

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 16, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The Petition of the Manitoba Registered Music Teachers' Association praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to Incorporate the Manitoba Music Teachers' Association.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina) introduced Bill no. 64, an Act for the Relief of Jacob A. Johnson and Donelda M. Johnson.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I would like to make one or two introductions to the House. It is my pleasure to introduce to the honourable members our guests on my left in the persons of Mr. & Mrs. Réal Çaouette, the Leader of the Creditiste Party. We also have with us today eight students of Grade 3 to 6 standing from Macross School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Gallinger. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George. We also have with us today 17 students of Grade 12 standing of the Dauphin Collegiate Technical Institute. These students are under the direction of Mrs. McDougal. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. We also have with us today 12 students of the 44th Winnipeg Cub Pack under the direction of Mrs. Empey. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley. And it is a privilege to welcome, these hundreds of miles away from home, 15 students of Grade 12 standing from the R. D. Parker Collegiate of Thompson, Manitoba. These students are under the direction of Mr. Baxter. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders, may I lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order No. 22, a Return to an Order No. 21, and a Return to an Order No. 20.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, may I lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 15 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and Return to an Order of the House No. 23 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders are called, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. With respect to the destruction by fire of the Prince Charles Elementary School at Portage la Prairie, will the Department of Education be offering any special financial assistance in the reconstruction? I believe we all know that the building was insured, but the replacement value will be much more than the insurance, so my question is will the Department of Education, through the finance board, be offering special financial assistance to the Portage School Board?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, my information in the Department has been to the effect that, in the opinion of my officials, the insurance coverage would cover the cost of replacement. However, if there is any -- I haven't had a final figure on this, but this is what I was advised as of yesterday. I imagine we'll just have to wait and see just what the total cost will be.

MR. JOHNSTON: A supplemental question, Mr. Speaker. If there is a difference between the insurance and the building cost, will the public finance or the school finance board pick up that difference?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I think that's a hypothetical question at this point. I see what the honourable member is driving at and I'll try and get some further information for him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Does the sales tax apply to charitable sales? For example, if a church is fund-raising and selling something, the proceeds of which

(MR. DOERN cont'd)... are non-profit and going toward a fund of some kind, does the sales tax necessarily apply to these things?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the sales tax applies to classes of goods and as such they are classified, not the use to which they are put or the organization by which they are sold.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Are exemptions ever made or can persons or organizations apply for exemption?

MR. EVANS: No, Mr. Speaker, not that I'm aware of.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Secretary. Has the government offered any financial support to the purchase of the Riel Home in St. Vital?

HON. STEWART McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I answered that question yesterday - no.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. I might point out to the Minister that yesterday I asked him whether he had been approached, and he said no; now I ask him whether he has offered any support. I would also like to know whether the government plans any special recognition of Louis Riel during the Centennial.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, no decision or no plans in that regard have been made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders are called, I'd like to direct my questions, one to the Minister of Agriculture who is responsible for Water Conservation, and the other one to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On March 18th I had two orders passed, No. 16 and No. 17, Orders for Returns requesting information. The one with respect to the water conservation is questions about the Portage Diversion and the other one was the Beat '70 Campaign. When can I expect answers to these orders?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (River Heights): In connection with the Order accepted by myself - soon.

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

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce if Louis Riel had lived in Dauphin, would we have had any special recognition for him?

MR. LYON: He wouldn't have been hanged.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware that the administration of justice in Manitoba depended on your geographical locality. My question is addressed to the Minister of Public Utilities. Has the province been considering any changes and any cancellations in the reciprocity arrangement for trucking with American States?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, there are no - rather I should answer that the matter of reciprocity arrangements are always under consideration and generally being extended as and when that is feasible and possible. As to the matter of any cancellations, I am not aware of any at this present time of speaking.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to briefly explain the reason for this submission. The thinking behind this submission is simply to attempt to discover the extent to which the criminal record provision is asked for in government agencies, in particular the relevance of why the question of whether a person has a criminal record is asked and the necessity of it. The Provincial Government itself appears to have a fairly enlightened policy in this regard in that a person is only ruled out of correction, working as a guard or in a penal institution, and in those matters where bail is a necessity. In all other instances they apparently would allow people who have some kind of criminal record to work, and I think this is certainly more enlightened than that which is found in some of their agencies and Crown Corporations.

This is a particular problem for people who have had records in the past and are now attempting to lead a proper life, and I think from their point of view, from a subjective point of view, they feel that they are being unnecessarily persecuted or harrassed. So it is for this reason that I wish to obtain copies of all the application forms for employment to determine the extent and the necessity of a criminal record provision.

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

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

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, the other day I introduced this resolution on minimum wages and I just read the resolution, so I'd better start from the beginning. I am sure you will allow me the extra minute. The resolution reads:

Whereas the Minimum Wage and its application have been the subject of much discussion, debate and dissension; and

Whereas the existing criteria or terms of reference used by the Minimum Wage Board to determine minimum wages are not in keeping with the objectives of Manitoba for the well-being of its citizens - and I should have said going into '70 or roaring into '70 to beat '70, but I didn't - and

Whereas the cost of living is continually changing and the Minimum Wage Board has no specific guidelines on how often it is to recommend its submission to the Government;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the criteria for establishment of a minimum wage be such as would provide an individual with an income sufficient to meet normal living conditions consistent with the standard of shelter, food, health, education, recreation, and such other amenities of life as are considered basic to the enjoyment of life in Manitoba; and

Be It Further Resolved that the Board be required to report when conditions require but no less than annually as to its recommendations to the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as usual I try to keep things as simple as possible. Last year we had a discussion on this problem, on this question, and of course we didn't arrive at any solution at that time because at that time I specifically requested in the resolution that we go to \$1.50 as the minimum wage. The government in its wisdom, or possibly not wisdom, felt - at least in my opinion I didn't think it was wise - that \$1.00 was sufficient at that time. Of course there was a certain amount of debate, discussion, and there were various opinions, and eventually after the Minimum Wage Board had gone through this country stumping up and down, and had a number of presentations made to it, they made a recommendation.

But, Mr. Speaker, this recommendation wasn't unanimous. It was the majority, which is true, but actually in essence it was strictly a decision by the chairman because he cast the deciding vote. For that reason I have introduced this resolution because I do not feel that it is fair, under the present criteria as used in The Employment Standards Act, for one man to have to make a decision of that kind as to how people shall live, under what subsistence level they will have to earn their living. Now why do I say this, Mr. Speaker? I say it for this reason, that apparently the Board members were of a divided opinion. We have labour members and we have employer members, employee and employer representatives, and they were of opposing views. The Chairman had to make the decision so actually, in essence, it was a one-man decision as to which way it would go. He could just as easily have voted for the other side.

Now when we get to the beginning of this, what are the criteria set out? The criteria set out in The Employment Standards Act, Mr. Chairman, are very vague and very inadequate, I would say. They say: "A Board in setting the recommendation it makes to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall take into consideration and be guided by the cost to employee of purchasing the necessities of life and health.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that mean, the necessities of life and health, purchasing the necessities of life and health. It could mean bread and water and a pallet to sleep on, or it could mean a lot more. Now I'm not going to say what they should be; I do think though that we have some guidance in this respect. We have, and Canada is a member of the International Labour Organization, which has many committees. One of its committees suggested that concerning employment policy - and they adopted this at the convention - that the criteria should be, and the objectives, that all human beings, irrespective of race, creed or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity of economic security and equal opportunity. Now this is a much broader criteria, Mr. Speaker, but I'm not going to say whether government should take this one or another one, but I do believe that the ones that they have in the Employment Standards at the present time are very inadequate.

The other thing that I believe, Mr. Speaker, is that the government is shirking its responsibilities in this respect. They are pawing it off onto a committee and that's not being responsible government, as they claim to be; that's not looking at the priorities or what we

April 16, 1968

(MR. FOX cont'd)... Manitobans should have or should enjoy. They are saying, "let's pass it on to a committee and let them make a decision." And while they are passing it on, they are also not even telling that Board what kind of criteria this Board should operate under, at least nothing specific except something in very general terms. And on top of that, they do not set out how often this Board should report. Now this is one of the other weaknesses as we have it under the present legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in respect to how often this Board should look at the criteria for the minimum wages, we all know that the cost of living is changing continually, and sometimes it's rising more rapidly than at other times. In my resolution I suggest that the minimum should be reported at least once -- should report at least once a year, and if necessary, more often. I don't think that I'm asking anything that isn't fair or that isn't workable.

Let me get to the specifics of the Board as it operates at the present time, Mr. Speaker. This Board tours the countryside from town to town, it gets submissions from various sources, but one of the things that I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, is that the people who are working for a minimum wage never appear before this Board. And there's a good reason for that. These people are working at the bottom of the economic ladder; they are in fear of their jobs; they have no security; they have no reserve because they are working at the bottom of this economic ladder; consequently, they dare not take any chances of expressing their views. That's one of the reasons why I do not think that the Board is effective at the present time the way it is operating.

There are other reasons, Mr. Speaker. Some of the criteria that the Board uses at the present time, that have been used in arguments, are very poor. I don't know where they started, but I do know that one of the criteria is what a single girl needs to subsist on, or exist on, and I do not think that this is an adequate criteria. Another one that's used is the figure that the Age and Opportunity Bureau presents. These too are inadequate, Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason that aged or senior people have a much lower requirement for living as compared to people of younger stature who are just starting out in life, who have to make their way, who have to raise a family.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this Board goes around, it receives much of its suggestions as to the minimum wage from employer representatives, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that when you have a narrow criteria, then almost anything that someone offers as a suggestion will be used in order to get at an answer. And this is quite often what happens, that the many representations that are made by the employer representatives, some of them are taken and accepted as being factual, but we've got to consider that these may be a biased view, because after all the employer is not there to expend money which he necessarily doesn't have to. If he can talk someone into making a minimum wage of a lower level, then it's money in his pocket. So I would discount some of these presentations that are made to the Minimum Wage Board at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing the minimum wage I would suggest that the government accept this responsibility and set the kind of criteria it thinks Manitobans should live by - not mine, not a board - but that government which says it's a responsible government, let it tell us what are the good criteria for Manitobans to live by, and then a board may have a better chance of determining the minimum wage which it will recommend to the government. In fact better still if the government itself instead of having a board determine it for it would set the minimum wages, I think then it would be responsible.

We have the same problem in many of the other areas of labour, Mr. Speaker, where this government that claims itself to be responsible says, "We're waiting for a Committee. It's a bipartisan committee, it's got labour and employers on it, so therefore until they come up with the recommendation, we won't move." Well, I don't think that's being responsible, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I say that this government could quite well do the job of setting its criteria, then it couldn't blame anyone else for the criteria that are there and it could set the minimum wage which would be fair and equitable to all Manitobans.

Now, we've heard the argument that there are very few people working at this minimum wage. This may be true. All the more reason why the government should then take the responsibility and set the minimum wage because it is not going to affect very many people. But if there are many people, then it means this is one of the reasons why the wage level, the average wage level in Manitoba is low, because there are many working at it. You can't have it both ways - that's right - so therefore you have to make up your mind which one you're going to take. One day you'll argue one way, the next day you'll argue the other way. I don't

(MR. FOX cont'd)... care which way you want to argue, providing you make up your mind and take the responsibility.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's also said that this is a responsible government. Fine, but it doesn't cost this responsible government one cent in respect of minimum wages. All it has to have is intestinal fortitude to say: "We want Manitobans to live under a decent standard and that is why we are suggesting that this be the minimum wage" - whatever level they arrive at. And let us adjudicate, after they have arrived at what they consider a fair and equitable minimum wage, whether it is fair and equitable. Let them stand up and be counted on this point; let them not pass it off on to a Board which cannot see unanimously on what its recommendations are.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, in my resolution is - as I said once before - that I would like to see, if we're going to remain with the Board, that it report at least annually. The cost of living seems to be continually rising. People working at the minimum wage have no recourse, no bargaining power, no way of improving their conditions. They have to wait for the charity of the government, after it receives a recommendation from this Board, as to whether they will get an increase in their standard of living. I'm sure if we had the opportunity to see how some of these people live that are subsisting on this type of economic income, we would certainly be shocked. It is in the neighbourhood of \$2,000 a year, just a little over that, Mr. Speaker. We know that many commissions and many studies have been made, and there have been recommendations that the minimum income maintenance level should be over the \$3,000 mark, that the poverty line starts at \$3,000, and here we are subjecting people to less than that at the present time. Mr. Speaker, I recommend this resolution to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have been around this subject at great length, particularly last year, and again I'd like to try and make it abundantly clear to the honourable members that when we're talking about a minimum wage we're not talking about a fair wage, we're not talking about the going wage, or we're not talking about a contractual wage; we're talking about a minimum amount of money that an employer can pay an employee for an hour's work, regardless of his ability, his skills or his condition. This is the minimum wage.

The next thing that I must point out to the honourable members is that the minimum wage in Manitoba is as high as most provinces, in fact is as high as many and higher than most, and by December 1st of this year it will be as high as any minimum wage in the Dominion of Canada.

It was during the last session, Mr. Speaker, when there was a great deal of discussion on minimum wages in this House, and at that time, as the Honourable Member from Kildonan has mentioned, the Minimum Wage Board was deliberating on minimum wages in the province. I would like to just digress for a moment and let's talk about this tripartite board, the government not assuming its responsibility, and he telling me now that labour doesn't want this responsibility. Well, I suggest to him that he check with the Manitoba Federation of Labour and find out if they want to withdraw from these boards, because I'll suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is on their request that labour has been represented on these boards by this government. They feel that this is a fair way and the proper way to arrive at decisions. It's fine to say you're sloughing off your responsibility. We saw indications of great responsibility here last year - \$1.25, \$1.50, \$1.75, \$2.50 for a minimum wage. Let's try and be reasonable, and let's remember what it is that we're trying to do.

Now, if you examine the discussions that took place last year, you'll find that there was quite a divergence of opinion, so I believe that I'll try and outline for you, as best I can, the policy of this government, and what we seek to do with minimum wages and how we seek to set the minimum wage.

I think at the outset we should make it quite clear that I don't believe that we could agree on how we would set the minimum wage. I should make it quite clear that I don't think we would agree on what the minimum wage would represent, and this is one of the problems when you say bring it to this House for the body politic to set. Goodness knows there's enough things for the body politic to do but to go out and try and establish a criteria for minimum wages. Let's remember this now, the least amount of money that an employer can pay an employee regardless of skills, abilities, a youngster just out of school, someone who is handicapped for various reasons, this is the least amount of money. We're not talking about fair wages, we're not talking about going wages, or we are not talking about contractual wages. I suppose, Mr.

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd)...Speaker, what I'm trying to say is there's no such thing as a scientific minimum wage which is correct in some precise sense. We have to work with an agreed minimum wage and it has to be worked out through an agreed-to process.

I'd like to say something about the objectives which we in this government seek to achieve through the use of minimum wage legislation. We subscribe to the view that the free enterprise system and the private market place, with workers and employers striking their own wage contract, that this by and large provides the most satisfactory basis for the establishment of wages and wage patterns generally in the economy. And before some of the honourable members would take me wrong, I'm not arguing that the private market place is perfect. We're all aware of a number of imperfections that characterize the labour market. But I want to stress this point, that this government does not hold itself responsible for setting wages in this province. It's fine for friends opposite here to say: "We will impose this, you will have a better life if we impose it, you do what we tell you, you have what we want and away you go. This is good for you because I say it is." We don't subscribe to that policy, but we do live up to a responsibility that we have in regard to minimum wages.

Now having said that, I want to proceed to indicate that we recognize that certain workers, for one reason or another, may, without some form of protection, earn an undesirably low level of wages. And that is the clear duty, Mr. Speaker, of the government to exercise limited intervention to protect these workers from what I would call substandard wages. And there are two considerations that enter into this specification of substandard wages in Manitoba. First, we have to determine what is desirable; and second, we have to determine what is possible. The Minimum Wage Board determines what is desirable on the basis of what is considered to be the needs of a worker, and determines what is possible on the basis of what is conceived to be the past capacity of the bulk of employers to meet the minimum standards without being forced to make onerous adjustments in either the number of persons employed or in the prices of products or services.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the desirable and the possible minimum wage are not usually the same. Even worse, there's very little agreement on either what is desirable or what is possible at any given time. In my view, the job before us is to ensure that we move as rapidly as possible towards a minimum wage which would provide sufficient earnings to meet what would be, for most people, an adequate minimum standard of living for a fully employed worker. Goodness gracious, what good is \$1.50, \$2.00 or \$5.00, if the fellow is unemployed? We can't move minimum wages faster than the economy can absorb without some undesirable dislocation, but at the same time we must make sure that we do not lag behind what is really possible.

Now, I'd like to illustrate what I mean by the past progress in experience in this field. In the period since 1963, the minimum wage has been increased from 66 cents an hour to \$1.25 an hour by next December 1st. These increases have been based on recommendations by the Minimum Wage Board on four separate occasions, and have involved the minimum wage moving from one level to a higher level eight times during the last six years.

Now, this brings me to my second point, Mr. Speaker. How should the minimum wage be established? Certainly, as the Honourable Member from Kildonan suggests, we in government have to take the responsibility for the minimum wage, but there are a number of ways in which that responsibility may be exercised. The minimum wage may be set by statute; it may be set by Order-in-Council; or the minimum wage can be set by Order-in-Council on the recommendation of a Board empowered to make investigations and recommendations. It can be set by order of a Board empowered to conduct investigations and set rates with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, or the minimum wage may be set by an order of the Board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all these methods are employed in Canada. The Federal Government has set its minimum wage of \$1.25 by statute; the provinces of Manitoba and Newfoundland by Order-in-Council on the recommendation of a Minimum Wage Board; the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia by order of a board, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council; the provinces of New Brunswick, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, Quebec and British Columbia by order of a Board.

Mr. Speaker, of these five methods, the Manitoba practice commends itself to us. There seems to be a great deal of merit in isolating the initial job of investigating the need for adjustment in the minimum wage from the open play of politics, and the important factors must be assessed and documented on the basis of evidence and enquiry. And this, I suggest to the

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd). . .Honourable members, is not a function for which this Legislature is particularly well suited. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the political responsibility for the minimum wage, stemming from the desires of the community to ensure certain minimum standards, cannot easily be delegated to boards and commissions, and therefore is the ultimate responsibility of this government. And we assume that responsibility. We believe that the present procedure for setting minimum wages in Manitoba, involving tripartite action as it does, and making investigations which are submitted to this government and making the necessary studies that are required to determine what is a fair, adequate minimum wage - adequate minimum wage . . .

MR. FOX: Adequate for what?

MR. BAIZLEY: Adequate to live.

MR. FOX: To who?

MR. BAIZLEY: To an individual worker who is fully employed, and I think this is the point that I would try and make clear. Once again, we are talking about minimum wages; we are not talking about fair wages we are not talking about going wages we're not talking about contractual wages, but we are talking about a wage that has been established as a floor, the least amount of money that an employer can pay an employee for his services, whether he's just out of school, regardless of his education, regardless of his ability. I think if we can keep that in mind, we might one of these days get it sorted out what we mean, because I'm sure my honourable friend from Kildonan is really -- he's talking minimum wages but what he's concerned about is fair wages.

A MEMBER: He's mixed up.

MR. BAIZLEY: Well, that doesn't seem to be unusual on that side. Well anyhow, the need for deliberations by somebody such as the present Board stems from the fact that there are a number of factors which must be taken into account and weighed when you are arriving at these conclusions, because you have to take into account the needs of the worker, you have to take into account the movement of wages, you have to take into account the cost of living, and I think you have to take into account what a fair employer is doing; and what fairer way to consider these measures than by a tripartite board balanced between labour and management and with an independent chairman. The point is that what determines the issue is not the number of criteria which the board examines or even the degree of agreement which is reached on each criteria, but rather where the emphasis is placed on the criteria. As you know, the Board makes its recommendations to the government and they in turn accept or reject, and I must say that the past four recommendations have been accepted by this government.

But I think there's one thing that is quite clear from what I've been saying, and that is that there is an objective, the objective in ensuring an adequate minimum level of earnings for full-time workers. That's another point that you have to take into account, the need of the individual to meet the minimum adequate standards on a full-time basis, whether it's \$1.25, \$1.50 or \$5.75. If he's only partially employed, the amount is not going to meet his needs. For some employers, increases in the minimum wage cause no problem; for others, it can be a dislocation of employees. Some may be entirely absorbed by the employer himself; others are passed on in increased prices, and sometimes increased prices seriously affect the output, affect employment. So here you have a minimum wage, a high minimum wage, but you haven't workers receiving these wages. It's been a great help to the worker.

I've been speaking so far about the use of minimum wage to secure a desirable minimum level of earnings for full-time workers. We do not think the minimum wage is a suitable instrument for a frontal attack on the problem of poverty, because no matter how high we set the minimum wage, it's of little benefit to no-one in the labour force, to people of substantial periods of unemployment, to people with large families, or to those suffering from ill health. And further, there's obviously no simple relationship between the minimum wage rate and a worker's family income. Policies for alleviating poverty must be more sharply focused on the various causes of inadequate family income. The impression has been given in some quarters, Mr. Speaker, that the minimum wage should be used to raise the general level of wages in this province. Well, this government believes that it would be extremely unwise to set the general level of wages directly or indirectly by legislative statute. The suggestion has been put forth in the resolution that the Minimum Wage Board should carry out an annual review of minimum wages. Well the past record of this government is ample testimony to its readiness to review minimum wages, and at fairly frequent intervals, and I see no necessity

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd)... for building such a rigid procedure into the process at this time.

Finally, I want to say that this government believes that the minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour, effective this December 1st, is a reasonable rate for this province at this time. It is a rate which compares most favorably with the general minimum wages across the country. It's as high as any and higher than most. Having said that, I would suggest that you honourable members who continually are harassed, as all of us with low wage rates, that low wage rates are not related to the minimum wage. They're usually related to the capacity and production of the economy. Certainly if our minimum wage is as high as any minimum wage in the country - I shouldn't carry on a conversation with you like this I realize, Mr. Speaker - but I think with the minimum wage in Manitoba being as high as any in the country, that we have to realize that that is not responsible for low wages in Manitoba. Now in due course, as the capacity of the economy to absorb these increases grow, I look forward, and I am sure all honourable members look forward to increases in the minimum wage which hopefully will bridge the gap between the desirable and the possible.

Mr. Speaker, I have no particular quarrel with this resolution, and in due respect to the Honourable Member from Kildonan and having regard to the fact that the suggested criteria are carefully considered in our current procedures, personally I see no reason for this resolution and I will vote against it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, it's always most interesting to hear from the Minister of Labour on matters that he is so unfamiliar with and to hear him use all of the vigor that he possesses to defend the indefensible. I sometimes wonder whether my honourable friend - and of course this is common with most of the front benchers opposite - whether they ever take time out to read the resolutions that are proposed from this side of the House. I question very much whether they do, because I am sure that if they did, they would support them in general. As a matter of fact, after the long tirade of my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, he turns around and says that what the Honourable Member from Kildonan has said, I agree with, and I am going to vote against it. Isn't this so typical - isn't this so typical, Mr. Speaker, of my friends opposite? They're in favor of everything and they vote against everything. This has been their history over the years.

My honourable friend the Minister of Labour suggests that it is not our function here in the Legislature of Manitoba to interfere with the normal process of collective bargaining between employer and employee. I agree with him. I do think, and sometimes question whether this is done by the government opposite, but one of the jobs that we have to do in government is to lay the basis for conducting negotiations in a favorable climate between labour-management, and indeed government too, and I think the government can be faulted in many respects because they don't take this into consideration.

But I agree with my honourable friend when he says that it's not up to us to interfere with the due process of collective bargaining, but I do think that it is an onus on those of us who are members of this Legislature to see that those who have not got the benefits of the due process of collective agreement are protected in their human endeavors. I don't think that it's enough for the Minister of Labour to turn around and say, as he did on a number of occasions, that as far as minimum wages are concerned, all we should be interested in is providing a certain amount of money as a minimum for an individual who does a full-day eight-hour's worth of work. Surely, surely the whole basis of the minimum wage legislation is to prevent the exploitation of individuals in the process of doing that work. I notice that in-between times when my honourable friend the member for Osborne, the present Minister -- the former Minister of Labour was giving him encouragement. Attaboy, up and at it because you're right in your denunciation of the process and progress in the minimum wages and what we have done.

Surely my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare is the proper man, Mr. Speaker, he is the proper man of all men in the front bench to give encouragement to the Minister of Labor to keep the living standards of those unable to defend themselves down to the lowest depth, because that is his psychology and that is what he's doing in the Department of Welfare. So I can well imagine these two peas who are so alike of being in the same pod insofar as consideration of the minimum and the minimal standards of the citizens of Manitoba. No surprise to me. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, it's no surprise to you either.

My honourable friend says to me that the proposition of my honourable friend from

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... Kildonan would lead to an open play of politics. He was talking last year of the resolutions that were before the House to introduce either \$1.25, \$1.50 or \$1.75 per hour. There was - there was, Mr. Chairman. He's right when he says that there were differences of opinion as to what might have been a reasonable rate at that time, and the answer of my honourable friend the Minister of Labour now is: Ah, but wait until December, wait until December when we have \$1.25 instituted here in the Province of Manitoba as the minimum wage. We then will be on a par almost with others. It's higher in British Columbia, it's going higher in British Columbia. You see, Mr. Speaker, even the interjection of my honourable friend the Minister is an indication that he's not aware of what's going on outside of his own little office across the Chamber.

I suggest to my friend that it is about time that maybe we should just take a look outside of the confines of this province who can't afford a higher minimum wage, in the opinion of my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, is because of the fact that we haven't made the economic progress that will allow the people to receive a higher wage, because this is what also he said in his remarks a few moments ago. I suggest to my honourable friend the Minister of Labour not to rely too much on the moral support that he's receiving from the Minister of Welfare but suggest to the Minister of Industry and Commerce that he should get up from sitting on his brain and get to work in order that the progress can be made in the economy of Manitoba to find a basis for a higher minimum wage.

My honourable friend says that the minimum wage that we have in Manitoba, the minimum wage is not the basis for an attack on poverty. He just repeated it by saying that this is right. Then what is the government doing in respect to an attack on poverty? Are they prepared to sit back on their haunches and just say, "well we can't do anything insofar as the attack on poverty is concerned," and let it go like that? How deplorable the situation is. Is it any wonder really, Mr. Speaker, why they only hold the confidence of some 32 or 36 percent of the people of Manitoba, and only by the trick of the trade they happen to have a slight majority over-all of membership in this House. Of course come the day, and I trust it will not be too long before the people have the opportunity of changing that 32 or 36 percent to where it actually is at the present time in my opinion, and in the opinion of others, down to a possible 10 or 12, giving them the benefit of the doubt.

But I say to my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, for goodness sake, go out of the confines of this little Chamber of your own office. We had a very interesting conference here a short time ago down at the Fort Garry Hotel dealing with some of the problems of labour in Manitoba. I suggest to my honourable friend that he read what transpired down there. The picture won't be as he suggested here. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. BAIZLEY: The picture was good.

MR. PAULLEY: The picture was good. The picture that they, the experts that appeared before that conference, was factual, and if this is what my honoured, earnest, sincere friend the Minister of Labour thinks is a good picture, boy I'd hate like the dickens to see a poor picture in the opinion of my honourable friend, because it certainly wasn't very good.

But apart from all of this, apart from all of this, my honourable friend deliberately, or otherwise, missed the whole point in the resolution presented by my colleague from Kildonan. In this resolution we are sincerely endeavoring to form a reasonable and proper basis for consideration of minimum wages. At the present time, as my colleague pointed out, if in the opinion of the Board the basic necessities of life consisted only of a loaf of bread and a glass of water, the recommendation could be on that basis. I sometimes think that your deskmate the Minister of Welfare bases his payments on that philosophy, but the purport of this resolution is to give some reasonable guidance to the Minimum Wage Board which they haven't under legislation under the present time.

And what is it, what is it that is suggested in this? That the criteria for the establishment of a minimum wage should be such as to provide an individual with an income sufficient to meet normal living conditions. Something wrong with that? Consistent with the standard are shelter, food, health, education, recreation, and other such amenities of life considered basic to the enjoyment of life. My honourable friend the Minister of Labour says we don't need to change because of the fact that all that minimum wages should be is an amount of money in order that an individual may hold body and limb together. Actually you know, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend in essence is saying to those married people in effect who are on minimum wages, you had no right to get married while in receipt of minimum wages, or no longer

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)...should you continue, and I say that this is all wrong. But this is what this resolution is asking for, and I'm sure that the Honourable Minister really didn't mean what he said. He couldn't have, because he was so far out on limbo - so far out on limbo in his attack on the proposition of my honourable colleague from Kildonan.

And then my honourable friend the Minister of Labour winds up his oration by saying, "There is no need for consideration annually; why my government has" - how many times was it? Eight times? - "eight times in six years raised the minimum wage." Heavens to Betsy, Mr. Speaker, it has taken us more than eight times in the six years to try and instill some basis of humanity in my honourable friends opposite, otherwise it would have stayed the way it was previously. And then to finalize his remarks by saying "We agree with everything you say, we agree that in the essence the minimum wage should be more, and we are looking after it" - (Interjection) -- There again, Mr. Speaker, support from my honourable friend the Minister of Labour. He says -- when I completed that sentence, he agrees that the minimum wage should be raised, he just says, "Yes, we are doing something about it," and yet a few moments ago he said, "when it comes in - when it comes in, the minimum wage is \$1.25 in December, things will be satisfactory and happy." What type of psychology, what type of reasoning in my honourable friend in finalizing his remarks. "We agree with everything you say but we disagree to the degree of raising our hands or standing up to support it."

Now I just want to make one appeal. I just want to make one appeal to all of the caucus meetings that are taking place on the other side of the House at the present time, and I'm sure that my honourable friends who are seated on the carpets at the back find that far more comfortable than the seats that are provided at the expense of the taxpayer in the Assembly. I'm sure that they are more concerned with the very very deep problems that they are discussing in their respective caucus meetings than they are with the destiny of the people in Manitoba who are unrepresented by labour and have to rely on those of us on this side of the House to speak on their behalf in this Assembly.

But I do want to make an appeal to them on the other side of the House, if I may briefly, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the dual Minister would just let me have his ear just for a minute. In the terms of the Romans, "Lend me your ear". Would you try and convince - and now, Mr. Speaker, I'm addressing my remarks to the acting Minister of Agriculture and Highways - would you kindly try and convince your colleague the Minister of Labour that it's time for re-consideration of the approach of the Government of Manitoba in the consideration of the basis on which minimum wages are arrived at. I wonder if the Minister of Urban Affairs may also join in the appeal to the Minister of Labour in this regard, and those other members who now have vacated this Assembly for a different climate, because possibly this one is a little bit untenable and a little uncomfortable at the present time, I wonder if some members of the Conservative caucus would only extend to them my greetings and felicitations and ask them to accept the second or third sentences pronounced by the Minister of Labour, that they are all in favour of the resolution as suggested by the Member for Kildonan and vote for it. Don't give lip-service but give voting strength to it, and if in the process, Mr. Speaker, if in the process it may be that one or two or three or four members of the Conservative caucus have to, on the basis of humanity and consideration, vote with those of us on this side to give more consideration to those people who are not represented by union organizations, or the Minister of Labour, I would welcome their support.

I cannot promise - I cannot promise, Mr. Speaker, that if they would do that and the Minister of Labour was defeated in his stand, that I could guarantee that the government would not be upset, but I do say to them that if they do what the heart, and maybe to some degree the mind of the Minister of Labour would love to do, support the resolution, I'll undertake to talk to the Leader of the Official Opposition and his caucus and my own caucus and the Member for Rhineland to see if we can consider this as a motion for adoption and not of non-confidence, because I'm sure - I'm sure that the Minister of Labour might consider it a motion of non-confidence if the members over there voted in favour of what he firmly believes should be done on behalf of some of the citizens in Manitoba who haven't full bargaining powers at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to add just a few things to what has already been said on the minimum wage. I feel that in the last few years almost everything has been said that had to be said. I know the Honourable Minister mentioned that

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . the minimum wage has been raised some eight times in the last ten years or six years, and I feel it was probably necessary that it was raised because the purchasing of \$1.00 what it was ten years ago is not today. I believe the dollar has shrunk in some ten years to 65 cents, so certainly the minimum wage had to be raised.

The other point that he made an issue of was that there are two things, what is desirable and what is possible. Well I'm sure the members on this side of the House are responsible members and have to keep this in mind when they do bring a recommendation and resolutions before the House, what is desirable and what is possible. I'm sure they keep this in mind.

Now I feel that the higher minimum wage is an important tool in fighting poverty. I know that different studies have shown that the large percentage of those living in poverty are low wage earners and most men who head poor families are working but are not making enough to get these people out of the poverty level. This is the whole problem. How can you fight poverty, Mr. Speaker, when one makes \$1.15 an hour today, and this amounts to about \$2,000 annual income. Well certainly these people live in poverty when you consider a \$2,000 annual income. I feel that the higher minimum is needed to bolster the purchasing power of the people who are in need. I know as well as anybody else in this House that just increasing the minimum wage will not solve the problem because there are some families with two dependents and there are other families with six dependents, so naturally the minimum wage will not solve all the problems. I think we have to probably give consideration to a study of a fair wage in Manitoba, not only the minimum wage, because there is great disparity between different people. Some with large families of course can live on the same income as a family with a small number of dependents. I feel a proper minimum wage will not solve all the problems of a worker, but I think it will be a help in emergencies and in cases when he needs it. I know that this will not help these people to save money for a down payment on a home and so on.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record of the House -- I have a Social Service Audit here that was done in Winnipeg, just came off the press a little while ago, and it states here the fact that Metropolitan Winnipeg does have a serious poverty problem. "Sixteen percent of the families in Metro area were earning less than \$3,000 annually. A recent survey of the Planning Division, Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, in 1967 revealed that of 2,224 families in the CPR-Notre Dame area, representing a cross-section of all families in this area, 1,465 had incomes of less than \$3,000." So at least 50 percent of these families in this area were living below the minimum standard and were living in poverty. "All studies indicate that the proportion of community's poor, at least in one heavy populated area of the City of Winnipeg, has increased, and it has increased during the time in the last six or seven years where we had almost full employment in the city and greater productivity." So I don't think that everyone in this city is getting a fair share.

Mr. Speaker, I'm just quoting from the report. "It is also of public concern because of the few people so affected are unable to contribute anything to the growth and development of their community, their province or their country. Quite the contrary, they are a great burden on the rest of the society when we pay the escalating social service and policing costs and family breakdowns."

So I think that I haven't got too much argument with the resolution. In the Whereas, all it states is that the subject has been of much -- the minimum wage has been of much discussion and debate and existing criteria or terms of reference is probably not in keeping. Maybe all it needs is a review, and I can't see any argument with that. We agree that the cost of living is continually going up, and as I quoted just a little while ago, your dollar has certainly not the purchasing power that it had a few years ago. So in that Whereas I have no argument.

In the resolved section, all it asks for is the Board to report once a year, and I'm sure there's no argument with almost all of the members of this House that the Minimum Wage Board should report once a year to this House. There is nothing wrong. The only thing I see is where the criteria for establishing the minimum wage is almost the same as in the Act, almost identically, with the exception of the last line where it states "other amenities of life as are considered basic to the enjoyment of life", which in Manitoba to me would probably be necessities of life that are needed. And really, I don't see much wrong with that resolution except that I do want to say at this time that I don't think increasing the minimum wage will solve our problem, which my point is the fair wage, because I believe that the study that has been made in Canada, as a matter of interest, of some 39 cities that were reported, Winnipeg is right at the bottom of the list, sixth from the bottom of the list of the 39 cities that were

(MR. PATRICK cont'd)... studies, and the ones that were below us were cities like St. John's, Newfoundland; Halifax, Moncton and St. John. So certainly I don't think we have much to be proud of because if this is the case, our income is certainly quite low and our costs are quite high.

Mr. Speaker, not only that our necessities are high, but I have an HCN Guide here, Heavy Construction News Bulletin, which is quite recent and it shows all the cities in Canada, and it doesn't matter what item you pick out, Winnipeg is the highest. If we take for instance in construction, gypsum board or cement - or anything that you may do - brick or structural steel, it's almost hard to believe. For instance you have gypsum board: in Halifax it's \$78.10 per unit; Montreal - \$75.00; Toronto - \$73.50; and Winnipeg - \$82.50. And these are reliable statistics that are used in construction appraising of jobs and so on. If we go to any item on this sheet, it shows in most instances - I wouldn't say all - but Winnipeg is on the top of the list. For instance, let us use cement: for one bag of cement in Halifax, we have to pay \$1.40; Montreal - \$1.50; Toronto - \$1.50; Edmonton - \$1.35; and Winnipeg - \$1.69. It's the highest. So we have to come to the conclusion that the costs in Winnipeg are almost at the top of the list, be it food supplies or construction components; and we go on the other hand, our wages are almost at the bottom of the list, or sixth from the bottom of the 39 cities that a study was made of. So I think that not only should we review our criteria for minimum wages but we should also probably look at the fair wage too.

I feel that this also probably is a good question of maybe placing a floor beneath the national standard of living. It's time that we should start looking at this area. I personally myself am particularly interested in the investigation into possibilities of ensuring a level of income for all adults that they would need and would not probably require other welfare services. I think it should provide a measure of the kind of personal freedom which the administration of welfare programs usually destroys. I know that this program required much more study and careful study, but this is perhaps something that we may do in this House. I think a system of income supplements with proper incentives may be a question that may go a long way, and, in the long run, may be much less expensive to the province than many other welfare programs. So, Mr. Speaker, I do support the resolution. I cannot find much wrong with it and I intend to support it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I was reluctant to become involved in this debate because I believed that the resolution is so reasonable a one as would indeed attract the support of all sides of the House. I thought that I heard that support when I heard the Minister of Labour speak, when he said that he supports the wording of the resolution, and then I heard the Member for Assiniboia speak and he said that he supports the resolution. Therefore, I find very little to argue about except what was said by the Minister of Labour in making his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I thought that last year we established the fact that members on all sides of the House were sincerely trying to put their position in as reasonable a manner as is possible. I thought that we established to the Minister of Labour that we had recommendations to make, which he shouldn't pre-suppose are based on any particular position, and yet we get the Minister of Labour today standing up and saying: "If you people are interested in forcing something down somebody's throat, that you people are interested in establishing wages; are interested in fixing wages." Well, Mr. Speaker, I could possibly take that from some economic Liberal who believed that everything should find its own level and that the processes of collective bargaining were sufficient to establish a free system of wages, and indeed I think that in our present economy that's what should be done, and I think that this is what this side of the House has been arguing. But the Minister of Labour suggests that we are trying to force a particular position; that we are trying to take some dictatorial position which he abhors.

Now, let's look at how deeply he abhors the taking of a position. First of all, he says he wouldn't tell a board what to do. Well, Mr. Speaker, has he looked at his own legislation, because that's exactly what the legislation that he is the Minister for supervising, for administering, does, and if he doesn't agree that it should be there, he should change it. As a matter of fact, the way he now talks, he is suggesting that the board is in fact not following the legislation, because his own legislation, Mr. Speaker, tells the board exactly what it's supposed to do. "A board in setting the recommendations it makes to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall take into consideration and be guided by the cost to an employee of purchasing the necessities of life and health." That's his legislation; he is telling the board what to do. And

(MR. GREEN cont'd)... if he suggests that we are taking that type of posture, then I suggest to him that he is wrong.

But more than that, Mr. Speaker, more than telling the board what to do, his legislation in fact prevents the very type of free collective bargaining that he speaks of. Mr. Speaker, there sits a Minister of Labour who for two years has sat on the fact that in Manitoba a court can order a person back to work. He says he won't tell anybody what to do, but if he sits as Minister of Labour in a province where the law says that the court can tell people that they must work - and let's be quite specific - two years ago a group of plasterers left their jobs where they were earning \$2.75 an hour and went to work for somebody who was paying \$2.85. Free collective bargaining? The court ordered them to go back to work for the employer who was paying \$2.75, and that Minister who believes in free collective bargaining has sat for two years and done nothing about changing that situation. And why won't he change it? He says that the Woods Committee, composed of roughly 12 labour people and 12 employer people, have been considering the problem and they haven't arrived at an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, this Minister apologizes for the fact that he hasn't brought in any legislation at all on these matters -- Mr. Speaker, this Minister apologizes for the fact that he hasn't brought in any legislation on these subjects because some board, the Woods Committee - I repeat, the petrified Forest Committee - hasn't brought in a suggestion as to what to do. We don't object to the board; we object to the way in which this Minister is using those boards. Let's take the Minimum Wage Board; it's a very good example. They sat, Mr. Speaker, from December of 1966 approximately. Before the House met the Minister had that board start sitting so that he could tell the Legislature: "We can't discuss this subject; the board is thinking about it." It met in December of 1966 to discuss minimum wages. Sometime during the summer, I believe - and I could be wrong about the date but I think I'm being conservative when I say the summer, it may have been later than the summer - Mr. Speaker, sometime around that period the Chairman of that board, who is Mr. McLean, who is also the Vice-Chairman of the Woods Committee - and they operate in the same way - the Chairman of that Board gave as his excuse, and the Minister knows this, for the fact that the board had not made a report, gave as his excuse that the members of the board were not unanimous.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's examine the position of a Chairman under those circumstances. He is saying to these labour people on the board - and I suggest to you that those are the people that he's talking to - "Until you people agree to a wage, there's not going to be an increase in the minimum wage." He told that to the press. He told that to the radio stations. He said the reason we haven't brought in a report is because there is no unanimity. And, Mr. Speaker, this Minister is prepared to continue under those circumstances, and it wasn't until there was severe agitation following his statement that he finally brought in a report which was a minority report, which had - and I think that it's reasonable to expect that there will be from time to time a minority report - which had a minority report on the part of the individual labour members.

So, we have a Minister who pretends to believe in the free market and the free forces of collective bargaining to determine wages and gives lip-service to that, who at the same time, Mr. Speaker, has legislation which I repeat says to a worker: "Not that you shall not strike, but that you must work, because in Manitoba a failure to work has been declared to be a strike." A failure to work for any reason; a failure to work because you don't like the man that you're working with; a failure to work because you don't like the wages you are getting; this can be and has been enjoined against under the laws that are administered by the Minister of Labour who says he believes in free collective bargaining. In Manitoba, a worker can't walk down the street with a sign and protest the amount of his wages. He can't say I protest the amount of wages that this employer is paying. And this law, free collective bargaining, under a Minister who says that he believes in the free play of the market insofar as establishing higher wages are concerned.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we could take that from somebody who actually demonstrated that his department was prepared to let those wages be set freely, but he's not, Mr. Speaker. He has sat, as I've indicated, for two years with these laws in Manitoba on the basis that 24 representatives can't come to an agreement on the subject, and if they can't come to an agreement his government is not going to legislate, is going to continue with those laws.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as long as he is behaving in that way, then let him not point to those members of the House and say that they are the dictator; they are the ones who are against free

(MR. GREEN cont'd)... collective bargaining; they are against the free market finding the level of wages. It's he who is against it. It's he who has laws which now say - and let's look at the way in which he has given his friends the best of both worlds - because the present Labour Relations Act says that collective agreements must be for a year, not less than a year. That means that a group of employees who sign a collective agreement with their employer are bound to those wages for a year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this society often talks about how it abhors wage controls, but it's going to control those wages for at least one year. There is nothing in his Act which says that the prices of that product have to be controlled for a year. So we have, Mr. Speaker, by a very subtle process designed by this type of government, we have what they have said would never happen; we have in fact a modified but effective form of wage control but free prices insofar as the sale of the products are concerned. So that a worker who signs a collective agreement based on today's prices is bound to those wages for at least a year, while prices of everything he buys may go up and he can't do anything about his wages. This is taking place under a Minister who says that he believes in the free forces of the market, insofar as the free collective bargaining, insofar as determining wages are concerned.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a model of this free type of collective bargaining; it's not as if I'm talking about a Utopia. The laws in England will tell him that this is not free collective bargaining, and as long as you don't have free collective bargaining in this province, then let him not say that this party - which is not in power after all - is the one that is trying to force things, because his party and that Minister is responsible for any lack of freedom which exists, and I suggest it does exist in our present law.

Mr. Speaker, I had proposed last year a very simple, a very simple remedy, something which - again not one person in this House spoke against - I proposed that nobody be ordered to work under pain of being in contempt of court. The Minister voted against that. Not only did he vote against it, worse than that, he somehow got everyone of his colleagues to vote that a man could go to work and be forced to work under pain of being in contempt of court.

I proposed another very simple solution which would free collective bargaining. I proposed that nobody be enjoined for walking down the street carrying a sign bearing information. What a very radical position. It's a position that would be taken by every person who believes in civil liberties in the last 200 years. Conservative, Liberal, Communist, Socialist, Fascist, men of all political persuasion would say that a man perhaps should not be forced to refrain from walking down the street carrying a sign. But the Minister voted against that, and not only did he vote against it, he got all his colleagues to vote against it. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the Communists or the Fascists wouldn't put that kind of rule in, so if the Minister wants to link himself up with someone, perhaps he could find that there are bedfellows who he could associate with, but certainly no democratic-loving person would propose such legislation except against the trade unionists. And this is the man who talks about free collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, the last proposition that the Minister proposes is by far the worst. He suggests that he agrees that his board is working under the criteria which our resolution proposes. Well, if they are, then they're somehow not obeying the rules of their existing statutes. Now, I don't agree with him that they are offending the statutes, but if he agrees that these should be the criteria, then in heaven's name what prevents him from amending the statutes to conform with what he says the board is now doing. There's nothing at all, Mr. Speaker, except that Minister's obstinacy against accepting a change which we think is a progressive one, because I agree, and the resolution states that there has been in the House arguments about \$1.50, \$1.75, and by the way, we don't think these things are unreasonable. If the Minister thinks working at minimum wages of \$1.75 are unreasonable, then perhaps he would indicate that the rate of \$1.75 provides more than what is necessary for a man to enjoy life in Manitoba, if he suggests that that is an unreasonable wage.

But we have had these arguments and we say that they have not been productive, and therefore we say that the board should be given a new set of criteria so that they could come to a reasonable proposal for minimum wages, which of course has to be in the end decided by the Cabinet, and there's nothing in my honourable friend's resolution that says that they don't ultimately decide this in the Cabinet. We say that the board should be given this set of criteria and that the Cabinet should, in the last analysis, accept the responsibility for

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) determining the minimum wage.

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

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, when the amendment or the sub-amendment was before us on this particular resolution, I had some brief comments to make at that time, and I feel that at this particular time I would like to make some new comments and perhaps the resolution will come to a vote today.

In looking over the resolution as it appears on Page 2 in its original form, the first part of the preamble, and I quote: "Whereas the Canadian Wheat Board makes payments to farmers on any date in the year suitable to the Board," it infers that the Wheat Board, the Canadian Wheat Board - which incidentally has been doing a good job as a selling agent for the farmer - it infers that the Board is operating in a very unbusinesslike manner and in a very haphazard way. That is, the preamble suggests that the Wheat Board just makes payments to the farmers at any old time of the year at all that's suitable to the Board, and I don't think that this is quite so. I think that the Board should be congratulated on the job that they have been doing and not condemned for their implied or inferred haphazard measures.

Now the second paragraph in the preamble states, and I quote: "Whereas the date on which the payments are mailed varies each year." That is so. It has been varying each year but always with certain justification, that is there's always justification certainly, probably not in the minds of some of the growers there's no justification, but surely the Board feels that there's some justification for making payments at the times that they have been making them in the past.

The third paragraph of the preamble certainly says, and I quote: "Whereas the farmer must be able to rely on receiving his Wheat Board cheque at the same time every year to carry on his operations." Well it would be helpful if he did. He could do a little more planning probably if he did. It would be helpful. It probably isn't imperative that he receive them every year, but it would be helpful.

Now when I spoke to this resolution before, Mr. Speaker, I pointed out some of the reasons why the Board in the past has not been able to pay payments on a specific set date every year, and I pointed out that Providence had a great deal to do with the size of the crop, not only in Canada but the size of the crop the world over. In 1966 and 1967 Canada had a bumper crop of wheat as you know very well, Mr. Speaker, and so did United States have a pretty good crop that year and so did a lot of the importing nations have a pretty good crop. I think it was something like \$2 billion, the world wheat crop, in both 1966 and 1967, and when the world produces bushels of that magnitude, then it means that there are not so many people in the market to purchase wheat and so the Canadian Wheat Board were not able to make those huge sales that they would have like to make. I think that we in this House should be very careful in our recommendations not to impose measures which could impair the efficiency of the Canadian Wheat Board. We certainly have to be responsible when we are considering a lot of our resolutions and I believe that we are.

The farmers of Canada, and this is true I suppose of every other nation in the world, but the farmers in Canada have been encouraged by governments and other organizations and institutions to grow all of the wheat that it is possible to grow, and they have made an excellent job of doing that since Manitoba's wheat crop has grown substantially in the last fifteen years through the use of fertilizers and other mechanization, and Providence again - Providence again has been very kind and we have had good crops.

Now last year, everyone knows what happened. In addition to having one of the best crops that we ever had on record, we had the greatest quantity of the No. 1 top-grade wheat that we ever had in Canada's history I guess, more No. 1 Northern than we ever produced. And do you know what the Canadian Wheat Board found? While it was nice to have a lot of Grade No. 1 wheat, No. 1 Hard Wheat, it wasn't the easiest kind of wheat in the world to sell. That is, the buying nations were more ready to buy greater quantities of the poorer grades of wheat. There are so many things to consider when you are talking about selling wheat.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat, as usual, but I see the new aspiring Minister is in his seat, the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, and I'm glad to see him there because he does at least grow some wheat down in his country. Providence has been good to the Tories as well as to the people on this side of the House and we have all been pretty successful farmers in the last two or three years, but it is kind of disappointing to members on this side of the House to see only two front benchers, and by that I mean literally front benchers, there are only two— here comes my honourable friend the member for Dauphin coming in now — they do grow a little bit of wheat up in his country too you know. — (Interjection) — Pardon? Was somebody speaking to me?

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I don't think you should forget the Speaker coming from Swan River Valley.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well of course the Speaker from Swan River Valley is kind of obligated to be in his seat when the Mace is on the table, and that doesn't go for my honourable friends opposite. They dash in and dash out, and they dash out more than they dash in. It's only the division bells that gets them to dash in as they did last evening and on so many different occasions.

But what this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is asking this House to do, is what? It's asking this House to urge the Canadian Wheat Board to close out the various pools at a set date every year regardless, regardless of the number of bushels of unsold grain, regardless of that — there could be a billion bushels — but regardless of the number of bushels, close them out anyway and make a payment. That's exactly what they are doing. So what they are saying in effect is that we in this Assembly know, by our great studies in depth that we make under the Dome here, that we know far better than the officials of the Canadian Wheat Board how to handle their business. I don't know whether we do or not. In fact, I'm darn sure that I don't. By gosh, I see the Speaker has even left our midst, but welcome to the Deputy. Welcome to the Deputy.

Now, Deputy Speaker, you being a farmer, do you feel that you are more qualified to dictate policy and program to the Canadian Wheat Board than the long-time officials and directors of the Canadian Wheat Board? I don't feel that I am qualified to say that. I don't think I am, because surely the Canadian Wheat Board, the selling agents of the farmers, you will admit has made a pretty good job — a pretty good job as acting as our agent in the last how many years? Thirty or forty years. They have made a pretty fair job, and are we in this House going to tell them at this stage in history that you have made a poor job, we believe that we can do a better one and we recommend the proposal set out in the resolution that's before us?

Now I think — and I don't know what the Honourable Member for Virden has done in this regard — I'm wondering whether the Honourable Member for Virden, the member that has put this resolution on the Order Paper, has he had a real heart-to-heart talk with the officials of the Canadian Wheat Board? Has he talked with the Directors? Has he sat down with them and discussed in real detail whether or not the proposal that he puts forward in the resolution is a workable one? Is it possible to do it? Is it sensible? Is it sound? Can it be carried out?

Now if he has not discussed it with the Directors of the Wheat Board and the top of officials, has he discussed it with his own Minister of Agriculture — his part-time Minister of Agriculture — has he discussed it with him? Surely to goodness the Minister of Agriculture, given his dues, he still isn't as qualified when it comes to managing the Canadian Wheat Board as some of the long-time directors, but what advice did the Minister of Agriculture give to the Honourable Member for Virden? Has he discussed the proposal with the aspiring Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne? He grows a lot of wheat. I don't know how his abilities are in the field of selling wheat, but has he discussed this with a lot of the backbenchers? What about his seat mate, the former Premier? It would be difficult to discuss anything with him, Mr. Speaker, because he's never in the House, but he must attend some of the caucus meetings. And surely the former Premier who professes to be most knowledgeable in this whole field of agriculture, so knowledgeable that he spoke at great length the other day at the Manitoba Conference at the University, and what was his subject matter? "Wheat and its Relating Problems". Now what did the former Premier have to say in this respect?

Well, I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that both you and I anyway, and most of the members

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) on this side of the House, would like to hear what the officials of the Wheat Board have to say. What is wrong with that proposition? Let's hear what they have to say about the proposal that appears before us at the moment. And so to enable the Directors and the Wheat Board and the officials of the Board to come and meet with us, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after the word "Board" in the first line and substituting the following:

"Occupies a position of special importance in the marketing of Canada's wheat, oats and barley crops; and

"Whereas Manitoba farmers have a vital interest in the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board, including the administration of wheat, oats and barley pools and the time of year when payments from these pools are made; and

"Whereas it is of interest and concern to members of this House to be familiar with the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board and the views of the members of that Board;

"Therefore Be It Resolved that the Committee on Agriculture be instructed to invite representatives of the Canadian Wheat Board to meet with the members of the Committee to discuss and consider the question of the Canadian Wheat Board operations in general, and in particular, the administration of the wheat, oats and barley pools and the time of payments from them to the farmers."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. D. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell who was absent last Tuesday.

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

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I don't want to debar my friend the Member for Russell an opportunity of taking part in this debate and I am quite prepared to grant unanimous consent to the honourable member to partake in the debate, but I point out that the honourable member who adjourned the debate was the mover of the resolution and it would be contrary to the rules to permit any other member to speak after that having been done. But, as I say, I'm prepared to allow or give consent to the honourable member to take part in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party for bringing to my attention an oversight on my part. We have this situation and I wonder, in view of the circumstances, if the honourable member for Birtle-Russell, by leave, might proceed under the circumstances.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, there is the additional problem I think on a point of order, as to whether or not by transferring his right to speak to the Member for Birtle-Russell the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye is thereby nullifying his own right to wind up the debate, resulting in a continuation of a process which might by unanimous consent be carried on, but I fear getting us into a situation to which there is no finality, because if my honourable friend cannot wind up the debate, then who can?

MR. SPEAKER: I am fully conscious of the position in which the House finds itself and I'm sure the Honourable Member for La Verendrye is of the same mind, and he would possibly acknowledge the suggestion that's put forward in giving up his right to speak if the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell is allowed to continue.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just in order that we're on four square, in essence, then, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell would be closing the debate on behalf of the mover of the resolution. Would that be the understanding?

MR. LYON: I think that would have to be, could be the only understanding, because otherwise there would be a continuation of the debate with no one winding it up, so if my honourable friend is transferring the right to close the debate to the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, then we would be prepared to give that consent.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, with all deference, I do not follow the logic of my honourable friends who have spoken in this regard, because the right to

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) "close the debate", as it is called, is just a privilege that the mover of a substantive motion has of speaking twice, which other members don't have. It's a privilege and a privilege only, and it is not necessary, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that a debate be closed in that way. The debate is closed when a vote comes and the mover of a motion does not necessarily have to close that debate, so I do not see that it follows that my honourable friend has to be considered as the closer of the debate if he speaks.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . on the point of order again, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I haven't the citation to quote from but it has been a past precedent established in this House that when a person takes the adjournment of a debate that person being the mover of the debate, it is usually agreed upon, and it's to me historic at least that it's understood that in taking the adjournment, the debate is closed to anyone else within the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the better part of valour in this respect is for me to take this matter under advisement and I will come forward with a ruling in due course in the entire matter, so we'll pass on to the next item.

Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. James. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I note with interest and am also grateful that the mover of the amendment acknowledges a very important fact, that there exists a problem in this utilization of equipment provided within our municipal schools and municipal systems. My resolution in the first place, Mr. Speaker, was very simple. I stated, quite clearly I thought, that I appreciate the work that has been done by a number of school boards, by a number of municipal councils, in trying to get the maximum utilization of equipment, premises and so on for the use of the public at large. The amendment to the resolution

MR. SPEAKER: remind the honourable gentlemen that the Honourable Member for St. James has the floor, and I wondered if a little attention could be paid to him.

MR. STANES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment to the resolution acknowledges the fact that there can be greater use - we are in full agreement with that. He also states that it is appreciated the work that has been done by many councils, by many school boards, which I also stated I think we are all agreed. Except, Mr. Speaker, he continues then with the Resolved portion, that changes it from using methods by which one can get better utilization out of existing equipment, to the effect that we should have joint bodies in new equipment. I therefore cannot support that because it changes the very basis of the original resolution.

I think it is a good resolution in itself, but not as an amendment. I think that to bring in a resolution, which the amendment does do, a new proposition that there should be more co-operation between school boards and municipal councils in building of premises, utilization of school premises for recreation and so on, I think it's a very good thing, but it does bring up a number of other problems. You are then asking two bodies duly elected to co-operate on the matter: who pays? Who's responsible to the public? This opens up the very subject which I am trying to resolve on existing equipment.

The reason I brought this matter up in the first place is not that it is not working fairly satisfactorily in some areas, but we are closing down a number of schools and I'd like to see someone made responsible for those schools, not only in acknowledging the maintenance and responsibility for them, financial and otherwise, but also in organizing their use. Therefore I, in closing, Mr. Speaker, say that I cannot accept the amendment because it's another story. Not that I disagree with it but I think it's another resolution and takes away from the very purpose of my resolution in the first place. I do urge members to defeat the amendment as it stands at the moment, to support the resolution as it stands, and perhaps discuss at some later date the amendment as a resolution on its own.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I so move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, in considering this resolution one must look at the various services that a municipal government offers its people and the efficiency with which different levels of municipal government are capable of offering those services. In other words what I am saying is that cost alone ought not be the only issue but also the quality of service. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the establishment of one municipal government responsible for the administration and municipal services in Greater Winnipeg is not only desirable but but at this point it in fact is necessary, and I say this because under one central administration we would enjoy a higher standard of services. Now it may be argued that some of the services presently offered in different fields by certain municipalities within Metropolitan Winnipeg are at the present time at a high standard, and this may be true, and this no doubt is correct in many cases, but I would suggest to you that the level of the efficiency of the services presently offered may not be adequate in the years to come, and the various municipal councils that we now have offering those different services - be it police, fire, what have you - may not be capable of increasing the efficiency of their own operations and expanding their own departments to offer the people the type of service that they may demand in the future; and therefore I suggest that the preparatory work, the ground work for this, must be laid now.

(MR. BEN HANUSCHAK) cont'd.) . . .

One of the areas of responsibility of a municipal government is the protection of its citizens. It's the provision of an adequate and a well-trained and a well-equipped police department, and it is within this very area of police protection that there's been considerable discussion over the past couple of years on both sides of the fence, those arguing for the assumption of a central administration taking the responsibility for police protection, and those arguing against.

Now it's been said by those who have argued against it that the police services would suffer if this were taken over by a central authority, because then it would become a larger operation, the police would not be as familiar with the people of their community, with the problems of the people of their community and the residents within any given area, but this need not necessarily happen, Mr. Speaker, because regardless of whether the police department is under the jurisdiction of a local authority within some municipality within Metropolitan Winnipeg, or under one central authority, you still have police officers assigned to work in different areas you likely will still have the same number of policemen, the policemen will still have the same opportunity to become acquainted with the area within which they are assigned to work.

Now, those who argue against this say that the police department will become less personal; it'll be more removed from the community as such. Now if this is bad -- and I'm not quite sure whether it is because I am inclined to think that it is better, because if the police department is somewhat more removed from the community then there's less likelihood, less danger of residents asking the police department of favors, special considerations, as from time to time happens, and then you will have a police department which would deal with all residents on a more fair and equitable basis.

It's also been said that a small suburban police force affords better training for police officers, that a police officer working on a small police force has greater opportunity to experience a wider, broader range of responsibility; but I would like to point out to this House, Mr. Speaker, that one learns not merely by being involved in diverse activities, but it's more so by working with experience and highly trained personnel. In other words, just simply being involved in the apprehension of criminals in various situations, and in being involved in a variety of other activities, if there isn't a proper guidance, a proper supervision, then I suggest to you that the policeman really benefits and gains very little from that type of experience, and in a small police force it is more difficult to offer the policeman the proper type of guidance and supervision that would really bring out the best within that particular officer. There aren't the proper and adequate training facilities for policemen in the suburbs, and certainly it can't be expected that they ever would be able to provide the same for themselves. And secondly, Mr. Speaker, police work is becoming increasingly more complex as the years go by, and, as I've indicated before in my opening remarks, the day is going to come that the suburban municipalities simply will not be able to train and equip a police force capable of handling the types of problems that they'll be faced with.

It's also been argued that a unified system such as we speak of in our resolution or that a resolution of this type would create, as suggested by the mover, the Honourable Member for Inkster, would in fact lead to a reduction in local service, but here again, Mr. Speaker, in fact the opposite is true, because at the present time the number of policemen that you have in any particular area is largely dependent on the number of policemen that those particular residents can afford to keep on their payroll, and you'll find a great variation between various municipalities based on that fact, whereas under a unified system it's quite true that at some given moment you might have fewer policemen in one area than in another, but in the event of need of additional police strength in any given area, it will become much simpler to channel the forces into that given area than it is at the present time where, if one municipality does require additional police assistance, then they must contact some neighboring municipality for the reinforcement of their ranks.

Then, of course it's been said that there are inherent dangers of a police force becoming too large, that it's dangerous to place the power that a police force commands in the hands of one person, but I suggest to you that that is not really a valid argument against a centralized police force, but rather that this whole issue should be decided on -- or that these factors should be taken into consideration deciding this issue: firstly, the quality of the policing services offered, the efficiency of the operation, and really the efficiency in detection of crime and apprehension of criminals. And if there is any danger in bigness then it is more than compensated by

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.)... greater efficiency, and really there is no evidence anywhere, Mr. Speaker, that a large police force is necessarily bad. We have larger police forces than what we have here in London, in Metropolitan Toronto, and there's no evidence from there that by reason of the fact that it is large that it is bad.

It's also said that it would impair the job security of the police officers who are currently on suburban police forces, but in fact the opposite may happen. If the police officer is well-trained, a larger police force would give him greater opportunity for promotion, for advancement, for specialization in the type of field that he is most interested in, is best trained for.

And lastly, this brings me back to my opening remarks when I said that we ought not consider this strictly on the basis of costs, because here again, even though costs may rise and if they do rise it will not be because of centralization, but the only fact that may contribute to an increase in costs will be the wishes, the demands of the people themselves. If they wish improved, more efficient services, then that factor may increase the costs of the operation, but not the fact that the police force has been centralized.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that a unified police force would be more likely to be able to afford to provide and utilize proper technical equipment which is so necessary today in the efficient operation of a police force. As I have indicated at the outset, there would be greater opportunity for specialization. It would eliminate the problems of communication to obtain assistance that we now have. We could maintain higher standards of recruiting and training. There would be better opportunity for advancement. There would be uniform law enforcement throughout entire Metropolitan Winnipeg which we do not have at the present time insofar as many of the by-laws, even though the by-laws may be the same as between one municipality and another, but the attitude taken by one police force toward it may differ from that taken by another. And above all, Mr. Speaker, it would also reduce the factor of political interference which we so frequently have in the smaller police forces, where the police force does become a political football for the municipal council.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that now is the time to take immediate action on this, not step by step, not one department by one department, but rather the establishment of a central administration for all municipal services for entire Greater Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster in amendment thereto. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, may we have this resolution stand. If there is anyone wishes to speak, they may do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Minister of Welfare.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat encouraged by the Leader of the New Democratic Party and his constituent the Member for St. Boniface, to say a word or two in this debate here today. I was somewhat impressed by the opening remarks of the Member for St. Boniface and I thought for a moment that calm and common sense would prevail throughout his speech when he indicated that he felt that politics had no part in a subject as important to the people of Manitoba as health services and welfare programs and things of that kind. Unfortunately, he was carried away with his oratorical eloquence and off he went, dragging his subject behind him, not letting it deter him or dissuade him of course from what I consider to be his main objective, and that was to attack the members of the front bench and those members of the New Democratic Party that might happen to get in his way. And he was particularly aiming his references to those members of the front bench who were beyond the reach of his voice. I think the Member for St. Boniface is really very easily offended. He likes, of course, to have an audience when he's speaking. He's one of those great grand-standers who likes to put on a show for the people, and a show he did give us the last time that he spoke on this subject --(Interjection)-- Oh, I probably will make some references to it. . . .

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): I just want to make sure.

MR. CARROLL: As the member for St. Boniface ranted and raved through his remarks, I was reminded of a poem, I don't know who wrote it, something about - in French dialect - something about "The wind she blow on Lac St. Clair." Well, every time the Member for St. Boniface gets up, the wind she blows from St. Boniface, I think, and one of our

MR. DESJARDINS: That's Drummond.

MR. CARROLL: Lac St. ?

MR. DESJARDINS: We'll give him a French lesson tomorrow.

MR. CARROLL : Whatever Lac it was, the inference is there. The wind blows hard when our friend gets eloquent and unfortunately the press referred to his speech as being colourful, so I'm sure that this will lend him further encouragement in the days ahead.

I do agree with his opening comment, though, that this is a serious subject, one which should have the best efforts and thoughts and considerations of members of this House. I speak for the government when I say that we want to see all Manitobans adequately protected with health services. Over 70% of the people in our province now are part of health care plans, and we are particularly concerned for those who are unable, for whatever reasons, to become part of this kind of a plan, who today do not have adequate coverage. The philosophy of our government was stated to the Royal Commission on Health Services when we pointed out that we were in favour of a voluntary plan and that our efforts should go to help those people who were unable to take advantage of schemes that are available today.

I think in the voluntary plan we have people who have adequate financial means, people in medium and high income groups; we have people who have adequate coverage in their own right or through company plans or union plans of one kind or another. And we think it's right that they should continue to get the kind of service that they prefer and that they want for themselves, and this would enable government to focus its limited resources on those of low income or no income, so that they may become part of a health care program. The Member for St. Boniface, I think, even led us to believe that he was in favour of this kind of scheme, so I suggest to him that he come along with us in our effort to try to provide a kind of scheme that will give us early protection of the people in our province who are unable to get protection at the present time.

He insisted, however, on playing games by trying to - categorize I suppose is the word - the members on the front bench with respect to whether they were on the left wing or part of the right wing of their particular party. He had me tabbed as one of the left wingers and I suppose if he means that I'm one of those people who is concerned about people, then I welcome that tag.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh boy, he's really giving you ammunition now.

MR. CARROLL: I think that we have given evidence that we do have concern for those unfortunate people who are unable to provide for themselves, the widows with children, the neglected children in our province, the elderly and people who are unemployable. I'm a left winger if I advocate programs to rehabilitate or to prevent social or financial breakdown. I'm a left winger, I suppose, if I advocate programs for people living in slum areas, for people living under depressed circumstances throughout the province, for people who are locked into uneconomic industries - the fisheries, the fur trade or things of that kind. But I would like to say that I'm not left wing enough to jeopardize the economic health of our nation for a plan which has intrinsic merit in its own right but which is not vital to the provision of health care for those in need today. And I think that other ways can and should be found to meet this situation. ..

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK Q.C. (St. John's): A means test.

MR. CARROLL: And why do we express concern for the economic health of our nation and of our own province? I think the evidence was given a year ago when the Treasurer was speaking on his budget and he reported to the House on the findings of the Tax Structure Committee, in which it pointed out that by 1971, the provinces together with their municipalities in Canada would be running in deficit by \$2 to \$2 1/2 billion a year.

"The Minister of Health, in referring to health services in his province, said the health costs were frightening and in 10 years the whole system could come tumbling down." Quote the Minister of Health for the Province of Saskatchewan. And that's why I supported the Bill that was before the House last year. The Bill that was before the House last year provided no alternative at that time, as we saw the situation, and I think circumstances have changed very substantially in the province since that -- in Canada since that particular time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Hog Wash.

MR. CARROLL: In talking about my fear of rising costs, I think all one has to do is

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.)... point to the results of the Hospital Plan which have indicated the tripling of costs in some 10 years. We know that costs will go up anyway but they'll certainly go up much more quickly in a compulsory scheme than they otherwise might.

With respect to our own Medicare program, in 1960 under the Social Allowances Act, the cost of providing Medicare to an individual was \$1.43 per month. By 1967, this has risen to \$5.09 and will be going up again as a result of negotiations that are presently under way.

I think another concern that we should have is the availability of services, the availability of medical personnel, the availability of facilities. We believe that a new approach on a voluntary basis would enable coverage more in line with our ability to pay and more in line with our ability to provide services.

The Member for St. Boniface on occasion is a proponent of freedom and this of course happens to be one of those occasions when he is a proponent of compulsion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I've made that quite clear and the Minister is not correct in saying this.

MR. CARROLL: Do I understand that you're not in favour of a compulsory Medicare scheme?

MR. DESJARDINS: Ordinarily, that's right. I made that quite clear.

MR. CARROLL: I'm quite willing to accept that statement.

The Federal Government has said that we can avail ourselves of a federal subsidy if we serve all of the people, the rich and poor alike within our province, but if we're looking to the poor only, the medically indigent, those for whom the provision of health services means deprivation in other areas of their lives, then there's no Federal Government help. Except, of course, through the limited means of sharing under the Canada Assistance Plan

MR. PAULLEY: Let them die.

MR. CARROLL: and this is the area in which we feel that we should be establishing priorities for the limited funds available to the governments of Canada - federal and provincial.

Under the Social Allowances Act, of course, we do provide for persons in need, a very comprehensive kind of Medicare program. The Leader of the New Democratic Party, of course, he has never been able to understand the needs test and has labelled our program as the meanest test of all.

MR. PAULLEY: Right.

MR. CARROLL: Well, we think we have a realistic test; it may not be perfect. We also think that the people who administer it are thoughtful and reasonable people, and in cases that do not fit our regulations, they have the right and the privilege to recommend that it be considered as a special case, and if the individual whose case is before them feels that he has been inadequately dealt with, or if his advocate, whoever he may be, wants to intercede on his behalf, they have the right to appeal to an appeal board. Because I'm willing to say that we aren't perfect, and that some people may make mistakes, but there have been very few cases that have gone to appeal, and in those cases that have I would think that the department has upheld as often as it goes the other way.

The case in question that was raised by the Leader of the New Democratic Party was not appealed, and the case was not recommended for special consideration by members of our staff. And I just want to point out that there were circumstances which existed that were not mentioned by the Leader of the New Democratic Party. That doesn't mean that there isn't a case here that should go to appeal. We're concerned about cases such as this and we're looking at our recommendations, particularly as they relate to prepaid funerals, to see if a more realistic level should not be allowed. But in this case there were other factors in addition to the one of the prepaid funeral that were involved, and I think this is probably not the time nor the place to discuss individual cases. But I do think that there is a mechanism here which does allow reasonable opportunity for people to make sure that they have a fair hearing to entitle them to the full and comprehensive medical service that is provided under the Social Allowances Act.

In general, I think that we are providing a reasonably good and satisfactory service for those people who are at the lowest level of our income scale: the elderly, the Mothers' Allowance cases, the unemployable and child welfare. But others, who are referred to sometimes as the medically indigent in the Province of Manitoba, are in very difficult straits and I believe that we should be directing our efforts towards trying to help these people. Today, two

April 16, 1968

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) . . . out of 10 provinces have indicated their willingness to try to come in under the Federal Health Scheme. They represent some 15% of the people of Canada. We personally have some doubt that one of those provinces will be able to qualify. We're looking forward with interest to see whether or not they do.

There have been some doubts expressed by the right wing of the Federal Party, Mr. Sharp and Mr. Winters. Mr. Trudeau has been quoted as having said that we've certainly gone far enough. I don't know that he's ever said that he's gone too far, but I certainly think that the failure of their Medicare program does warrant some second thoughts about the scheme that is before us today, and I think that the time has come for a re-examination and a re-thinking of the present plans to see if we can't come forward with a plan that is better tailored to the economic and the health needs of the people of Canada today -- (Interjection)-- The change was very substantial. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe that some interruptions are inevitable, but since the Minister has taken the floor, there has been a constant amount of interruptions and I would ask the honourable gentlemen to pay the respects of the Minister while he is speaking.

MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just about finished. I was asked what the change was. I think the only change that - and it was a very substantial one - was of course the fact that the Federal Government themselves were having second thoughts and were openly questioning whether or not they should be proceeding, in the light of the present economic circumstances, with a plan that obviously might jeopardize the economy of the nation. At least two of our senior Cabinet ministers, both of whom were leadership candidates, indicated that they would be quite prepared to re-open this issue once the leadership race had been completed. There were certainly substantial doubts cast over the scheme as to whether or not it was going to proceed after the leadership convention. It was during this period of time that the Government of Manitoba had to take decisions as to whether or not we could proceed with a Medicare program. In view of the very substantial doubt that was being expressed at that time we felt, as many other provinces felt, eight out of ten, that it was not a propitious time to proceed with this program. So this is the main reason why we sought at that time to take steps that would enable us to delay our consideration of the matter until such time as further steps could be taken in consultation with the Government of Canada. So it is, Mr. Chairman, that I propose to vote against the proposed amendment that is before us at this time.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question. I didn't want to interrupt him at the time, but during his discourse, Mr. Speaker, he intimated that in connection with a specific matter or specific case that I had raised in the House on a person on a prepaid funeral plan, that I hadn't given all of the facts or circumstances to the House. My question to my honourable friend, and I agree with him that this isn't the place to air individual and personal problems, but I would like the honourable friend to answer me whether he suggested that I was deliberately evading laying before this House the full circumstances, or are the circumstances that he has in mind circumstances that have prevailed over the year and a half that I have had this case under the consideration of the Department of Welfare?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't meaning that he distorted the case. I think he used the facts that were available to him to his best advantage, and all of the circumstances were not brought forward in the debate when he spoke on it at that time. I do give the other side of the case. I do feel that this might be a proper case for appeal in view of the doubt that has been raised about it. But I do have confidence in our people who investigated the matter and I feel that it was adequately looked into by them.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Minister of Welfare - he mentioned somebody as an advocate can make the appeal, and I presume he means by that myself. Is there any appeal by the Minister himself who apparently from what he has just said, feels convinced that in this particular case there is room for reconsideration.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, it would be most unusual to appeal against myself, because in effect the decision of the department is the decision of the Minister and I accept responsibility for the decision that was taken. I feel that if others feel that circumstances would warrant an appeal, then the appeal should be launched.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker. . . . one more, because this to me impinges on the presentation that I made, and I tried to be factual and full in it, and I wonder whether the Honourable the Minister would be prepared to meet with me in a joint appeal to the board on behalf of these people. I wonder if the Minister could answer that. He seems to agree with

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)..... me that there are extenuating circumstances in this case that warrant an appeal. He says that he cannot the appeal because he is the department. I ask my honourable friend: will he join with me in an appeal insofar as this particular matter is concerned?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the New Democratic Party is a big boy and he can well launch the appeal on his own behalf. I have indicated my position - it would be quite illogical for me to appeal my own decision, but I would welcome him to take that step. I think it would be a right and proper decision for him to make.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, I'm a big boy, but the Honourable the Minister is a big wheel, and I'd love to have a big wheel and a big boy appealing on behalf of a poor woman who has been prejudiced by the Minister of Welfare.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make a few remarks based on the offering of the Minister. Apparently the Manitoba Medical Society is going to wind up in a very short time, and I think the people would like to know as a service -- the people would like to know just what

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please. I wonder if the honourable gentleman is staying within the bounds of the resolution that we're discussing in what he intends, or is he putting a question to the Minister?

MR. DOERN: No, I'm making a statement, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I'm taking part in the debate.

If the Manitoba Medical Service -MMS- is going to be winding up in a couple of months, I think the people of Manitoba are concerned with just what is going to happen to their medical coverage and their medical facilities, because at the present time things appear to be up in the air and I don't think that the government has really given us any reassurance that the coverage that those of us who are in the plan are presently getting is going to be maintained. Costs are rising and the fees continue to go up. The Minister apparently attributes this to simply a fact in itself and he seems to have argued that the costs would have risen anyway. Some people think costs are rising in anticipation of a medical care plan, but if we have a medical care plan, and if we're getting these rising costs anyway, it seems to me there's at least a hope that by having Medicare we might be able to negotiate and to keep some of these costs down, because I would suggest that they are skyrocketing at present, going up 20 or 30 percent at a crack, and talk about various percentages of "X" and only getting 90 percent of this or 75 percent of this, I think this is all very meaningless.

I think the Member for St. Boniface has argued before that the fee schedule should be included and that we should know and should be able to negotiate just what the doctors should receive. I am also interested in the comments of the Minister that the government really didn't intend to go into Medicare last year, didn't really believe in entering Medicare last year, and I think that's true. They were in a sense forced into it because they certainly don't believe in this kind of coverage, and last year I suppose it looked as if everybody was in so the government was in. This year it looked like everybody was out and so the government got out.

But the question, is, what is going -- the Minister talks about the coverage that is being given today. He says that they have provision for special cases; they take care of people who are sort of at the lower end of the social economic scale; and I agree that they do cover some of these people, but there's still an additional two or three hundred thousand people who are not covered. There's at least a couple of hundred thousand Manitobans who don't have medical coverage. Now I don't know their reasonings for this. Maybe these people aren't intelligent enough to take out medical care. Maybe they can't afford it. And the Minister can talk about all the cases that he covered, those so many thousand cases, but it doesn't include the 30-odd percent Manitobans who have no medical coverage.

He talks about special cases; if a person is turned down they can appeal their hearing. He talks about special hearings, fair hearings and so on. I just wonder how many people really make that kind of an approach. I think people go and apply and are turned down, and as far as they're concerned that's the end of it. I wonder how many cases there really are that you get -- I bet you there's not more than a dozen or two a year that are appealed. There surely aren't hundreds involved.

And the government has, I think, hung itself on a very silly point indeed. They have based one of their reasons for not proceeding with a medical care plan on the fact that it's

(MR. DOERN cont'd.)... unconstitutional. They argue that health is a federal matter. Well --(Interjection)-- oh, they say health is a provincial matter, sorry. The government says that, and that therefore the Federal Government shouldn't get involved, and we heard suggestions made by the Premier and by some of his advisors that they might put up a test case to see whether or not in fact this medical care provision, the federal medical plan, isn't in fact ultra vires or not applicable.

Mr. Speaker, I think that kind of talk to me is meaningless because they could have done this last year. If that was their approach why did they go in? Why didn't they make their test case a year ago? They know as well as I do that there's such a thing as co-operative federalism and I don't care what the constitution says. I don't care whether it's in Section 91 or 92, we have gotten around the provisions of the constitution, we have used the constitution, we have bent the constitution by simply agreeing outside of it. Co-operative federalism has been a fact since 1945.

I think that the Minister has suggested he might look into some of the present limits for a person applying for free Medicare. I think this is long overdue. I've spoken to people who have their lifetime savings of a couple of hundred dollars for funerals --even if it's not for funerals, just a small amount of money, and a suggestion that comes from the department implicit is: spend or get rid of your accumulated life's savings. Get rid of that few hundred bucks you have saved. Spend it down. Get rid of it. Give it away. Hide it. And then you can come to us with cap in hand and we may consider giving you something. You're almost encouraging people to lie and you're encouraging people

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege here, I think he's so grossly distorting what is the fact in the case, that I wouldn't want anyone to take the impression away that we advocate that people evade, give their money away to become eligible. I think this is a distortion of what the facts are.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if a person has an income, if a person has a bank account, and a very very small income like a pension, etc., and it amounts to a few hundred dollars or over a thousand dollars - in one case, I know of one amounting to \$2,000, a couple saving their money for their funeral and for a rainy day and so on - there's a cut-off point about how much money one can have, and the result is if you have more than that, by implication I suggest to qualify you have to get rid of that money. Now you can get rid of it in a pre-paid medical plan. You can gamble it. You can buy yourself a colored TV set. You can give it to your relatives. But the implication is: get rid of that money; spend it or hide it; and I think some people are sorely tempted to hide it or transfer it. We only have, it's true, at present two provinces who are apparently going into the scheme. Saskatchewan, it is obvious, is going to be in and the British Columbia government I suppose is the second one and they are talking about it. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any doubt that Medicare on a national basis province by province, will be a fact within a few years - two to five years I'd say would be an outside limit for all the provinces to be in - and the Manitoba Government, this new government, is throwing away \$15 million, or more - 17 or 17 1/2 or more - and we could use this money and we could cover all the people in this province by using the kind of premiums we're collecting now and putting that together with the Federal Government share; and the result is that government simply ignores that kind of money.

Mr. Speaker, I think, in brief, the government has not made a case as to why this resolution shouldn't be supported. The government talks as if all those in MMS pay their own way and all those outside it are covered by the government. I mean, that's the kind of suggestion one would tend to believe is the result, that if people can't afford it, they just don't have the means etc. etc., the government steps in. Well what about the gap in between? What about the MMS coverage and the few that you cover, the hundreds or thousands that you cover? What about the 200,000 people of Manitoba - are they getting proper medical coverage? I'm worried about them and therefore I think we should support this resolution and back it and proceed with the Medical Care Plan. The people want it; that's the important thing. The government does not want it; they've made that plain. They made it plain right now explaining their actions of last year. But the people of this province want it. If you don't believe them go to them on a referendum, or go to them on an election. Fight an election on Medicare and we'll see what the results will be.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): ...brief remarks. I think the time limit will be satisfactory. We're dealing with the motion and the amendment to bring in Medicare and that

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... it be done so by July 1st of this year. I have no intention of either supporting the amendment or the motion. I think members will remember from last year what my position was and this has not changed in any way --(Interjection)--Well, I'm glad they did change to the extent that they have. I hope they stay with their decision so that we will not go into these compulsory plans which we've had so many which haven't worked out.

I would like to have a full explanation, as some other members have indicated, from the Minister responsible as to the situation regarding MMS and their services. I think we cannot afford to wait until we deal with that matter in the estimates. I think we should have a statement long before that and that this statement should be made as early as possible. To me it seems that the Liberal group are certainly capitulating on principle when they're bringing in a motion of this type. We should be standing up for our rights, and as far as I am concerned, health and welfare both are provincial matters and that we should be the party responsible and not the Federal Government instituting programs and that we just go along, because what will happen is what already has happened on so many occasions, that they bring in shared programs of one kind or another and we go along for awhile and then they drop out, because, as has already been pointed out, then they can claim it's unconstitutional. So I think we should pay closer attention to these arrangements when they do come up and before they are made.

I certainly disagree with the assumption here by my friend who just spoke preceding me, that people in Manitoba would vote for such a plan. They sure wouldn't, and I, if I was the government I'd dare them and go to a referendum because I'm sure they would not. They would not endorse a compulsory medical plan.

A MEMBER: Why?

MR. FROESE: Because the people should have a choice, that's why. The choice should be left with the individual; whether he wants the plan or not, and what type of plan he wants. We have other provinces in Canada that have programs where people can make a choice of their own. Why not just make a contribution to the individuals to support them in acquiring a plan of their choice? Certainly there would be nothing wrong with it and you would maintain the principle of the choice in such an arrangement.

One thing I fail to see is that our government, when they stand up for principles in this matter, why they do not apply the same principle in connection with education. Here we have a similar matter and they have a completely different colour, and I'm referring to the Whereas where it says that: "Whereas the Manitoba taxpayers will therefore be required to pay their share of federal taxes to finance this plan and will not be getting any benefits from the plan." The taxpayers in Manitoba are contributing to the education of this province, educational plans, and yet many areas of this province are not getting any benefit through the 5% sales tax. And I do hope that at some time they come to realize their inconsistency and that this matter will be changed, because by condemning the Federal Government on this point, they are condemning themselves. And this they should realize, in my opinion.

I listened to, with great attention, at some previous occasion when the Honourable Member for St. John's spoke, trying to explain the way, the difference between contributing to a compulsory or a voluntary plan, and to me there is a vast difference between the two. And that is the matter of choice. We should keep our people free so that they can make a choice and make a choice of their own, and not have to go along and conform in every way.

The question has also been raised of throwing away \$15 million that is available to them if they comply with the Federal plan. Well, we in Manitoba will not be the only ones who will forfeit that amount, and I think we should stand pat and hold out for the Federal Government to change. Certainly they should realize that if a majority and more than a majority of the provinces are holding out, the Federal Government at some time will realize too that they have to bring in changes, especially now that we have a new leader and that he'll probably want to go to the people and want to get their support, that he will have to realize that he has to bring in some changes in this connection.

So, Mr. Speaker, I for one definitely will not support the amendment, nor the motion, the main motion as it stands.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I shall try to be brief and I don't know if I'll be able to finish, but I think in the interest of all concerned that I would like to just read this resolution right out again, and it simply says this: Therefore Be It Resolved that the Law Amendments Committee of the House be instructed to undertake during this session a review of the sales tax and its effects, and make recommendations to the House.

I agree with this resolution wholeheartedly, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I shall not try and bring out very many points that certainly could be of interest in this matter. I will try to basically bring out one main point, so to say, and possibly try and deal with that basically and leave the other points to other members.

I think it is quite clear that we must, from time to time, take a look at anything; if it's ourselves; in this case if it happens to be a taxation problem. I believe that it is only fair that we must take a look at a thing like this from time to time, and even though it has now - our taxation has been enforced for approximately nearly a year, I think the time for some articles could be right now, to take a look at it and to make sure that we are dealing justly and fairly to to all the people concerned. And surely, while a year is not very long, I think that even during the last 10 months possibly this government and possibly the people that are paying the sales tax have become aware of quite a few problems that really do exist, and I'm sure that many of you members could name numerous.

We have talked of a number of things in this House, of taxation, in regards to double taxation, or other types of taxation, and I think the aim of this resolution is to give our Law Amendments Committee, if it were formed, to give them an opportunity, to give the people an opportunity also, to stress their grievances and to have this thing renewed and re-examined. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is also possibly of more interest to me personally, the item that I wish to mention - I do not wish to bring it up for that matter; I wish to bring it up as a matter that I think concerns a lot of Manitobans, and I'm referring to the matter of auction sales. And I will try and point out why I think that a Law Amendments Committee would be very useful and essential in considering some of the problems that come up in this matter.

I mentioned a little while ago, Mr. Speaker, that it is hard to believe that some of our taxation is not just on a single or a double base, it is happening on a triple, and possibly at times - and quite often I would say - even four times that the same article is being taxed. Now it's very hard to believe that whoever drew up those rules at that time could not really see these problems forthcoming, and I don't wish to call them a hard lot. I wish to say that they could have known all these problems at that time. I'm sure that these are things that you just have to review from time to time and you cannot possibly see some of the things at first.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think most of us are aware, that have been to auction sales, that they are usually and nearly always consist of goods or merchandise that are not new. Very seldom are they new. I don't think that statement is questionable at all. I believe we are aware that goods sold at auction sales in most cases are used. In plain words, they have been taxed before. Yes, Mr. Speaker, possibly the Provincial Treasurer could say that they have not been taxed before in this province, but they certainly could have by now, and in very many cases in this world of transients, in this time where people move from one province to another, they have been taxed, either as new goods or otherwise, and I'm very happy also to say that I'm sure the Provincial Treasurer was aware of this, that not all provinces charge a tax when it comes to auction sales, but I think in this world of transients, because of their type of occupation or because of the work that they are inclined to be adopted to, I think in most cases where sales taxes have applied before, this individual has paid a sales tax on these goods. So Mr. Speaker, it is certainly ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is now 5:30 and I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman. I'm sure he would agree we would leave this open for him to speak to when it next appears. Agreed? It is now 5:30. I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 this evening.