we did get off track on family maintenance, at that particular time, and having got off track, we could not, assuming government, just leave things as they were.

There were a number of things I had to say about The Family Maintenance Act during the committee deliberations. Let's look at all of the reservations I had, not simply the fact that it didn't include provision to enforce machinery to ensure that maintenance orders would be followed and the maintenance would be collected. There was the so-called concept of no-fault maintenance that was built in more than simply suggested terms to the legislation, and the reservations that my colleagues on the Committee and in the House expressed at that time with that concept. There was the repeated call that I made for more time to study both pieces of legislation further, to seek out feedback and input, from the community on those pieces of proposed legislation, to permit proper absorption on the parts of those members on the Committee and all members of the House, of the ramifications of the legislation and proper public absorption and understanding of the issues contained. I asked again and again, and I know that my honourable friend from Selkirk would not dispute the fact, both officially and unofficially, through conversations and interviews with the media, for more time in deliberation on both pieces of legislation. I proposed an intercessional committee to continue examining and sifting out, and reading and assessing the ramifications and the implications for society in those two pieces of legislation, so that we could come in the end to the House, either in government or opposition, either one of us on either side, with good workable, responsible, acceptable, realistic legislation.

I said, and my catch phrase at the time was, let us not rush to imperfect legislation, let us not replace poor legislation with legislation that is similarly poor, only poor in different ways, but equally imperfect. Let us take the time to perfect legislation and ensure that we are bringing in some advances and some progress, that not only eliminates the anomalies and the difficulties and the unfairness of the past, but that is viable, and that is realistic, and that can be implemented and observed in contemporary days.

That was my basic objection, not only to Bill 60, but to Bill 61. I felt that we had made sufficient progress in terms of elimination of some of the more glaring inconsistencies and anomalies and weaknesses of Bill 61 that I could live with and support the finished product. I use the term finished in quotation marks, "finished" as of that time, June, 1977. I did not ever reach that point on Bill 60, the Family Maintenance Bill. Actually, Sir, some gratifying strides are being made in the case of maintenance and the enforcement of maintenance orders and the collection of maintenance.

The Marriage Conciliation Branch, under the Ministry of Corrections and Rehabilitation, which as you know is part of the Department of Health and Social Development for which I am responsible, lends two staff man years on a full-time basis to this function, to the Attorney-General's department. It is of course that department that has the responsibility for enforcement and collection of maintenance, and the Marriage Conciliation Branch lends two staff man years, full time, to the AG's department to that function, and the results are very impressive and very gratifying to date. This practice was instituted under the stewardship of the former Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, who was Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services in the previous government, and now the effects of the introduction of that kind of program are making themselves visible, and it certainly recommends itself as a program and a practice that I can recommend to my colleagues in the new government as something we would like to extend and expand and build upon in the future, Mr. Speaker.

The Marriage Conciliation Service provides assistance to persons who seek professional counselling, who seek legal intervention to resolve family issues, and who need help in terms of follow through on maintenance orders. They operate under The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, they operate on behalf of applicants and dependent children residing in Manitoba, respondents residing in reciprocating jurisdictions, they act through the facilities of the Civil Litigation Branch of the Attorney-General's department as I have suggested, and they pursue the objective of enforcing existing orders from courts at all levels in Manitoba and reciprocating states. At present, maintenance pursued in 600 cases is being handled on an ongoing basis. It's estimated, Sir, and I mentioned this during consideration of my Estimates a few days ago in the House, that approximately \$150,000 was recovered last year through this service and turned over to the Provincial Treasury to offset costs for families in receipt of public assistance. In many other cases, it enabled families to remain financially independent, and it appears on the basis of present operation, that we can count on at least the recovery of an average of \$150,000 a year in this field through this service. And as we're able hopefully to beef up this service and expand the efforts, we should be able to secure and ensure collection of maintenance in larger amounts, in larger sums than that, on an annual basis, so that there is progress being made in the field of enforcement.

of maintenance orders, and that should be recognized and acknowledged for the record.

At the same time, I stand by my conviction that government and those who are part of it, have an ongoing obligation to continue to work in this field and in this area to perfect, on a reciprocal basis with other jurisdictions across the country and across North America, a system of machinery that really will have teeth and clout in it and that will work in 90 percent of the cases, not just in 20 or 25 percent.

So, Sir, that was my position on Family Maintenance. It's changed not the least today. I simply face a position today, address a position today, where legislation that was not perfect, that was in fact far from perfect, that had many flaws in it, has been replaced or is being hopefully replaced by legislation that is a little better, a little more perfect, a little less imperfect. As I said in those remarks last June in the Third Reading Debate on the Family Maintenance Bill, we got off track in our pursuit of concepts and objectives in the family maintenance field; there was so much emphasis on the no-fault concept, which was never enshrined in totality, but it was so much at the centre and the substance and the core of what we were talking about, that many of the more realistic and pragmatic objectives of good family maintenance legislation were subordinated, and unfortunately relegated to a lower priority. And having got off track, the new government, the government now in office, to which I have the privilege to belong, simply couldn't leave things the way they were.

In other words, Sir, we had imperfect legislation on the books, legislation that in our view was imperfect, and not imperfect simply because it failed to come to grips with the problem of enforcement of maintenance orders, but imperfect, Mr. Speaker, because it was enacted in what we felt and what I said was haste, that it didn't permit sufficient time for sober thought and study, and imperfect because although it did not in fact achieve enshrinement in an absolute sense of the concept of no-fault maintenance, it purported to promote that concept and it moved very substantially, very substantially, too far in our view in the direction of such enshrinement.

My colleagues and I find it unreasonable and unfair to support the no-fault maintenance concept, the no-fault maintenance principle. We find it unreasonable and unfair to suggest that it should be imposed on the men and women who live in this province.

Why then, the Honourable Member for Selkirk may well ask me, introduce our replacement bill, Bill No. 39? Why introduce it at all? Why not just repeal Bill No. 60 and leave things as they were in the past? Because the time has come, Sir, to move forward in concert with other Canadians in the field of Family Law and we recognize that, and I don't think I ever disputed that throughout our months of deliberation last year. Bill No. 39 represents a careful considered responsible step forward. The legislation is needed because it recognizes that financial need should be the primary basis for an award of maintenance and it makes that unarguably clear. That, Sir, is an important legislative step, not to say social step.

At the same time Bill No. 39 acknowledges the validity of conduct as one of the factors to be considered in determination of awards, and this government does not believe that conduct and the concept of conduct should be ignored in such deliberations.

I refer to the comments and the creative approach already put on the record in support of this legislation by the pilot of the legislation, my colleague the Honourable Attorney-General, and remind honourable members that the inclusion of conduct in a determination of quantum award, and here I am quoting directly from my colleague, "follows recommendations by the Manitoba Law Reform Commission, the Ontario Law Reform Commission, and the Family Law Review Committee." All recommended that some concept of conduct ought to be retained in an award for maintenance.

My colleague also said that people will not accept the proposition that an individual should bear no responsibility whatsoever for his or her actions, no matter what those actions were or are. The government agrees with that. The Attorney-General agrees with it, his colleagues in the Executive Council, including myself and our colleagues throughout the government caucus agree with that, that it is not reasonable or fair to propose that persons should bear no individual responsibility in cases of this kind for their actions.

Conduct as it is contemplated in Subsection 2(2) of the Family Maintenance Act refers to extreme types of behaviour. It is important that members of the Legislature, that the people of Manitoba, recognize that that is what we are talking about, extreme types of behaviour. I suggest that it is unreasonable and illogical and again as I have said unfair to submit Manitobans to a system that does not admit of a wide spectrum of possibilities, a wide spectrum of types of behaviour and conduct, and to the ever present possibility of extreme types of behaviour that are inconsistent with the general values that, I think, society as a whole would recognize as being the accepted responsible norms of mutually respectful behaviour as between spouses, as within households and families.

So, Sir, we present, as the new government, a piece of legislation that I do not argue is perfect in terms of the challenges and the responsibilities still facing us in the family maintenance field,

but I suggest, Sir, that it is better than the legislation that is on the books at the present time, and it is better than the legislation that was enacted by my honourable friends opposite when they were government — legislation that I voted against. I can vote for this legislation for precisely that reason. I admit we still don't have the machinery, the provisions, that I would like to see for enforcement of maintenance orders and collection of maintenance. We are coming some steps in that direction. We are coming steps in that direction. The legislation itself does not make that possible, but we are coming some steps, as I have pointed out to the Honourable Member for Selkirk, through the machinery that is in place now between a branch of my department and the Attorney-General's Department. It was there and I gave the previous government credit for that. I said that results, the effects of it are now being felt, and I would hope that it will recommend itself so clearly, so demonstrably, that I will be able to expand and build upon it.

I recognize that it was put in place under the previous Minister of Corrections in the previous government, but it is having some results, so that I can take some consolation in the fact that some small steps of progress are being made in terms of collection of maintenance. I am still not satisfied. I think I have made that clear in my remarks. I still believe that we have an enormous challenge ahead of us in trying to produce the kind of machinery that I pleaded for last year, that I know the Honourable Member for Selkirk agrees with me, is necessary. It should be put in place as quickly as it is practical and possible, but that doesn't say that we shouldn't try to make some progress in the field of Family Law.

I think that the things, the steps, the initiatives, that were undertaken by the previous government in the field of Family Law last year represented progressive steps, represented steps along that path. I never disputed that. I did argue that because of the ramifications, the effects, the anomalies, the apparent inconsistencies, the difficulty of grasping all the technicalities of the two pieces of legislation, that we needed more time, not only for the public to absorb and assimilate and digest and react, but far more than that, Sir, for members of the Legislature, particularly including myself, who felt that they needed more education, more opportunity, more time to think about the legislation and to examine all the intricacies that came up day by day, week by week, as we went through those Committee hearings. That was my basic plea and my basic objection. Alongside that, as I have suggested, was the concern over the no-fault principle, which was watered down to a certain extent in the final form which the Statute took as Bill No. 60, but it was only watered down, Mr. Speaker, it was not modified in principle. It was not modified as a philosophy or as a concept or as a fundamental approach. We, in our Party, in Opposition, then and in government now cannot support that concept, the universal concept of no-fault maintenance.

So that with those weaknesses, those imperfections in mind, we found it impossible to swallow the legislation and to support it when it came time to vote. But I recognize, saying all that, notwithstanding all that, that progress in the marital property and family maintenance field, the Family Law field generally, is overdue. I would like to be part of it. I would like my government, our province, and our total Legislature to be part of it, and I felt, as a matter of fact, gratified last year and often expressed that gratification over having the opportunity to participate in the first tentative progressive steps along that path.

The fact that those steps were not perfect, were not totally acceptable, is no reflection on the previous administration, should not be construed by them as any attempt to denigrate what they did. They were unacceptable steps in final form, in many ways, they were not perfect but they were a beginning. I think that we have approached the subject with more caution, with more consideration for the kinds of lengthy deliberations which people normally like to bestow upon issues of this magnitude. I think that we've proceeded with the consideration of the social imperatives in mind while at the same time paying heed to the desirability of caution and care and moderation. That really is what the legislation in front of us represents, a careful, considered approach rather than a hasty approach that would have tossed up in its way and in our paths as many difficulties, as many inequities as existed under the old statutes, on the old books.

So that's my response to the Honourable Member for Selkirk and honourable members opposite when they ask me, as they have a right to do, where I stand on this legislation in the context of where I stood on similar legislation last year. I say similar, not the same, not precisely equal but similar legislation. I commend to them the comments already made in support of the legislation in introducing it by my colleague, the Honourable Attorney-General. I think that honourable members opposite can, will, certainly should, accept the proposals put forward in Bill 39 as reasonable and responsible steps toward long overdue family law reform that Manitobans will be able to live with rather than the kind of precipitous initiative that would have created more problems than existed before they made their proposed changes in the field last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry has made an interesting rationale for the

position that he is taking with respect to this bill. He quoted his words of last year and indicated — and I heard them quoted very clearly — that the first priority before he is going to vote for the kind of thing that was presented last year, was something to be done with regard to the enforcement of maintenance orders. Mr. Speaker, he can't escape from that. The first priority. And, therefore, because he voted against the measure last year, because the first priority was to do something with regard to the enforcement of maintenance orders, one would have expected the member to say that now that we have done something with regard to maintenance orders, I am prepared to consider further measures with regard to family maintenance law.

But, Mr. Speaker, there isn't anything in this bill with regard to maintenance orders and, Mr. Speaker, I think that the honourable member will have to agree that he has had to revise his priorities, that one of the priorities that he is suggesting is a priority, Mr. Speaker, which is merely presented to provide a complete, again, raising of aspirations which cannot be fulfilled. Because the people involved who have talked about the enforcement of maintenance orders and everything that the honourable member says is reasonable to do, at the present time is being done, but the priority that was being requested is that the state pay maintenance orders and that is what several groups of women have come to the Legislature and requested.

Mr. Speaker, my argument with some members of the Legislature is they lead people on to believe that this is possible, that a maintenance order — and I ask the honourable members to consider this — that one woman gets a maintenance order of \$1,000 a month, which is possible, and her husband leaves the country and he cannot be found, and another woman gets a maintenance order of \$200 a month. Is the honourable member going to lead people to believe by his suggestion that the priority is the enforcement of maintenance orders, that the state will pay one wife \$12,000 a year and another wife \$2,400 a year because they are unable to enforce judgments, because, Mr. Speaker, it is . not only women who cannot enforce judgments If the state is going to pay judgments, then I tell him that there are thousands of unsatisfied judgments and people who have suffered by them because they have not received the amounts from the judgment creditors who they are rightfully entitled to say that they should get their money from. To suggest to one group of creditors that the state should be enforcing maintenance orders, Mr. Speaker, is to suggest pie in the sky. So my honourable friend seems to have dropped that priority.

The other provision, Mr. Speaker — and he is ignoring what I consider to be the most important provision of this bill, and major reason why I am going to oppose it — this bill, Mr. Speaker, says, "The Family Maintenance Act being Chapter 47 of the Statute of Manitoba, 1977, is repealed." Mr. Speaker, the Minister is asking us to repeal a law and the law that he is asking us to repeal is better than the law that is before us at the present time. Why the Minister proceeded in this way, I will never know, Mr. Speaker, unless it is some type of real . . . There are two features, there are two possibilities: (1) The Conservative Party could not stand the fact that the New Democrats were the first in this province to introduce —(Interjection)— Well, I'll give you an alternative in a moment.

(1) They could not stand the fact that the former Attorney-General and the New Democratic Party made a forward advance in family law. If that legislation was there, it would be considered by them as giving the previous government too many marks for having made that progress. That's one alternative.

(2) The second alternative, Mr. Speaker, is that they thought something was wrong with the bill, they believed their own propaganda, they went then and looked at it, they had the experts look at it, found that nothing was really wrong and therefore made some changes merely for the sake of making changes — and I'm going to deal with that, Mr. Speaker — and brought the bill back and said, "Repeal the old Act."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is not merely improving the existing law, and it may be that this would be an improvement of the law as it existed before the New Democratic Party legislated, it may be, but what he is doing is repealing a better law. So this is not a progressive step, it is a retrogressive step, Mr. Speaker, and that's the reason, Mr. Speaker, and the major reason, that I will not vote for it, that I am in principle against it. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister had had the guts to not say that he was suspending the previous legislation but that he was repealing it so that it didn't exist at the present time and we were faced with the previous law or this law, I might, with some misgivings, but I've done it before so many times, say, "Well, it's not good enough but it's an achievement, it's progress and therefore I will vote for it." I voted for premium medicare. I didn't believe in it. I believed in medicare. I believed that premium medicare was better than no medicare. I wanted to get rid of the premium. But that's not what's happening here. In this bill, I am being asked, and this Legislature is being asked to repeal an existing law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some important differences in this law but not the ones that have been made, in my opinion, not the differences that have been indicated by the Member for Fort Garry. Mr. Speaker, the concept of no-fault maintenance, as he described it and as I have heard

it described by various people throughout the province, I never voted for. No such law was ever passed in this province. If anybody suggests that the New Democratic Party bill, the government bill, that was introduced and voted on in the Legislature last year, provided for no-fault maintenance as it is understood by apparently the Member for Fort Garry and many other people, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that that, in my view, is misleading the proponents of no-fault maintenance. Because, as I understand the proponents of no-fault maintenance, they say that regardless of the circumstances that existed when a marriage broke up and the economic union was such that one partner supported the other financially because he received the paycheque, whereas the other was a active participant in the marriage and was entitled to part of that cheque, that that would continue regardless of the circumstances and until the non-receiving spouse, that is the one that didn't receive a paycheque, was independently secure financially, that that is the concept of no-fault maintenance as it has been argued to me and as I have been led to believe.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for no such provision, and the bill that was passed had no such provision. The bill that was passed, Mr. Speaker, contained a provision that the judge was entitled to look at the circumstances and he was entitled to look at the circumstances under which the parties were living apart, separate and apart, including, and that was including in addition those circumstances which would, or would not, tend to make it possible for one of them to become independently self-supporting. Mr. Speaker, that's not no-fault maintenance.

I want to advise my honourable friend that if he is talking about no-fault maintenance — and I want the Conservatives to hear this and this will be another reason for voting against the bill — this bill is more no-fault than last year's bill was. I challenge the people who are saying, "No" with that statement because, Mr. Speaker, this bill says that fault will relate only to quantum, only to quantum, the amount of maintenance, it does not say that the spouse is not entitled to maintenance.

And then it takes the bigger savings clause which we had in last year's bill, which was much broader in terms of discretion, and eliminates it. The discretion clause which dealt with the circumstances under which the parties were living apart, which I believe was necessary and which the honourable member says was a modified no-fault, I don't think it was a modified no-fault at all. I think it permitted a judge to look at the circumstances under which the parties were living apart, to decide whether he was going to give any maintenance at all. Mr. Speaker, that's what I voted for. That is what I voted for and that is what I believed that law to say and until a judge said that it didn't say it, I still believe that law to say it.

Mr. Speaker, we were much more concerned — and different people will have varying degrees of how they deal with this — but I was much more concerned with what happened when the separation took place than how the separation came about. Because, Mr. Speaker, we still live in this peculiar society where a man who is earning a paycheque can go philandering from one city to the other, be away from home for a month, sleep with a different woman every day for the 30 days of that month, come home and find her husband (sic) perhaps in a compromising situation with the milkman and say, "You have caused the breakdown of the marriage, you get nothing."

Mr. Speaker, that's what our bill said we would not place emphasis on. We said that if there was —(Interjection)— Well, the honourable members, yes, Mr. Speaker. The honourable members of the Conservative Party really truly the best breeders and thinking in those terms, think that the situation that I described is perfectly right, that a husband can do whatever he wants, that if the wife is caught in an indiscretion, she is out on her ear, penniless. I believe that that's what they believe, Mr. Speaker, because I see the giggles from that side of the House and I know the attitude; I have been up against it in the courts, Mr. Speaker, for 15 years; I have seen it in the courts and I see it in the faces and the giggles and the smiles on the part of the Conservative Party opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOMINO: Point of privilege; I think we should point out to the Member for Inkster that our giggles were caused by something totally different. We were just amused at the fact that he was relating a story which concerned a husband who was having an affair with a milkman.

A MEMBER: That's what you said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has no point of privilege.
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable members for responding to my unintentional humour; the fact is that what I was referring to — and I still do not take back my remarks about the Conservative members because that is what their leader has demonstrated and that is what

they are demonstrating with this piece of legislation which they are now supporting — the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that if that's what they want, and if that's what they are looking at, and I will repeat that what we said was that it is very difficult for a couple to go into court and start determining who is responsible for marriage breakdown, that it should be enough that the people cannot live any longer together and that that should not upset the economic situation which has carried forward up until that time, that that should not upset it. And that what should upset it deals with the circumstances as to how they are living apart.\$

Now there was, I admit, some discretion in the previous legislation but I suggest that it was much less evident and probably would less be used, although I will admit, Mr. Speaker — and I say that for the record — that once a judge has a little bit of discretion it is impossible for any member of this House to say how he will use it. But at least it declared an intention, and what it said is that no wife would be required to support a husband who was living under circumstances which made it completely unjust that she should have to continue to do so if she happened to be the breadwinner, and no husband should have to support a wife if they were living under circumstances which would make it completely unjust for him to have to do so, and it ignored the way in which the marriage broke up. Because, Mr. Speaker, those are the most fruitless exercises, going into court and hearing what a wife said about her husband and what a husband said about his wife, and trying to get to the root of the breakdown. It's such an impossible task and such an unfair and unjust task, and one which a judge really is not competent to decide on the basis of a particular conduct one way or the other, that we felt that the parties should be able to go their own ways and the economic situation should continue except under certain circumstances.

Now, that's not no-fault maintenance, Mr. Speaker, and if my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, is voting against no-fault maintenance or a greater degree of no-fault maintenance, vote against his bill, because this bill, Mr. Speaker, says that a court may, in determining the amount of support — not in determining whether he will give support, but determining the amount of support — consider the conduct that it's so unconscionable. In other words, no matter what the conduct of the wife, or of the husband — depending on who is being supported — that one can imagine the most horrendous conduct —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, no, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that where you are talking about considering the amount — I ask my honourable friend, when he introduced a bill, could it be one dollar, and he said that he could not answer that question. The amount could certainly not be nothing because he is talking amount of support, and when we are talking about the amount of support I think we are talking about support. If you want to know how I think it will be interpreted — and nobody will be able to answer; you won't even be able to get an answer from the Attorney-General, all he can do is predict. I predict that it will mean that he cannot go below support, and support means the subsistence. And what the judge will try to figure out is what is the subsistence living condition and he will probably use as a guide, which they have used before, the amount which welfare pays, because that is considered the lowest level of support.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill is no-fault maintenance, at least to a subsistence, and Mr. Speaker, my observation on that subject is as good as anybody, as good as the Attorney-General, and I suggest that if the Act was intended to say that the support could be refused, then we would not be saying in determining the amount of support and maintenance, we would be determining whether he will have to support and maintain, and if so, how much.

So my honourable friend is voting for a greater degree of that concept, no-fault maintenance, than existed in the other legislation, because in the other legislation, Mr. Speaker, the judge had a discretion of not giving any support at all. The judge had a discretion of not giving any support at all, and the reason for non-support in this particular case is the amount of support.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when we're talking about the amount of support we have introduced a new concept. The discretion under Paragraph 5, determining whether to give an order, is much broader than the discretion contained in the suggestion that we're going to no-fault, because the paragraph that suggests that we're going to no-fault says that you will consider the amount of support. It's rather, Mr. Speaker, like the story about a person saying to a woman, or vice versa if you will have it, "Would you spend the night with me for a million dollars?" She said, "Yes, yes; a million dollars — that's a lot of money." "Would you spend the night with me for ten dollars?" She said, "What do you think I am?" And he says, "We've already decided what you are; we are now haggling about the price." Mr. Speaker, in this case what we are doing is haggling about the price, haggling about the amount, and it's right in the legislation and the Member for Fort Garry says this is a better bill on the basis of no-fault. It's neither a better bill on the basis of no-fault, nor is it a better bill on the basis of what my learned friend, what my honourable friend said, was the reason for his speaking on the bill, namely that there is a provision for greater enforcement. And Mr. Speaker, the one part of the legislation which I indicated that I did have a problem with, both last year and this year I said so in the House, is I did not really believe that it was wise that during a marriage that a third-party intervention does not help a marriage. And I believe that, and I would so say

at the Committee and even deal with the clause on that basis. It didn't cause me to vote against the bill last year because in principle I agreed with the bill, and I was satisfied that given some time there could be changes and that it would work its way out.

But Mr. Speaker, here we've had these genius lawyers and these committees, and they've looked at this bill, and there was a provision in the bill last year that said that during the marriage — and I won't go into the specific session — spouses had the mutual obligation to provide each other with information and statements, etc., and it specified "during the marriage." Do you know why it specified during the marriage? Because when they were no longer living together and were at odds with each other in court you could get that information. You could get that information on a suit for maintenance, or before a Family Court judge, but the Conservative geniuses, they decided that they don't want it to happen in that way, or at least it would appear that, but they have made a horrendous error. They took out the words "during the marriage," ostensibly so that it would not apply during the marriage. I don't know whether that's the reason, but it could be the only reason because they can get it outside when they're not married, if there is a claim for maintenance they can get it. I suggest that they took out the words "during the marriage" because they did not want it to apply during the marriage. But the way they've got it now, Mr. Speaker, all it means is that it applies during the marriage and after the marriage because it says that they have a mutual obligation to supply it at any time, and the words "during the marriage" being taken out does not mean that it no longer applies during the marriage, it just means that it no longer applies only during the marriage.

And that's what bill we have got under these great improvements, on unworkable laws, that were presented to the Legislature unresearched. Baloney, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Fort Garry knows that he sat for two years; it was not precipitous legislation. He sat for a year considering briefs; he sat for another year considering legislation —(Interjection)— eight months, Mr. Speaker. —(Interjection)— November till June? Wasn't it considered previously by the Law Reform Commission? —(Interjection)— All right, Mr. Speaker.

But let's talk about this precipitous action. It was referred to the Law —(Interjection)— I stand corrected, it wasn't two years. I stand corrected, it was one year before the Law Reform Commission, it was another year — if you will have it — during consideration, eight months before a Legislative Committee at which you had briefs and you had lawyers and counsel was made available to you. It then came to the Legislature and was considered in Committee, again with briefs and . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Included in that eight months. That's included in that eight months.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, all right. I am suggesting that there were two phases of the Committee; that the Committee sat outside the House and then it sat during the session. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's not precipitous; that's a pretty thorough legislative process. The member wants to say he disagrees with the Act —(Interjection)— I find it very difficult to understand, and I guess the Member for Fort Garry has a difficulty, because I believe, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry really wasn't that upset about the legislation last year; he is part of a government group that is bringing in a bill, that the bill, he is led to believe, does things which I as an individual MLA say do not do. I say that as far as the concept of no-fault as he is talking about it, not perhaps as it is understood by different people, is more present in this legislation than in the bill that is being repealed, because this legislation specifically says that he will consider those circumstances only in determining the amount of support. The other bill said all those circumstances can be looked at in determining maintenance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not trying to congratulate the Conservative Party as having made a move towards no-fault maintenance as those words are understood, and I have to say that because people will have different interpretations on them, because I never voted for any such legislation and, Mr. Speaker, said I wouldn't, and do not agree with those who talk about it in those terms and have said so.

And if I am opposed to that, and I am, Mr. Speaker. I say the words last year were better, not only for fulfilling my objectives but for fulfilling the Member for Fort Garry's objectives, than the words this year. Mr. Speaker, that happens to be my opinion on this legislation. I will vote against this bill because this bill repeals better legislation. I will vote against this bill, Mr. Speaker, because it is a horrendous insult to this House to pretend to be bringing in better legislation when the legislation being brought in is worse, and it is being done, Mr. Speaker, with a certain amount of sadism, a certain amount of cynicism. This could have been, without great difficulty at all, an amendment to the bill that is now on the Order Paper, and it should have been, Mr. Speaker, because then we would have seen the amendment that was being voted for, and we would have had no difficulty saying that the amendment that is being sought does not improve the Bill. It is being brought in with the supposed result of improving the present law, only because a better law was suspended.

It is being brought in with the repeal of a better law and, Mr. Speaker, if I have no intention of helping my honourable friend play these devious kind of games, I will vote against repealing the legislation. I say that the provisions for maintenance and the supposed improvements are not improvements at all. They take a backward step, first of all, in terms of what was a better maintenance law, though not a perfect one by any means, and, Mr. Speaker, if one wants to discuss no-fault, they are further along the line of no-fault legislation than was, in my opinion, brought in by the previous administration.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, since I have some disagreement of interpretation of the Honourable Member for Inkster, I feel it is well that I speak now at the same time so that we can clarify our differences at least.

I do want to say that I agree with him in describing the intent of this Bill, the scheme involved in not amending the Family Maintenance Act, which is on the Statute Books of the Province of Manitoba, and which was not repealed by the Conservative Government, and bringing in this other Bill. I agree with him wholeheartedly in his description of it and in his criticism of the manner in which it is being dealt with.

I must also say that I felt sorry for the Minister of Health watching him flounder around. Mr. Speaker, he thought he made a good speech. Let me tell him that the one he made that was given minutes long a year ago or so was a fairly good speech because it was rather clear and he knew what he was talking about. He was talking about imperfections relating to enforcement of maintenance orders. But now, Mr. Speaker, in much more than five minutes he floundered around trying to explain the fact that he made no contribution whatsoever in improving the imperfections which he spoke of in the aspect of enforcement of the order. I know he has been kind of busy lately, but the fact is he is supporting a Bill which is no better than the Bill that he attacked last year in the area in which he attacked it. Now he talked about no-fault and I don't believe that he was that harsh on the question of fault last year, otherwise he certainly would have spoken on it at some length. So he floundered around and I invite him, if he finds the time, to read the speech that he gave today and see how many times he repeated himself in trying to enforce the point, while he was wiggling around the fact that his conscience bothered him, because, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health does have a conscience and he does have belief, and he does have a certain ethical position in regard to family relationships, which was evidenced by the deep interest that he took throughout the discussions in previous years and in the participation he had in the development of the Act that is now on the Statute Books of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, will have an opportunity to speak further on this the next time it comes up, but I do want to say that the question of fault is one with which I have certain differences and I want to discuss the two bills and compare the two in relation to the discretion of the courts and what the courts should be involved in in relation to assessing whether or not they can order and the extent of an order.

Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the fact that there is greater no-fault in the present bill. I do believe that there is a direct invitation to the courts to get deeply involved into every little aspect of the family relationship between the couple throughout its existence up to the separation, that the courts are not only invited but are required to go into all of what we call the "washing of dirty linen," and I don't know to what avail, and I am going to come to that.

Mr. Speaker, the section which deals with conduct speaks about, "that the court in determining the amount of support should have regard to a course of conduct that is so unconscionable as to constitute an obvious and gross repudiation of the marriage relationship."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if the interpretation given to it by, I think, both the Attorney-General and certainly by the Member for Inkster, in other words, a person may be absolutely destitute, unable to support herself in any way except at the public charge or by her husband who may be well-off, the amount shall be determined by a course of conduct. And that is sheer and utter stupidity, Mr. Speaker. Either she should have support, she should have an Order of Separation, or she should not have an Order of Separation, but to assess the amount in such a way as to make her starve, to penalize her in that way, is sheer, as I say, stupidity.

On the other hand, to assume that because the husband may be at fault, that is the supporting spouse may be at fault, then the suggestion could well be that the husband has conducted himself in such an unconscionable manner that he should pay five times as much as is reasonable to take care of the needs of the dependent spouse. Because it says "the amount", "in determining the amount," which means either way. Either less than should be proper or more than should be proper, will be determined by a course of conduct. I say it is stupidity and I say that it is a sop to somebody's particular concern in the Conservative Party that they had to bring in the strong language that brings about an obvious and gross repudiation of the marriage relationship.

Mr. Speaker, I would think that in any separation that is in some way instigated by one or other of the parties there is already a repudiation of the marriage relationship. But to constitute an obvious engross because of an unconscionable course of conduct is playing around with words which is only there to result in an invitation to the Court to have to listen, whether it wishes or not, it will have to listen to all the complaints that the parties can extract about each other, can think up, can dream up, and drag this matter into Court at a great length of time, and to the disrespect and to disrepute of the marital relationship and what may have been a halfway good marriage until the time of separation took place, because there are many such that have breakdowns after a lengthy time of an understandable and good relationship.

Now we deal with the section dealing with factors and it starts out by saying, "in determining whether or not to make an order", whether to make an order. Which means, Mr. Speaker, the court may decide not to make an order, and the court then can decide not to make an order, not on the basis of unconscionable action or unconscionable conduct, the court may decide not to make an order, that means no money — that is maybe the matter that the Minister of Health was interested in — no money, no protection, no order involving a prohibition to visit the premises that are being occupied by one or other of the parties, and the court in making the order and what provisions it should contain shall consider all the circumstances of the spouses. Again the court will have to listen to every story, every horrendous or minor matter that took place between the marriage. —(Interjection)— Real or imaginary, because the court must listen and must decide how much real and how much imaginary.

And then having obligated the court to consider all the circumstances, then it says, "including the following." Mr. Speaker, "including the following" means not excluding anything else, of course, so including the following — and there they copy very much what is today on the Statute Books of the Province of Manitoba, very much except to the very last sub-clause. These are all reasonable matters. The important difference here is that in the present Statute which is on the Statute Books we say, "shall only consider these factors", and that prevents the court from having to listen to all the real and the imaginary dirty linen existing between the parties. And the court should be concerned, we said, with only those factors, and they are to my mind reasonable factors and they do leave out fault, pointing the finger at each other except in relationship to what exists after the separation, and I think that is very important.

The Member for Inkster did say that what took place before the separation is much less important than the fact that there is a separation, and that now it is a question of the dependant person being supported by the earning person in order to help that dependant one adjust to becoming financially independant of the other. That important difference is spelled out in all of these clauses that appear in both bills, except for the last one in the existing Statute. The financial needs of each spouse; the financial means, earnings and earning capacity of each spouse; the standard of living of the any obligation for the support and maintenance of a child or person other than the spouse; any contribution of a spouse within the meaning of Subsection 2, which I needn't deal with just now; the amount of any property settlement made between the spouses — now we are talking about their ability to support each other on property settlement — And it goes on including the length of time the marriage had subsisted, and that is important because the marriage that may have subsisted two months surely should take into account whether or not there is a dependency of such a nature that it came about because of the long-term relationship where one spouse was looking after the household and the other was earning a living. So the length of time is concerned.

Now the Attorney-General's bill says, "Well, no, that is not all the things. You have got to consider all the circumstances, everything that is going to be brought into Court and threshed out." Whereas what we talked about was after the separation, the circumstances under which the separated spouses are living and the likelihood that those circumstances can reasonably be expected to affect the financial status and make it possible for the dependant spouse to become financially independent.

The important thing there and probably the only difference I have with the Member for Inkster is that I believe that the court should take into account the circumstances of the way in which they are living as it relates to the opportunity to to become independent and that that is a major difference.

But, Mr. Speaker, I make it clear that in my opinion the present bill before us opens up the door completely to the court exercising its discretion in all aspects of fault from the day before the marriage took place right through until the day of the hearing itself. And to that extent it is an invitation to consider fault, to go back to a law which well could have continued to exist if the Conservatives had eliminated the law in the Statute Books passed last year by the NDP and just left the law as it was, because there is very little progress made. The Minister for Health, I'm glad he listened, I'm glad he stayed — he has other things to do — but Mr. Speaker, I have to tell him that he has not been able, I believe, to satisfy himself that this is a progressive step. A move forward, Mr. Speaker, it's laughable, because they are really introducing all the old hackneyed

concepts, rejected by most people in society, but obviously not by Conservatives. That is the problem that the Minister of Health has. He is a Conservative and he has to live with his caucus and I think that that is his problem at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member will have 28 minutes when next this item appears on the agenda.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 4 — MINIMUM WAGE FORMULA

MR. SPEAKER: We are now dealing with Private Members' Hour and the first item of business is the Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan. The last time this was on the Order Paper the former speaker had just finished speaking at the close of the day. It is now an open Resolution. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: The subject of the minimum wage or an increase in the minimum wage has taken up a great deal of the time of both the House and the Committee to examine the Labour Estimates in the past - few weeks and justifiably so. So what I have to say today will be brief and concise, I hope.

For a while we have stood in what I consider to be earnest debate, discussing the pros, discussing the cons, of increasing the minimum wage from the \$2.95 that it presently is at, and we have done so, Mr. Speaker, I might add, well fed, well clothed, and well paid for our efforts. The 57 of us have been locked in, or 56, philosophical debate, philosophical battle, and banishing statistics and dogmas and reasons, and sometimes even a bit of rationale and logic, throwing figures back and forth across these Chambers and in the Committees.

And while all that has been happening here, Mr. Speaker, and we feel very self-important for our efforts, some 30,000 to 40,000 Manitoba workers, who are indeed very important persons for their efforts, the producers of wealth of this province are making \$2.95 an hour; they are still making \$2.95 an hour for a 38-hour average work week, and that comes to roughly \$112 a week, Mr. Speaker, \$112 a week. Now that's a sum that is hard to imagine for persons in our position.

I went — if I can relate just a personal incident, Mrr. Sspeakr — I went into a grocery store last week, and while I'm not a fancy eater, I am a big eater, but I don't buy expensive food — I may buy a lot of food but not expensive food — and I bought groceries for two persons for one week. And I walked out of that store, Mr. Speaker, \$70 poorer, \$70 poorer, and like I said, there was nothing fancy about the food I was buying. It was hamburger, it was not T-bone, hamburger at \$1.39 a pound I think the latest figures from the list that was given to us by the Minister of Agriculture, and T-bone at \$3.69 a pound; I didn't even look at the T-bone section, it's the hamburger section for myself, and it's the stewing beef section for the people on minimum wage. But as I walked out of that store \$70 poorer. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I wonder if we could have a little more quiet in the Chamber while the honourable member is speaking. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And while I walked out of that store \$70 poorer, I thought about what I would say today in this debate on the need for increasing the minimum wage. And so I thought at that time, well I am not going to talk so much to the details of the resolution because I think the formula that has been presented by the Honourable Member for Logan is a workable formula. It is a straightforward formula and to me, to my way of thinking, it is sufficient in scope and language, although I could agree with the Member for Logan that the government may want to work up to the percentages included in that formula. I do think that working up towards that goal is an admirable goal indeed of the government if they would take it upon themselves.

So while I do not speak to the resolution, I do want to speak to the problem, and the problem is, how does a minimum wage earner, a minimum wage worker, stay alive, have a decent standard of living, if the minimum wage does not increase to the rapidly increasing cost of living? There are some 30,000 to 40,000, as I said previous, Mr. Speaker, some 30,000 to 40,000 Manitoba workers subsisting, not even existing, subsisting on \$112 a week in this province right now. Now that is a number that has been frequently belittled by both the Minister and the government backbenchers. 30,000 to 40,000 Manitobans and in many cases their families, their complete families, making \$70 trips to the grocery store, paying the price, indeed paying the price for their own efforts to remain productive, to remain in a work force, a work force that is not growing as rapidly as is numbers of workers entering it, trying to buy clothes for their families, paying rent for shelter which they need — these are essentials, these are not luxuries — and falling all the time farther and farther

behind in an increasingly expensive world. And to use the Minister's figures, almost 65 percent of the minimum wage earners have only that in common to support them, that is their sole form of income, 65 percent of them, making that \$112 a week, leading their lives or at least trying to lead their lives on that amount of money.

Mr. Speaker, if the minimum wage is a minimum wage, it is also a maximum wage. It is a wage that many industries put as a maximum to pay their least paid help, so while we discuss it as a minimum wage here, I would suggest to those people who are living on it, it is their maximum wage.

I would challenge the Minister, I would challenge any other person in these Chambers, or perhaps even the onlookers, to try to live, live out a year on less than \$6,000, because that is what that \$112 comes to. I think we all if we were put in that position would suddenly change our tune.

You know, the members opposite rise to their feet in this debate and rise to their feet in the committee and they talk about the negative impact of raising the minimum wage. They talk about the disadvantaged position that an increase in the minimum wage would put small business persons into, the disadvantaged position it would put the restaurant owners into — these are all their examples, Sir. The garment factory owners would then be in a disadvantaged position, the disadvantaged position of all the entrepreneurs, big and large, if their government was to increase the minimum wage.

And while they do that — I've listened very carefully — and very seldom, if at all, very seldom, if at all, do you hear them talk about the disadvantaged position of the minimum wage earner. They are blind to that. They are oblivious to the disadvantaged position that they're putting the least protected, the least able to defend themselves workers of this province into, as if those 30,000 or 40,000 minimum wage earners are insignificant. They don't consider their plight, as if their value to society is less than that of a restaurant owner or as if their value is less than that of a textile plant owner or an entrepreneur, or as if their value to society is any less than that of a member of the Legislative Assembly. And because these 30,000 to 40,000 minimum wage earners, because they only produce the wealth and because they don't produce profit for themselves, they are somewhat looked down upon as if they are somewhat entitled to a lesser life, they are not deserving of a better life.

That is the perception that I get, that is the opinion that I get from the members opposite from the Minister. I do not believe that I distort their feelings, for let's have a look, Mr. Speaker, at what they have had to say during the course of discussion during the Labour Estimates, during the debate in this House.

The Minister — and if I quote her correctly I hope I do — said she was speaking to one of the members of the committee and she wanted to remind the member that there's something under 10 percent of the population that actually receives the minimum wage. She went on to say, I believe I quote her correctly, "We are not talking about that many," 30,000 to 40,000, and "We are not talking about that many." Well, I would have to suggest to her, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what kind of voice she has, that when she says words like that she is not considering those 30,000 to 40,000 people, because to those 30,000 or 40,000 people, that are "not that very many" that she talks about, to them they are the most important people in the world. They have to live and they are entitled to a decent standard of living —(Interjection)— and their dependants also, the Member for St. Boniface mentions — the 65 percent of them who are the sole earners for their families.

The Member for Rock Lake when he spoke to the Minimum Wage, he called it, Mr. Speaker — I use his words — "a minute situation", a minute situation. You know such sympathy and understanding for the plight of those working poor — and they are working poor — such sympathy and understanding tempered with insight and sensitivity to their plight. I don't even think I will discuss those remarks any further because I don't think they're worthy of it, "a minute situation" he says.

And the Member for Gladstone hits the nail on the head as to the government's attitude about the minimum wage because they are uncomfortable with this debate, Mr. Speaker. He says, "As far as the minimum wage goes I think we are wasting a whole bunch of the committee's time, whether the minimum wage is \$2.90 or whether it is \$3.10, what difference does it make?" Well, if that member has trouble with his arithmetic, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that he go out and try to live a week out on \$2.90 for a 38-hour week, \$2.95, then try to live a week out on \$3.10 and he would see very quickly what difference it does make. As minimal as it is, when you are living on those sort of wages, Mr. Speaker, it is a magnificent difference.

Another classic from the Member for Gladstone: He was talking about people who are capable and in good health. He said if they aren't earning over the minimum wage very shortly there has got to be something wrong with their system. Well, I would go so far as to agree with the Member for Gladstone, that if they aren't earning the minimum wage very shortly, there is something wrong with "a" system, but it is not the minimum wage earner's system, it is the socioeconomic system

that allows not only for the minimum wage earners not to get an increase, but also allows for over a million productive workers to languish unemployed and unproductive because it can't find work for them, and a system that encourages — and that's what they're doing by not raising the minimum wage — a system that encourages businesses to pay less than a living wage to some 30,000, or to some 40,000 Manitoban workers.\$

But the classic quote, the most informative, the most enlightening quote, Mr. Speaker, comes from the Minister herself and I will repeat it now because of the encouragement, I am sure, it will give to the unemployed, to the low wage earners, to the working poor and those who, through no fault of their own, through the fault of the system's service, the socioeconomic system, no fault of their own personal systems, to those who are presently down and out that need this legislationhe says, "I think that anybody who is below the poverty level needs assistance of some sort and I'm not one that is going to stand by and see somebody starve to death." Well, Sir, the great humanitarian's words in capitalist's clothing. It's a comfort to all that the Minister of Labour who is responsible, responsible for increasing the minimum wage, is not going to stand by and see anyone starve to death.

Maybe they won't eat so well. Maybe they won't eat so well and maybe they can't afford the decent housing that they need, or maybe they can't afford the new clothes when they need them, but thanks to the Minister they won't starve to death — welfare instead of increasing the minimum wage.

While addressing myself to the Minister's previous statements I have to answer a statistical argument that she made in her contribution to this debate. I have to correct, or at least attempt to correct the impression that I feel she left behind. She was speaking of the percentage of the industrial composite average wage that the minimum wage was throughout the past number of years and she implied, if not stated directly, that the previous government had abandoned the minimum wage earner, that they had let that percentage fall, and that since the percentage is an integral part of this debate I feel that I should discuss it for a bit.

In speaking about the relationship of the minimum wage to the industrial composite average weekly wage, she used a set of figures that began in 1968 and ended in March, 1978, a 10-year period. She compared the minimum wage throughout that period to the industrial composite average weekly wage. And when the NDP assumed power in 1969, as a percentage of that industrial composite wage, the minimum wage was 50.9 percent. And over the years that the previous administration was responsible for the minimum wage, it increased steadily, it increased consistently with one exception, in 1972 it went down a few percentage points and then went back up again until it reached a high of 54.9 percent in September, 1976. Now that is not the 60 percent that we were talking about in the resolution. That may be true, but the fact is, that the increase in the percentage went up steadily and consistently with that one exception for the eight years that we were in power.

In September, 1976 when it was 54.9 percent, that was the last figure that she used in her statement that applied to the NDP administration. The next figure came under her own administration. It is her figure and it is her choice of timing, and what do we see? It shows that the minimum wage has toppled from 54.9 percent to 51.4 percent. Now part of that took place under our administration, to be perfectly honest, Mr. Speaker, part of that took place under our administration — (Interjection)— Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But also a vast majority of that decline took place under their administration.

The next figure, the last figure she used was also under her government's tenure and we see it dropping even further now — a period that's been completely within the tenure of the government that sits on that side of the House now — and we see it drop another 1.9 percent to 50.3 percent; less than it was as a percentage, less than it was when the NDP assumed power the eight or nine years previous.

Yet, she tries to use those figures to embarrass the previous administration, the New Democratic government administration, which has always pledged itself to bringing about greater equality or greater opportunity for equality. She tries to do that with those figures, Mr. Speaker, but I would suggest that all she succeeds in doing is condemning her own government. But we see the decrease day by day taking place under their administration.

I note that you have indicated I have a few minutes left, four minutes left. If time allowed, it would be easy to continue on but time is running short so, in closing, I'll be brief.

I ask the Minister of Labour to start acting like a Minister of Labour and to do something positive and something necessary for the working poor of Manitoba, for the minimum wage earner. Because that minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, while it is a minimum wage to those people, is a maximum wage and for tens of thousands of workers in this province, if as a minimum it is inadequate, then as a maximum, Sir, it is deplorable.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I had not originally intended to speak on this issue but after listening to the Member for Churchill's remarks, I feel that I should say something because I think that either intentionally or unintentionally, I'm not sure which, I think he's misunderstood the motives of those members across the floor on this side of the House, the members over here who at this time are resisting and at this time were not in favour of a raise in the minimum wage. I would hope it's unintentionally because he doesn't understand us and he hasn't been listening to what we've been saying. Because I think that we're discussing a resolution of this sort which, in effect, calls for a very large increase in the minimum wage. I think I at least, when speaking for myself, want to make it perfectly clear that if I thought that this resolution would actually help the working poor in my constituency, the working poor in Manitoba, there's no way on earth Sterling Lyon or Ed Schreyer or anyone else could stop me from voting for it. But I don't think this resolution will help anyone except that it might get the Member for Churchill some ink in the newspaper tomorrow, it might get the Member for Logan some ink. I'm not sure whether they're just being crass about this in a political sense or whether some members opposite really don't understand the economics of it.

Now if you take a first glance at raising the minimum wage, it appears that it's an easy solution to the problem of how do we help the working poor, and it's a problem, I admit. Nobody in this society should be asked to live on \$2.95 an hour times 40 a week. No one should be asked to live that way because no one can live in a decent manner in that sort of fashion. But raising the minimum wage, I suggest to you, won't help them; it hasn't helped people in that situation over the last ten years. There have been studies done in the British Isles and a recent study done by the Government of Canada which shows that the discrepancy between the rich and the poor hasn't gone down in our country, to be exact, the gap has increased. And if you count inflation, I think that the people at the bottom end are probably worse off now than they were five or six years ago, even though we've been increasing the minimum wage.

Now, as I say, I'd like to help the poor, and I think the purpose of the minimum wage when it was originally introduced was very worthy. The purpose is to protect the lowest paid part of the work force from exploitation. I endorse that objective, but as a means of redistribution of income, I don't endorse the minimum wage, because the minimum wage is not a good means of redistribution of income. If we're to raise the minimum wage too high, and I suggest the formula suggested by the Member for Logan is too high, what we end up doing is hurting the very people we want to help. And how does it hurt the people on low income? Well, I'll tell you how it hurts.

I want to quote from some economists who work for the Brookings Institute, and for my friends opposite who may be ignorant of economics, the Brookings Institute is not a right-wing institute at all. To be exact, it is considered a very liberal and progressive group of economists. Let me quote from a report that they brought out, 1977, I'm quoting now. It says, "that when minimum wage rates moved beyond its historic range of 40 to 50 percent of average wages, the chances of all minimum wage earners of obtaining jobs are reduced."

Let me go on and further quote. It says a little further in the same article, "Increases in the minimum wage hit young workers particularly hard, because employers tend to hire older workers for their jobs, or to replace the workers with capital investment."

So, I want to see these workers helped. I think what we have to look at is a government and a society with maybe something like a negative income tax. Maybe direct grants to these people, maybe direct subsidies, but let's not legislate the wages so high that we legislate them out of jobs.

When I was a young fellow growing up in Transcona, it seemed like all my friends, I personally worked from the time I was 13 in a local Winnipeg hotel as a bellhop, but most of my friends worked in gas stations, pumping gas, low-skilled job, they were paid the minimum wage at that time. As the minimum wage rose, gas stations phased out those gas jockeys. Now, the students, I was teaching at Gordon Bell, almost none of them work in gas stations, because it's not economically feasible to hire a student to work for \$2.95 an hour pumping gas.

Now, I'm not about to delve too deeply into the motives of the members opposite, although I note that it's a former union organizer who just spoke, who just chastised us, I note that it's most often the unions in this province, in this country, who urge, and were most vocal about an increase in the minimum wage. The same unions who won't spend a penny on organizing these people. The same unions who neglect them continually, and who don't want to service this sector, because it's too difficult. It's not skimming off the cream, not skimming off the \$12.00 an hour people, who can afford to pay the high union dues, the prestigious jobs.

The same unions always urge this, and I would suggest, that in many cases, and I've said this before and I'll say it again because I don't want to be misunderstood, I'm not a person who is opposed to the trade union movement. I believe it's a very essential part of our economic structure and it serves a useful purpose, and I fear, and I don't like politicians who pick out any sector, whether it's small businesses, big business or unions, and harangue against them, and try to single them

out for abuse. And I don't want to do that, but in this case, unions have been negligent, and I say, when they urge raising of the minimum wage they're most often not concerned, they're not concerned, Mr. Speaker, about those very people. They're concerned about their own membership who are most often better paid. And they're concerned about getting higher salaries the next time it comes to negotiating, because it's a well-known fact that the minimum wage and the low income earners set a base and the unions argue and they work for increases in their own standard of living, and their own increases in wage and salaries, they base it on that. —(Interjection)—

The Member for Selkirk says nothing's wrong with that, except it takes the motives of the unions when they come to asking for more wages for higher salaries for the low income people, for the minimum wagers. That's not because they're concerned about those people not being able to live, it's because they want a better base to argue and to fight for higher wages for themselves. And they should admit that.

Now let me say that I don't think that any rule or resolution should be discarded or considered morally wrong or right, because of the motives of those who support it. I think that resolutions and actions and laws have to be justified, not by the motives of the supporters, but by the effectiveness of the actual resolution or the action that you're asking us to undertake by the effectiveness of that action in doing what you want it to do. And I think on these grounds, this resolution is not effective at all, because it's not going to help the poor, it's going to hurt them, it's going to drive them out of jobs, it's going to encourage the Salisbury Houses in this city to do what they're already doing, but to do it faster.

We used to have on the block where I live, I live on Langside street, down by Sara, we used to have a little Salisbury House at the corner of our street, and it used to employ people, they used to work there and serve food. Now, we have a big Salisbury House at the corner of Broadway and Maryland, and it's a self-serve, and the place is twice as large and employees half as many people. It's like that quote that the Minister of Labour read to you a little while ago, that came from the former member Member for Crescentwood, Mr. Cy Gonick, who said at that time that big businesses don't worry about the former social democratic government in this province, but little businesses do, and it's because they continually gave into the temptation to do the politically attractive thing, to raise the minimum wage because everybody can understand that raising the minimum wage must be good. It takes a little more intelligence to see beneath, to see that raising the minimum wage is not always good, that raising the minimum wage hurts the small businesses. Small businesses are the number one employers of the people who are working on low income. If you work for Bristol Aerospace or CPR, you're not working for \$2.95 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like further to quote from a man called Dr. Grant Ruber, who is the Academic Vice-President of the University of Western Ontario, and also the Chairman of the Ontario Economic Council. They released a report on minimum wage, and the basic suggestions they made in that report were that governments should look seriously at subsidizing the incomes of low incomes earners, but government shouldn't touch the minimum wage, because the minimum wage was actually hurting the people who had to work for \$2.95 an hour.

And he says, quoting from this report, which was released March 20, 1978, "Governments have influenced high unemployment levels with politically popular minimum wages, but there is a direct correlation between so minimum e of the highest wages, are in effect, in provinces that have the highest levels of unemployment."

In a time, when the members opposite, and this government too, are very concerned about the high rate of youth unemployment, raising the minimum wage would hurt, would hurt the chances of young people to get jobs.

Just take a look. The province of Quebec has a minimum wage of \$3.27 an hour, it's the highest in North America. And that, by the way, only brings them to 50 percent of the average industrial wage in the province. But last year, in the province of Quebec, they were able to create 49,000 new jobs. That's a pretty poor state of affairs if you take a look at the whole economy, but they were yet able to produce 49,000 new jobs, but the number of jobs for people under the age of 24 actually went down by 22,000. The Ontario Economic Council suggests that that happened because of the high rate for the minimum wage. The employers shifted in either older workers, whom they considered more stable, so if they had to pay a higher wage, they thought, well, we'll try some older workers, we won't take a chance on young people. Or employers shifted to capital investment, like Salisbury House has been doing. They built a new Salisbury House, it was a takeout and a self-serve Salisbury House, phasing out the older, labour-intensive-type Salisbury Houses.

So, I'd ask the members opposite to consider everything when they vote on this resolution, and not to just satisfy themselves with throwing insults and slurs across here because our motives, and we're sincere in this, our motives are the same as yours. We want to build a better society, and we don't want to see people suffering in our society. We happen to believe that raising the minimum wage at this time is going to hurt people, and we honestly believe that. And if you can't accept it, at least accept that our motives are genuine, because they are.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Logan will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was very enlightening to hear the Honourable Member for St. Matthews put his thoughts on record with regard to the minimum wage. All I can say is that the honourable member speaks from a very comfortable pew. I understand that he is an employee of the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, a school teacher, and is one who is very well paid, and who sups quite well at the public trough, as we do as Members of this Legislative Assembly. For him to say that he feels this great compassion for those on the minimum wage, especially those, I understand' he must have a number in his constituency, because it's very close to mine. I have quite a number and for the honourable member, and this seems to be the tack of the government, the government members, when they're discussing the minimum wage, is to make some of the most virulent anti-union attacks that one can hear in this House. I have never heard them in the last eight years. They are now in their seats, and they know that they're safe for four years, —(Interjection)— Well, I'm saying that they may even go their five years, because they are the most arrogant bunch of people that I have ever had the opportunity to meet and to associate with, because the honourable members opposite . . . Mr. Speaker, if the honourable members over there had wished to take part in this debate, they had the opportunity to. I waited for them to make their remarks in the debate, but the Honourable Member for Pembina, and the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, and the Honourable Member for Emerson, seem to make their best speeches from the seats of their trousers, and that seems to be the only that they can make any speeches in this House that make any sense, because I think that's where they sit on their brains most of the time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take too long in this debate, because I think we have put on the record our views on this matter. I think the members of the government have put their views on the record, and it will be very interesting for members of the public to read exactly what the members on the government benches think of workers in general in Manitoba. They don't think very much of them.

And now we are hearing from "Foghorn-Leghorn" from Minnedosa, who makes his best speeches from the seat of his trousers. . . .

MR. BLAKE: Boy, you're sure funny today, Bill, aren't you?

MR. JENKINS: So this is the member, Mr. Speaker, when he was elected to this Chamber, and I'll deviate just a moment and come back to the point, but coming into this Chamber in a by-election, the Minnedosa by-election, who said, his main object was to improve the tenor of debate in this House, and he has been one of the worst offenders of the tenor of the debate in this House.

MR. BLAKE: Turned the socialist hordes aside. . . .

MR. JENKINS: But to get back to the motion that we have before us here, which is dealing with the minimum wage, and I think that my colleague, the Honourable Member for Churchill, when he pointed out the statistics that the Minister used in her argument and in her debate — and I must say that she reads speeches very well in this House. I don't know who's her speech writer, or who prepares them for her, but she reads them very very well.

MR. ORCHARD: Those who live in a glass house shall not throw stones, Bill. I see you're reading.

MR. JENKINS: I'm reading from Hansard.

MR. ORCHARD: Oh, does that make a difference?

MR. JENKINS: I'm going to quote from Hansard too, for my honourable friend's benefit. The Honourable Member for Pembina wanted to speak on this debate, in fact he approached me when I first introduced this resolution and subsequently withdrew it because of some of the answers that the Minister was giving us, but he wanted to make a speech on this and I was waiting with anticipation today to hear some gems of wisdom from this honourable member, but I guess he didn't have a speech written for him or something or other, so that's why he's not here. But to get back to the formula and as I said when I introduced this resolution, I didn't expect you to buy the formula

I said to the Minister that she and members of the Treasury Branch and the Progressive Conservative Caucus could come up with a formula of their own, but at least do something. But you are prepared to do nothing and the Minister without Portfolio, No. 2 I believe it is, or is it No. 3, the one in charge of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, stated in committee when we were dealing with the Minister's Estimates quite emphatically, and I haven't got Hansard here to check it out but I'm sure someone can find it, stated very emphatically, it is not the policy of this government to raise the minimum wage, period. That's the policy, we know that's your policy so stop beating around the bush and coming out with pious statements like the Member for St. Matthews who sits in a comfortable pew and makes anti-union attacks, and for the Member for Gladstone who's not here. One should have heard the remarks that he made in the Estimates on the Department of Labour.

That was the attitude of this government towards all workers. So, the honourable members opposite and the Minister produced figures saying that the cost of the minimum wage was directly in relationship to the unemployment rate. Well for the honourable members edification opposite here are the latest stats from Canada.

The unemployment rate, number one in Canada, 19.6 percent coupled with the lowest minimum wage rate, tenth is the province of Newfoundland with a minimum wage of \$2.50. That is a Progressive Conservative government for my honourable friends edification, a Progressive Conservative government and if we were given the rationale that the Honourable Minister of Labour that raising of the minimum wage would drive workers out to these low havens of low wages, we would have all other provinces, nine other provinces flocking, the business community would be all flocking to Newfoundland, but loand behold what do we find, 19.6 percent unemployed with the lowest minimum wage.

Next we find New Brunswick, number two and for my friends, Progressive Conservative government in New Brunswick, 16.3 percent unemployed. The minimum wage \$2.80, number six on the list.

Next we come to P.E.I., and let's not leave the Liberals out because they're not much better than the . . . they're like Tweedledum and Tweedledee. P.E.I. 15 percent unemployed rate, third in the country, eighth with a minimum wage of \$2.70 an hour.

Nova Scotia, another good Liberal bastion I guess, not too much — I understand it was a very close vote in P.E.I. in the last general election that they had their provincially and perhaps they wouldn't even be in seventh place in the minimum wage, 12.6 unemployed, \$2.75 for a minimum wage for seventh.

Next we come to Quebec, where the Minister likes to say, Quebec, highest minimum wage, highest minimum wage and also the highest minimum wage and, according to the Minister, the highest unemployment rate, but we find Quebec at 11.8 or fifth place in total unemployment.

Next we come to British Columbia, 8.4 percent, minimum wage of \$3.00 an hour, incidentally higher than Manitoba . . .

MR. COWAN: It has higher unemployment.

MR. JENKINS: Yet has higher unemployment.

Next we come to Ontario and this is the one variation. It's a Progressive Conservative government, but it's one that is perhaps most highly organized in terms of organized employees in the country at 8 percent, seventh in the unemployment rate and with a minimum wage of \$2.65. Followed by Manitoba at 7 percent unemployed, a minimum wage of \$2.95 an hour and using the Minister's figures for we don't worry about the others and I see that the figures here don't include the Yukon and the North West Territories, if we take all the jurisdictions we would be seventh, but in this case we're fifth.

Then we find Saskatchewan at 6.4, \$3.15 for a minimum wage. —(Interjection)— Yes, for second place in the scale of the minimum wage.

Alberta, oil rich Alberta — poor restaurant owners in Alberta — 5.4 percent unemployed and \$3.00 . . . of Manitoba.

Now, the honourable member likes to refer to the minimum wage and the survey that was done in the States. There was one done the other day and if we'd put as much credence in this report as that report which came . . .

MR. ORCHARD: If you don't like it, you don't believe it . . .

MR. JENKINS: . . . and that dealt with law enforcement officers and one-man police patrol cars where they said it was safer for a one-man patrol car than a two-man patrol car.

So that kind of jargon and what we've had and we've had people go down to find greener pastures and come back, but you know it is quite interesting, Mr. Speaker, that when the present government

were in opposition and we were on that side of the House and if we in debate happened to mention somewhere else, they said, don't talk about that place, we're talking about Manitoba — thank you, Mr. Speaker, — we're talking about Manitoba. They have now changed since they've moved from this side of the Chamber over to that side of the Chamber they want to talk about anywhere else but Manitoba. Don't talk about Manitoba, talk about anywhere else. They're quite sensitive about Manitoba. They're quite sensitive about Ontario and other places. They even go now, they go to places like North Dakota, like to talk about the minimum wage in North Dakota, Alabama, Georgia, they're good —(Interjection)— I don't know, perhaps they might even want to talk about South Africa, they have slave labour there. But to get back to the resolution that is before us and I would say to the Minister, to her Cabinet Ministers, I know how you're going to vote, you're going to vote the thing down, but I think it is incumbent upon you to think. The Minister said, last December when we had the special session and we asked her about the minimum wage, that in six months' time that she would make some announcement one way or the other. Well, I think to set the record straight, this Minister, this government should come out and say flat rate to the people of the province of Manitoba, especially to that 30,000 or 40,000 which the Minister doesn't seem to worry too much about, say that you're not going to increase the minimum rate. In fact if you really want to have this great influx of small business into this province, lower the minimum wage. When the Minister stated in debate, you know one of the objectives of the minimum wage legislation is to reduce the incidents of poverty by ensuring at least a livable wage, Mr. Speaker. If we keep on raising the minimum wage, all the people that have little businesses, their little businesses, which make up 80 percent of the businesses in Manitoba, we'll have a lot more unemployment than there is now and there will be a lot more people in worse shape than the few people that are affected that were making the minimum wage. Is the Minister trying to tell us that 80 percent of the businesses in Manitoba employ only 30,000 to 40,000 people? I find that very hard to believe. I find that very hard to believe, that these 30,000 or 40,000 people, and as I said when I introduced this motion, these people unfortunately do not belong to trade unions. That is one salvation that they have in their own hands and perhaps when they see the attitude of this government towards their plight, they'll perhaps organize themselves and do the very things that they should be doing to try and get an increase in wages.

They would be welcome in the trade union movement and they have been asked and given the attitude that this government and its policy towards raising of the minimum wage, I think that they will be joining unions. As I said, I don't expect that this motion will pass, in fact, I would perhaps fall backwards over my chair if it did . . .

A MEMBER: It would be worth it.

MR. JENKINS: It would be worth doing that back somersault.

I expect you to remain true blue to your ideals of protecting those in society who need the least protection. You have reduced the income tax for those at higher incomes; you have abolished the inheritance taxes, you have abolished the gift taxes. That doesn't apply to those people on minimum wage. They are not leaving any great fortunes to anyone. The legacy that those people can leave to their offspring is hard work, and they are hard working people. And as the Member for Churchill said, when you see these people go into the supermarkets or the grocery stores to buy groceries, then we all know, and surely the honourable members opposite must go to the store once in a while, we know how far \$100 goes in a store today, and the food dollar is shrinking in value all the time. And these people are in no position to bargain, the only people, at the present time who can do anything on their behalf is we, as Members of this Legislative Assembly, and it is our responsibility to try and put across that idea to the honourable members opposite. Unfortunately we can't do anything about the minimum wage. It is within your power, and it will rest upon your heads and your consciences.

QUESTION put, MOTION declared lost.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The Resolution before us is the Resolution on the Minimum Wage Formula, Resolution No. 4.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Bostrom, Boyce, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Doern,

Wednesday, June 21, 1978

Green, Jenkins, Miller, Pawley, Walding.

NAYS: Anderson, Blake, Cosens, Domino, Downey, Driedger, Ferguson, Galbraith, Hyde, Jorgenson, Lyon, MacMaster, McGill, McKenzie, Mercier, Minaker, Orchard, Mrs. Price, Messrs. Ranson, Sherman, Spivak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 15, Nays 21.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: I have a change in Economic Development, Mr. Blake for Mr. Spivak.

MR. SPEAKER: Do I have a feeling from the members the hour is 5:30. Is there an agreement on that change on that Economic Development Committee?

The hour being 5:30 p.m., the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 p.m. tomorrow afternoon.