

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 19 June, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions  
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** The Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Concordia, that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. R. PENNER** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 61, The Statute Law Amendment Act (1985)(2); Loi de 1985 modifiant le droit statutaire (2), (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor); and Bill No. 62, The Charter Compliance Statute Amendment Act; Loi modifiant diverses dispositions législatives afin d'assurer le respect de la Charte.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of members to the gallery, where there are 21 students of Grades 4, 5 and 6, from the Komarno School under the direction of Mr. Buchkowski. The school is in the constituency of Honourable Minister of Housing.

There are 80 students of Grade 9 standing from the Lockport School, under the direction of Mr. Weibe, and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

There are 5 students of Grades 3 and 4 standing from the Arthur Oliver School, under the direction of Mrs. Dyck and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

There are 22 students of Grade 8 standing from the Riverside Junior High School under the direction of Mr. Kuttig. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Thompson.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS Bilingualism in Manitoba - government's position

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Attorney-General. In the aftermath of the Supreme Court decision, there are various views being expressed. I wonder if the Attorney-General could indicate whether it is the position of the Government of Manitoba that Manitoba is now a bilingual province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** That question was answered by the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the Premier's answer . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I'm not sure in that answer, the Premier covered the question I'm asking. I'm asking a direct question to the Attorney-General: Could he tell this House whether or not it is a position of the Government of Manitoba that Manitoba is now a bilingual province?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is asking me for an opinion. That question, to the extent that it was answered, is answered by the decision of the Supreme Court. I am not going to proffer my opinion on its opinion. The Leader of the Opposition has shown no previous disposition to accept my legal opinions, I doubt if he would now; and in any event, an opinion would be out of order.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not looking for the opinion of the Attorney-General. I'm looking for the official position of the Province of Manitoba and he, as the chief law enforcement officer of this province, should be able to put forward that position. I'm asking the Attorney-General, is it the position of the Province of Manitoba that we are or we are not a bilingual province?

**HON. R. PENNER:** The Premier of this Province answered that, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I realize that the Attorney-General has been muzzled on this particular issue by the Premier, but I wonder if he would state what the position is, in the absence of the Premier. What is the position of the Government of Manitoba? Is the province or is it not a bilingual province?

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Deputy Premier could indicate instead of the Premier, whether or not it is

the position of the Government of Manitoba that Manitoba is a bilingual province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I have the same response as the Attorney-General. That question has been answered by the Premier and by the Supreme Court decision.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, this is a question that is being asked by people throughout the province.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, what is important is the position of the Province of Manitoba. The people are asking and they want this question to be answered. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Acting Premier is, is it the position of the Province of Manitoba that Manitoba is now a bilingual province?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Oral Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Acting Premier will not answer that question, I wonder if she will answer the question, are there additional obligations that accrue to Manitoba other than in the translation of statutes and regulations as a result of the Supreme Court decision?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, the decision is lengthy and detailed and is being analyzed, but to date the opposition have had an opportunity, as well, to hear the first reports on it and I'm sure they'll be able to read the fine print in the same way that we are.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Acting Premier would indicate whether or not her government will be undertaking any new initiatives . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. G. FILMON:** . . . with respect to French Language Services as a result of this decision.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, that question is a hypothetical question. If and when we have anything to announce, we will announce it.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my question was not hypothetical but the answer was hypothetical.

It appears as though the Acting Premier has no information to share. I wonder if she could indicate to us when the Premier will be in the House to answer questions on this and other matters.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order! I'm having difficulty in hearing the questions and answers. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Acting Premier could indicate when the Premier will be available to answer questions on this matter.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I really do find it strange that all this concern about getting immediate response at this point in time is emerging. The opposition wanted the question answered by the Supreme Court. It has been answered by the Supreme Court and the answer's there for all to read.

**MR. G. FILMON:** The Supreme Court cannot tell us the answer as to whether or not this government intends to undertake any new initiatives to offer additional French language services in Manitoba. The Supreme Court cannot answer that.

This Acting Premier can and I want her to tell us whether or not that is the case. Will the government be undertaking new initiatives to offer additional French language services in the Province of Manitoba?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, recorded in Hansard are the words of the Premier. As I recall, he said that services would continue to develop in an orderly fashion. It's there for all to read.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder if the Acting Premier could then indicate what new services, with respect to French language, the province is intending to put forward?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, it's the Leader of the Opposition who is adding the word "new." I think if you read the Premier's statement, you will have the full answer to the question.

**Turenne, Roger -  
leave of absence**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Acting Premier could indicate whether or not Mr. Roger Turenne, the Director of the French Language Services Secretariat is currently on a leave of absence or has applied for a leave of absence from the government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I'll take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Acting Premier could also indicate if such a leave of absence is either currently under way or in the process, and for what length of that time that would be.

Mr. Speaker . . .

### Old age pensions - de-indexation of

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** . . . I previously asked the Premier and I wonder if the Acting Premier has the information with respect to the letters that were sent out to senior citizens on the de-indexation of pensions, to whom those letters were sent, how many were sent, and what the cost was?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, there were 11,300 letters sent; 700 in addition from the caucus office and that is the response to the question.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I had some difficulty hearing the answer. She said 11,000 plus an additional 750 from the caucus office?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, 11,300 were sent to invite seniors and we'd like to include in the invitation all the members of the opposition to what we hope will be a very special day on the 24th here at the Legislative Building. An additional 700 invitations were sent out from the caucus office.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Acting Premier is not aware, but my questions were not with respect to invitations to the celebrations next week. They were with respect to the resolution on the de-indexation of pensions. I wonder if she could indicate how many were sent and at what cost.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** I'll take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, that question was taken as notice previously by the Premier and I'm wondering when the Acting Premier can bring that information back and, at the same time, if she could indicate to what mailing lists those letters were sent.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, that information will be provided in due course. Again, I think that the concern of the seniors reflected by the members opposite seems more to have to do with the question of letters sent rather than with the underlying issue, the threat to the senior citizens' economic security, of de-indexation of the pensions. Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that what we were hearing from the opposition were suggestions of how to promote some redress at the federal level of that very unjust proposal.

### Bilingualism in Manitoba - translating of statutes

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General and ask him whether he is prepared to give serious consideration - as opposed

to outright rejection - to Mr. Green's proposal that the government could pass a bilingual bill, legalizing the effects of the province's statutes?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has dealt with that issue. When the Supreme Court answered Question No. 4 with respect to Bill No. 2, passed by the opposition when they were government and relied upon by them, when the Supreme Court said that that was totally invalid in terms of what it considered to be the requirements, it really dealt with the suggestion that was made by the Leader of the Progressive Party, effectively.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Attorney-General if it is not similar or identical that these proposals do not have a great deal of similarity between them, in the sense that Supreme Court said that the statutes are invalid but what flows from them is temporarily valid. Is that not somewhat similar to Mr. Green's proposal, his proposal being that they should be permanently valid?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I previously said that I'm not going to give an opinion on the opinion of the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, however, with respect to Question No. 4, said that that particular process is invalid and it follows that anything that is analogous to that process is equally invalid.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, can the Attorney-General indicate what line the government is going to take before the court when they return? Are they going to argue that all the laws will be translated within a certain period of time or are they going to argue that only the major statutes should be translated and the minor statutes or the spent statutes or the repealed statutes should not?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Elmwood has spent a lot of time in this House proving that although he was once a history teacher, he knows nothing of history. He's now proving in spades, as he said, that he knows nothing about the law.

It is not possible, Sir, to re-argue before the Supreme Court a case that has been argued and just decided. That is not what the Supreme Court has asked either the Attorney-General of Canada or the Attorney-General of Manitoba to do. It has simply asked that, with respect to the time that might be required to fulfill the obligations set out in the decision, how much time is required. That's the only issue left to be decided, the only issue left to be decided.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would simply ask the Attorney-General, is he saying that it is not possible to make any distinctions before the court or any clarifications before the court, but that everything is crystal clear and there are no further arguments and no further clarifications? I'm suggesting to him, Mr. Speaker, that he can make a distinction and he can make a case, not to translate all the spent . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Oral Question Period is not a time for proposing certain questions or for making arguments. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister again whether he believes that there is no interpretation whatsoever of the Supreme Court ruling, or whether one could, in fact, argue before . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member is seeking a belief, which is an opinion.  
The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** I want to simply ask whether the government is going to make a case before the court of the futility of translating the spent and repealed statutes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** The Supreme Court decision does not require the Province of Manitoba to reenact all the spent statutes.

### **Manfor - current operating deficit**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I direct a question to the Deputy Premier. In view of the fact that the Minister responsible for Manfor, in fact, this government, has hired the highest priced employee in the history of this province; in view of the fact that the Minister has continually made boastful and glowing remarks of this individual's accomplishments at Manfor, and I quote, "He has done a very commendable job in turning that corporation around," I direct a question to the Deputy Premier: When was Cabinet first informed of the fact that Manfor's estimated current operating deficit will be in the \$18 million range, a 100 percent increase over last year?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The member is fully aware that Manfor is before a Standing Committee. The member has an opportunity to ask any and all questions that he wishes with respect to Manfor at that time. Mr. Speaker, the member's question illustrates, rather dramatically, his naivete, if he thinks . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, the member was quoted yesterday as saying he recognized that the investment in upgrading was a necessary thing for Manfor. I would hope he would have enough intelligence to recognize,

as well, that a turnaround does not mean that every year you're going to be in exactly . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Minister.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, it does mean that in every instance you're going to be exactly where you hoped you would be. That has nothing to do with the necessary management decisions that have to be made on a day-to-day basis on a whole range of issues that affect Manfor. The Manfor deficit which is projected this year to be much worse than we would have anticipated has everything to do with market conditions, with the soft market, and nothing to do per se with the management decisions that are going to make the difference in the long run for Manfor.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that somehow one individual is responsible for the market conditions which affect all forest product industries is nonsense and should not be made by anyone with any common sense.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Again, I direct this question to the Deputy Premier. This government has hired the highest priced employee in the history of this province. The Minister in this House has said that going reports of this individual's capabilities and I quote, ". . . has done a very credible job in turning the corporation around." I ask the Deputy Premier, when was Cabinet first informed that Manfor was going to be in a deficit position of some \$18 million in this current year?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I think, given the history of the whole forestry project up in The Pas area, that the nerve of people on the opposite side to suggest that the issues are short-term and simple and that a decision to start and stop, or even the pay level of the people that one employs should follow the up and down of the market is absolutely ludicrous. We hear day after day accusations that this side of the House doesn't understand business in the private sector and competition. Mr. Speaker, from the drivel coming from the other side of the House showing an absolute lack of understanding of how you must plan ahead, how you must work the ups and downs of the market, and put yourself in a favourable position to maintain jobs and make a profit - it just boggles the imagination.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Perhaps the Deputy Premier forgot the question that I asked. I asked the Deputy Premier when was Cabinet first informed that Manfor was likely to be in an \$18 million deficit position in this current operating year?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Member for Swan River that as Minister responsible, I was aware

of the deteriorating situation of Manfor this particular year, some months ago. I want to point out to the honourable member that what we're talking about is a projection for a year-end loss for a year that does not end until September 30, 1985. There are still three months to go.

I want to point out further that one of the reasons that there was a shutdown and that we have decided to control our inventory at Manfor was because of the fact that we were aware of this deteriorating market situation. We have made the tough decisions. I remind the honourable member that when they were government, they did not have the political guts to make any of those decisions; not the decision to invest money when it needed to be; not a decision to shut down when it needed to be shut down . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please, order please.

The answer to a question should not become a speech.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I ask a simple question of the Minister responsible for Manfor. A short couple of weeks ago the Minister said that this individual has done a very credible job in turning the corporation around. When was the Minister aware that Manfor was going to be in an \$18 million deficit in this current operating year? Was he aware of this fact when he made this statement in the House a few weeks ago?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I hope the member in his own confused kind of logic does not persist in the belief that one particular year indicates a lack or no lack of good management. Mr. Speaker, I don't hear the member commenting on the fact that compared to 1982-83, the '83-84 year saw a \$15 million reduction. I don't see him talking about the \$10 million increase in sales. I don't see him talking about the reduction in overhead in operating costs.

Mr. Speaker, there are some very specific reasons for the loss this year. They were outlined very clearly, in case the member wasn't listening in committee yesterday. He has an opportunity to ask those further questions. I've indicated that I knew some time ago of the deteriorating situation. Difficult decisions were made by the Manfor Board of Directors and by management, which includes Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more aspects to developing a healthy corporation than the reporting of one year's loss. The member persisting in that kind of intimation by way of his questions is unparliamentary and certainly doesn't reflect any appreciation at all for what business is all about.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.

I believe it is the Chair's responsibility to decide what is and what is not unparliamentary.

### **Ramps, wheelchairs, etc.- government building, The Pas**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Government Services.

It has come to our attention that there are no access ramps for wheelchairs or baby carriages at the government building in The Pas. Could the Minister inform the House what steps are being taken to provide this service to the people there?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, we are constantly attempting to upgrade government buildings to meet the minimum fire and safety requirements, as well as access for handicapped people. Those are the priorities. Whenever projects are undertaken or can be undertaken with the funds that are available, we are dealing with those priority aspects for our buildings, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I wonder if the Minister can inform the House when this renovation will be undertaken at the building in The Pas.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I wonder if the Minister could inform the House if the new government building in Flin Flon provides wheelchair access facilities and how many other buildings there are and what cost will be involved in providing this means of access to government buildings in Manitoba.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that the member did not choose to ask that question during the Estimates when he could have had detailed answers for these kinds of things. I don't have that answer with me at the present time and will attempt to get that information.

### **Borrowing requirements - status of**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I took a question as notice yesterday with respect to the borrowing requirements of the province. To date, total financing arranged is \$792.8 million. That includes the Treasury Bills to September 25, 1985.

### **Fishing, sport - use of live bait**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Acting Minister of Natural Resources. Could the Acting Minister indicate whether the use of live bait for sport fishing in Manitoba waters is being allowed this year?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I know the honourable member would be delighted for me to rise to the bait in his question.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** But, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to angle with the member. I'm going to be able to tell him that, so far as I know, there has been no change in the regulations that existed last year which provide the honourable member the right to use live bait in certain parts of the province.

### Hunting regulations - expansion of re Natives

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, to the same Acting Minister of Natural Resources, a Native group indicated, in the last week, that they felt that the hunting regulations should be expanded for the Native people. Can the Acting Minister indicate - whether the Government of the Day is supporting that request?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I know the honourable member is shooting from the hip on that question - or shooting from the lip, pardon me.

I know my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, has been having . . .

**MR. G. FILMON:** Do we have a stand-up comic over there?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, he's just trying to get Frank to smile.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition wants to crowd my act. I know that my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, has had extensive discussions with interest groups and I'm certain that there is a genuine concern on the part of Native people in this province with the diminishing resource in wildlife. There will be opportunities and I think the Minister is considering those opportunities for further extensive dialogue to bring Native people into the practical administration of wildlife resources.

### Meat, wildlife - illegal sale of

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** To the same Acting Minister then, Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding that a report was forwarded to the Minister of Natural Resources indicating that as many as 1,800 wildlife carcasses are being transported and utilized in the City of Winnipeg illegally. Can the Minister confirm this figure?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I know that the honourable member likes to indulge in the hottest rumour that he can get a hold of and I'm certain that is probably the best he's come up with in years.

I certainly cannot corroborate that kind of rumour. I don't think it's advantageous for the honourable

member to be repeating that kind of hearsay. I would remind him of the rule in this House that obliges the honourable member to be certain of his facts before he asks that kind of question. But I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague and his department are very, very alert to any wrongdoing in respect to the sale of meat in this province that is not authorized.

### Family Farm, Preservation of - introduction of bill

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Some time ago, the Minister introduced a title of a bill, Preservation of the Family Farm, Mr. Speaker. When will we see the introduction of the bill and the detail of it?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, we have engaged legal services in working on this matter. As soon as their advice on this matter is received, we can proceed. If it is not received in full detail before the end of the Session, we will likely proceed with it at a later date.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, the other question is, is the Minister proposing debt moratorium legislation in that bill?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, government policy will be announced and . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I believe the honourable member knows that he should not ask questions about a matter which is set down for future discussion on the Order Paper.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, then all I can conclude and ask the Minister is, the bill will not be introduced at this Session of the Legislature?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can conclude what he likes, but usually his conclusions are false.

### Bills, drafting of - cost to government

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General. Could he indicate how many bills have been sent outside of government for drafting for this Session and what is the anticipated cost?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** No bills have been sent out on a contract basis with respect to this Session, at least to

my knowledge. We are able, with the legal translation staff that we presently have, who are very good and much more experienced than they were a year ago, to handle the business of the Session in-house.

### Curriculum - Grade 12

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, in answer to one of my questions on Monday, the Minister of Education stated that in Grade 12 it was mandatory for students to take two core curriculum courses. I'm wondering if the Minister was correct in that statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice and check Hansard.

### COMMITTEE CHANGES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Riel.

**MRS. D. DODICK:** I have some Committee changes, Mr. Speaker: on Economic Development, the Member for Rossmere substituting for Churchill, and the Member for Burrows substituting for Osborne.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, would you call the Second Reading of Bill No. 40?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Before the honourable member proceeds, the Honourable for Emerson with a Committee Change.

### COMMITTEE CHANGE

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a committee change on Economic Development. The Member for Swan River for the Member for Virten.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### SECOND READING

#### BILL NO. 40 - THE WORKPLACE INNOVATION CENTRE ACT

**HON. L. EVANS** presented Bill No. 40, The Workplace Innovation Centre Act; Loi sur le Centre d'innovation des lieux de travail for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm pleased today to make a statement in follow-up to the Speech from the Throne of March 7, 1985, when it was announced that members would be asked to approve the establishment of a new Workplace Innovation Centre for our province.

As mentioned in that speech, the introduction of new technology into the workplace brings with it new challenges for workers, companies, and governments. There is concern among all of these groups in Manitoba that we deal with technological change and inform creative and humane ways which bring the greatest benefit to our province in both an economic and a social sense.

Legislation which we are considering today, Bill 40, proposes to establish an innovative, co-operative initiative which has the potential to enable Manitoba business, labour, education and government to help each other deal effectively with technological change.

By its very nature, technological development means change and adjustment. It will impact on the skills we require and the methods by which work is organized. The transition will inevitably spawn some hardship, but to retard technological change evokes the prospect of greater hardship down the road.

Through the Workplace Innovation Centre, the Provincial Government is attempting to facilitate the process of change in a way that promotes an equitable distribution of the risks and rewards that come with technological development in our province.

By way of background to the specific role of the Workplace Innovation Centre, I'd like to remark on the broader picture of technological development in the province. Technological development is not new. It is a continual process of using scientific knowledge to meet the increasing demands and needs of society. It is an evolutionary process, but one which at times moves forward very rapidly and which can cause major discontinuities in our everyday lives.

No one would deny that today the pace of technological change is accelerating and has potential impact throughout society, such that every individual and every group must take it into account in their planning efforts. I am sure it is not necessary to emphasize to members of the House or to the people of Manitoba the importance of technological development.

The Manitoba Government has recognized the importance of technology to sustain job preservation and job creation and to allow our province to remain competitive, both here and abroad.

In commenting on technology policy in Manitoba, my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, has noted that the Manitoba Government has developed a strategy based on the province's strengths and priorities. This strategy has three major thrusts. The first emphasizes improving Manitoba's position in what we refer to as a "technology adaptation," which is adopting refining, implying and diffusing of technologically innovative ideas, that is, new products and processes in every economic sector.

Technology adaptation will be complemented by a second aspect of the strategy aimed at what we refer to as "technology creation." Technology creation is what the popular press often calls new technology or high technology centres. Our efforts in regard to technology

creation will be applied selectively where the province may have comparative advantages based on its natural or human resources.

The commitment of the Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker, to technology adaptation and technology creation is evidenced by the increased support which is given to existing initiatives and to the establishment of new programs which have been initiated through the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

This year the province assumed total responsibility for government contributions to support the successful operations of the Manitoba Research Council, the Industrial Technology Centre in St. Boniface, and the Canadian Food Products Development Centre in Portage la Prairie.

In the last year, as well, a number of new initiatives have been established by Manitoba Industry, Trade and Technology, including a technology commercialization program, strategic research and scholarship programs, a technology discovery program and an information technology program.

However, in addition to technology creation and adaptation, and of equal importance, is the consideration for the human aspects of technological change. Human development must accompany technological development. Indeed, technological development cannot occur without human development. This means that we must have consideration for the workers' security, consideration for the preservation of jobs and creation of new opportunities; consideration for fair working conditions; consideration for appropriate education, training, and retraining opportunities, and consideration for the human dignity of participating in the process of technological change.

It is this third area, in particular, that we are concerned with in this particular legislation. The human aspects of technological change that the Workplace Innovation Centre will operate, working towards an equitable distribution of the risks and rewards, the costs and benefits of technological development.

In a spectrum of technology related government initiatives, the Centre's role will be to provide a balance in our policy development, giving necessary attention to human issues and concerns. The concept of this centre is evolved from joint government, labour, business, education and community consultation, initiated by my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, by the late Mary Beth Dolin, former Minister of Labour.

The province established this joint ministerial responsibility out of its concern that any policy developed should reflect the interests of both business and labour, and the realization that these two key sectors must work as partners in order for technological development to succeed.

In September of 1984 the two Ministers established an interim board or committee of 12 members, representing business, labour, and community organizations, the Provincial Government Departments of Labour, Industry, Trade and Technology, and Employment Services and Economic Security, as well as educational institutions, a microcosm of the parties to be most affected by and interested in the effects of technological change.

At least 10 meetings were held between September and December 1984 and the interim committee

submitted in January of this year a report, which enthusiastically and unanimously supported the creation of a centre to promote the introduction of innovative practices in the workplace, to address the human aspects of technological change by involving business, labour, education, government and the community in new ways of working co-operatively together and thereby promote the principal of equitable distribution of the risks and rewards of technological change.

In its report, the interim board specifically suggests that the staff of such a centre, under the guidance of a board of directors, could operate in a number of areas, such as providing information, carrying out or funding research, advising groups and individuals on technological change or directing them to assistance from appropriate consultants and advocating innovative workplace practices. I would like to table a copy of this report for your information.

The interim board urged the government to move quickly and this we have done recognizing the importance of addressing the human dimension in this time of rapid and potentially traumatic change. As outlined in the bill before you, The Workplace Innovation Centre Act will create a broad based board of 14 directors to operate a centre at arm's length from government which will report to the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security.

The board will consist of four business representatives, four labour representatives, two education representatives and two members at large, all to be selected from representative panels of nominees presented by relevant organizations, institutions and interest groups. As well, two government representatives will be nominated by the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank the co-operation of various key organizations such as the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce, and the Manitoba Federation of Labour for their work and support in this particular endeavour.

The board itself will engage staff for the purpose of carrying out the practical functions necessary to achieve the centre's objectives. The centre's purposes as stated in the act are, and I quote from the legislation: "Addressing the human dimension of technological change through the involvement of business, labour, education, government and the community in innovative ways of working together and through the promotion of the principle of equitable distribution of the risks and rewards of technological change."

I'd like to take special notice of the word "innovative" in that statement of purpose because the whole concept of the development, establishment and operation of the centre has been and will be a very new and exciting type of co-operative venture that may not only benefit Manitoba but may also become an important model for other jurisdictions.

The priorities and eventual direction of the Workplace Innovation Centre will be determined by the new board but without limiting those roles or priorities which the board may choose within the centre's general purpose.

The legislation identifies several important areas of activity which the centre may pursue including: identifying, assessing and prioritizing the human impacts



of technological change; investigating and evaluating the human aspects of equipment systems and work procedures; acquiring socio-technological information and making it available in ways which are easily understood; advocating necessary changes and practices required for the successful application of technology; advising on the development of policies related to the introduction of new technologies; providing information, advisory and assessment services to specific groups and workplaces to be involved in the introduction of new technologies; promoting better communications and co-operation by interfacing with organizations in business, labour, education, government and the community; addressing training needs by providing consulting or referral services to companies and individuals dealing with new technologies; and investigating matters related to health and safety in the workplace arising from the introduction of new technologies and work procedures.

These broadly described roles will result in the centre's carrying out a variety of practical functions such as:

(a) Helping employers and labour groups establish guidelines for technological change in their places of work; for example, establishing acceptable period of notice of change, identifying training and retraining needs as a result of change and agreeing to ways of dealing fairly with displaced workers; as well, the centre could encourage networking among employers and employee groups enabling valuable experiences with technological change and workplace innovation to be shared;

(b) Acting as a consultant or identifying consultants to work on-site and walk employers and employees through a specific technological change process; for example, assisting in the selection of equipment and advising on organizational changes required for managing new and ongoing tasks;

(c) Doing research, developing an information base and making the information readily available to employers and employees whether they are large companies or interested individuals. Information about training options and names of contacts with specific expertise or experience might be provided;

(d) Working with employers to encourage greater worker participation and involvement in the implementation of new technologies.

This, Mr. Speaker, can lead to a higher quality of working life, increased employee commitment and improved productivity. It is intended that the centre will give full attention to those most responsible for and affected by technological change, those sectors of our economy which are changing most rapidly and those people who may be disproportionately affected such as women and older workers.

These are some of the way in which the objectives of the centre can be met, ways which can lead to securing benefits of technological change for everyone involved.

In support of the centre, the Manitoba Jobs Fund has approved \$1.2 million in core funding for three fiscal years, 1985-86 to 1988-89. Of that amount, \$500,000 will come from the portion of the Jobs Fund which was contributed by the Manitoba Government Employees Association. It is the intent that as the centre develops expertise and credibility, it will generate and

seek supplementary funding such as fee for service and grants to offset the government funding and thereby expand its operations.

I'd like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by emphasizing three points: Firstly, the need for the centre is obvious as it is seen as an opportunity to assist all Manitobans in capturing the benefits of technological change and thereby taking a lead role in integrating the social and technical aspects of technology; secondly, the centre will promote the philosophy expounded many times by this government, that of co-operation; co-operation between business, labour, government and other groups, representatives of which have all endorsed the concept of the centre. This co-operation will extend down to the working level, for we envisage the centre will work closely with other technology centres and programs in this province and elsewhere. We also hope it may be possible for some staff to be seconded from other groups, thereby cementing the spirit of co-operation in this endeavour; thirdly, finally, as an initiative within a spectrum of technology related programs in Manitoba, the Workplace Innovation Centre will assist in integrating technology into the society in which we live.

Technology is often regarded as an impersonal, pervasive threat. This is far from the case, Mr. Speaker. It certainly impacts on almost everything we do but because of this we must ensure that we consistently integrate technological development with our other priorities such as economic development, job creation and equality of opportunity. Thereby, Mr. Speaker, we can move a long way toward a more complete and sustainable quality of life for Manitobans.

Thank you.

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

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Portage la Prairie that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**A MEMBER:** Bill No. 26, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** One moment please.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. 12.

**MR. SPEAKER:** One moment please.

## COMMITTEE CHANGES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Riel.

**MRS. D. DODICK:** Yes I have a committee change, Mr. Speaker. Economic Development, Ste. Rose for Rupertsland.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The bill that the Honourable Government House Leader introduced?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. 12.

**ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND  
READING**

**BILL NO. 12 - THE CHILD AND  
FAMILY SERVICES ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 12, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** I would like to thank the Minister for providing me with the breakdown of the new bill in an analysis form, so that one could readily understand what the department was attempting to do. In fact, the Minister provided this to myself and the Member for Rhineland some week to 10 days ago, and it helped greatly in trying to understand exactly where the new additions were and what changes were being contemplated.

I could say, at the outset, that it would appear it's not really a brand-new act, but at least about 70 or 80 percent of the act is really part of the old act that has either been revised or slight word changes have been made because of certain other aspects. There are some new aspects included in the act that were not included in some of the earlier legislation, and this analysis helped to quickly identify those areas that were purely what we'd call administrative or housekeeping, and be able to concentrate then on the specific areas of additions of the legislation.

I have a couple of specific concerns and then two or three general concerns, and I have voiced one or two of them to the Minister in private. One of the concerns that I have is the definition of "abuse" contained in the act. I note in the Minister's explanation that the definition of "abuse" is arrived at as a result of consultation between the Attorney-General's Department and professional people on her staff, and I believe possibly some others.

I feel that it's perhaps not tough enough and perhaps not wide enough to cover possibly some of the grey areas that one might consider abuse. I agree that this whole question of child care, making sure the children are indeed provided proper protection and supervision and care, is a very important principle, and its intent in the act, I agree with.

The concern I have is that "abuse" is defined in three specific areas and they're contained in the act and I won't go into them. My concern is that if you don't hit within the four corners of one of those particular definitions, a child who is at risk may, in fact, be returned to the parent or put back into the situation that the workers attempted to extract them from, because it's really a court definition or a court finding after the evidence is in - whether a child is, in fact, subject to abuse and then certain things will flow from it.

I would just like to put on the record that perhaps there should be either a general catch-all phrase or something to the effect where there is a finding, or in the opinion of a court, that a child may be at risk through abuse, and this would take us beyond the physical, the mental, and the sexual aspects of the strict definition. I know the definition is intended to be broad but I think we could only err in the positive here. I would hate to see one or two cases not fall within this particular area

so the rightful remedy would flow, if the definition isn't broad enough.

The other area of concern that I have, and I know that the Minister and the government have put great store in the community aspect of the new way of delivering child care and family care into the communities. In fact, they reorganized the old central delivery of care services into six regional units within the city, and that is now in the process of going through the gestation period to see how it will function and the board members and the new staff in these various new agencies are coming to grips with their new roles and responsibilities.

The principle behind establishing the sort of community based organizations was to get community involvement. I know that there was a great process where the community was asked to put forward people to stand on the board, and you would then get them having input into the delivery service, on the theory that they reflected the concerns of their particular neighbourhood and the centre, the professionals within the department, or that agency, could properly target on them and that's a good objective.

But running throughout the act, there seems to be a contrary theme to that type of principle. I may be wrong - and perhaps it may just be poor drafting or inappropriate drafting - but the power of this legislation stays with the director of the department. If you look at certain specific sections, that power is reinforced: "the director shall prevail;" "the director shall set standards;" "the director shall ensure;" "the director's opinion shall prevail;" and these go throughout.

Nowhere in the act is there any room or provision for the taking into consideration of the board's opinion. In fact, the staff members, the director, the deputy director, all have very specific powers spelled out to them, but the board of the community - community representatives - they don't seem to have any power or function. I'm wondering if they would end up being, perhaps, just an advisory body and the advisory body is only as good as the people who wish to listen to it.

In fact, if the worst scenario situation occurred, they had no rights and no authority, then in effect you would be just having six sub-departments of the Minister's department basically providing services in a local community setting. This would seem to go around or subvert the whole idea of putting community input into the local distribution and provision of services.

I can appreciate why the director of the department should have certain provisions, but it seems to me that the people who are responsible and accountable in the community sense, should be given some authority and some responsibility and being able to have some specific input into the quality, the types of service, the method of services and everything else like this.

Now that's a fine balancing act and I can appreciate it because you don't want to get six different regional centres going off in six different directions and providing six different types of the same service, so it's a fine line. The only conclusion that one can come to is, at best, the community representatives are merely an advisory body and have little, if any, input into the running of the neighbourhood communities. If I'm wrong, I'd be pleased to be corrected. If not, I think the matter should be addressed to at least allow them some greater degree of control and perhaps some degree of autonomy, from that of the director.

Another area of concern is that in the past, children have not been introduced into court proceedings and have not usually been a party to a court proceeding. There have been methods or ways of introducing or allowing a child, if of sufficient age, to express an opinion to a judge or perhaps a social worker on a matter before the court, but this act starts with the premise that a child should be in court. Now there is a distinction - if over age 12, it's almost mandatory; if under age 12, it would be the decision of the judge whether or not they should be.

I don't quarrel with the concept of having the child's opinion sought, because in many instances they will give you the true reflection of the facts. They won't be trying to shade it or cover up or do things. In fact, I think in many instances, their information and their comments probably will be the most revealing and most telling on a certain set of circumstances.

But by the compelling of a child now to come into court, that child will become a party to the proceedings and the court system is an adversarial system. As much as we would like it not to be, that's what the role of our civil courts is, in fact, the criminal courts as well. We will have an adversarial situation, the child can be represented by counsel if it is deemed that is important.

The key is that the child would then be giving testimony, perhaps under oath, that may hurt one or both of his parents, or family members because the family definition now is very broad, and that child may have to go back to one of them or live with two or three of them after making certain comments in a courtroom or under direct examination or cross-examination, that in fact may jeopardize his position in that particular family unit.

The other part of it is that these children would be subject to cross-examination and I think the child, as long as it sticks to its basic simplistic answers is all right, but when you start talking to a child in shades of grey and things like this, a child of young years may not be well equipped - and I know the courts would be concerned with this - but if there is an adversarial position developed and I, as a lawyer, speaking on behalf of, say, the husband who is being accused of abuse or something like this, I would want to cross-examine that child. I would like to know on what basis the child is making those comments.

In fact, you could very well end up hurting the child because of that court experience, in the adversarial sense, or the evidence given under oath in public may hurt that child in the family setting.

The principle though, I think, should be there and I think the principle could be worded differently, that they not be a party in the court proceedings, but that the child's opinion, if over 12, should be obtained; if under 12, should not be obtained unless under very special circumstances. That would just take some minor drafting changes, but I think it would protect the child far more than this anticipated procedure is.

In dealing with one of the new aspects or new areas in the proposed legislation, there is a section dealing with the family and the principles outlining - and there are some 11 of them in the beginning of the act. I think only one or two deal specifically with children, and the balance of them, in different ways, deal with the fact that the family is the basic cornerstone of the society and it is the first and fundamental body responsible

for the well being of children. One cannot disagree with that premise or the principle that's being stated.

The section also provides, under this Family Services Act, it said that a family may - and it's a "may" - "come to and seek assistance and shall be provided with counselling, all types of services, if requested by the parent or the member of the family."

There's a bit of a problem here in the sense that if a family believes that they have problems with their marriage or it's affecting the children and that family member or family members attend to the particular worker who's going to be looking after them for assistance or counselling, through that process you are going to perhaps get a revelation of certain information. That information is being given in confidence for help. The help is to prevent future problems.

The act says that any information dealing with child abuse, even if given in confidence, must be acted on and dealt with. I'm not objecting to dealing with the question of abuse, making sure it's identified and dealing with it. The problem I can see is, if you start the family consulting process and suddenly evidence of potential abuse occurs, that worker then is under a professional and legal obligation now to report it and a certain mechanism to investigate kicks in, it would seem to be that the word would get around and family members would say, don't go to them and talk because there is no confidence. They will not protect anything you will do. In fact, you'll end up shooting yourself in the foot. It will not do what it's intended to do.

You also have a bit of a conflict where the worker or the agency involved has to deal with the concerns of the children because, after all, there is the child responsibility and the family responsibility and that worker must be dealing with the interests of the child. That same worker is also burdened and requested to look after the interests of the family.

Now because of circumstances, they may be in conflict. How can the worker juggle those two? In fact, you're almost into a conflicting position. There seems to be a shortfall here or a lack of understanding of the potential problems that may occur. Now I don't disagree with the two principles. The problem that I'm having with and the concern I can see is how one person is going to try and reconcile two principles that, in fact, may be in conflict. Where does the responsibility of that worker or the agency lie - to the child or the family?

The other problem that I can see is - I believe that with the dissolution of the old Children's Aid, a lot of specialized delivery programs were broken down and all of the staff were distributed equally throughout the six new offices and they have become generalists. There's nothing wrong with that. It's just that some had a special, perhaps, aptitude or expertise dealing with adoption or abuse. Now they are dealing with a whole myriad of problems and I can see an uneven delivery of service to the various clientele and people who are supposed to be receiving these services, because those who may like one particular area, may not or feel uncomfortable in another area of delivery of service. I can see a problem developing here where, if you don't allow some degree of specialization, you're going to have everyone being a jack of all trades and, in fact, a master of none, and a heavy caseload where you're constantly dealing with one area and you're jumping to the next and you're going back to a third

area. It creates, I can see, a great stress on the worker and it's going to cause some problems in getting people who can properly deliver all types of service.

As we know, there can be a general practitioner and then there should be some specialists. As I read the change in the legislation, the specialist has been done away with and we're only now dealing with generalists. I know the professionals who are in the field will do the best that they can, but some conversations I've had with some of these workers is that it's causing them problems. If you're giving an uneven service, then the community is suffering because of it.

The thrust of prevention is a good one; let's prevent today the problems of tomorrow. Who can disagree with that? In fact, it's long overdue. That principle though, unless properly funded and staffed, is not going to result in any positive effects either tomorrow or next year or 20 years from now.

I advise the Minister now that during Estimates I'm going to be trying to determine how much new funds and new resources have been allocated to this whole area of prevention. My information from people who are now working in the field is that they are so busy working under a crisis situation, they don't have time to deal with prevention, or if they do, it's given short shrift because the emergency comes first and that's where they're concentrated.

In fact, part of the thrust in the changing of the direction was to lessen the amount of money that we're spending on crisis intervention, which was, in fact, what the old Children's Aid was doing, to now move to a field of prevention so that we can stop the waste and abuse and harm to young people and members in the family and get them before the problems become acute and almost irreparable.

If the current staff is looking after crisis now, how are they going to have time to work on the prevention? The prevention aspect is probably the one that takes the most time, the most care, the planning and will need staff and some resources. Of course, staff is a large cost and my information, and I hope the Minister can correct me, is that there has been no real new money allocated to the Departmental Estimates to really concentrate on this whole area of prevention. Without it, I think that section of the act then becomes meaningless. If it's to be phased in over a period of time, that's fine, but when you hold out to the public that they can arrive as a family and work on preventive problems, then I think it's important that you have at least some services there now to facilitate the prevention work, because without it the whole thing will fail.

One final area of concern - there are a number of specifics or important areas that I would like to deal with, but they deal with specific clauses and I will refer to them at Committee hearings - there's actually two; one is a minor area dealing with the reporting of abuse. There is a registry that is contemplated in being established where it says, "Any information on suspected abuse shall be recorded by the director in that registry." I could not find, and maybe it's implicit that after a long process of whether or not there is abuse and certain action is taken, that if there is no abuse, if the child is not in danger that that information is removed from that registry. Maybe it's implicit, but if it is, I would suggest to the Minister that if the situation is not an abuse situation, the person who is accused

of that, in fact, did not commit it, there is no suspicion of it, nothing, that that person's name should be removed from the registry. If it is not, I can envisage several types of problems primarily if a foster parent might be alleged to have caused an abuse. That information, as I understand the legislation, would require that person's name to be put on to registry. There is no way if that person is exonerated, whether through court proceedings or investigation by professionals, that that person's name would be removed. I think in fairness to all, so that some future harm or damage couldn't occur, that that name should be removed.

One of the very early comments in the bill is that the new child and family service centres are to reach out and work, in fact, are mandated with the other agencies within the community. In other words, they're insisting that they not be islands onto themselves but they work with all those other social agencies and any other agencies in the community and that's as it should be.

However, one gets the feeling that perhaps the government is trying to put all its eggs in one basket through these six child and family centres and, in fact, are perhaps discouraging or trying to remove some of the existing infrastructure in community services. One case in point, I would like to refer to an example where the Young Parents' Community Centre, which has been established in our community and has been functioning for some time, whose funding comes from, I believe, certain religious organizations also from the United Way, Salvation Army - they all have representatives on the board - but some year or two ago they, along with the Pregnancy Distress Services and Children's Hospital Development Clinic recommended that a certain special program be developed for single parents.

This program receives funding from the Core Agreement and it was recommended by the Provincial Governments and it was to receive funding some two years ago for a two-year program of approximately \$125,000.00. I'm sorry it's the Young Parents Community Centre is the program that was set up; it was Pregnancy Distress that helped establish it along with the two other agencies. They received \$120,000 in their first year of operation and when they asked for their second part of the grant, they were advised by this Minister and the government that no further funding would be provided. In fact, the Minister indicated in a letter of May 27 of this year that they regret to advise that funding was not available and that they encourage your committee to explore other funding options.

In the core area of Winnipeg last year, there were some 265 births to single mothers between the age of 18 and 19. This particular facility since January of this year, in January it handled 236 clients and that number has grown to May of this year to some 433 clients. This is a group of people who were afraid, because of the past history of Children's Aid, to deal with any child care agency.

It was identified in the community by several social organizations that there was a need to help these mothers and young children, so it was set up. But the government has stopped the funding and the concern is that, not only is it this organization dealing with the core, but they're drawing their clients from all over the

city, because it's the only area that is capable of giving them the type of support and encouragement that they're looking for.

In fact, they have just had an analysis done by Research Associates from the Manitoba School of Social Work, who finds it a very positive experience and one that should be continued and makes several recommendations: That the facility should be larger and on one level; that the hours of operation should be expanded to include evenings and weekends; it should expand its outreach clients especially to the Vietnamese community; the funding base should be guaranteed on long-term; the setting, which may be intimidating to Native clients; upgrading and training of staff; and institute a community board.

Now this was an assessment. It obviously found a need, obviously filling an important void, but this government has seen fit to stop the funding through the Core Program, has not seen fit to give it continued funding. There is a definite need.

Now if you're closing down a very important and essential type of community service, of what value is the principle of saying that these new child and family centres should reach out and work co-operatively with the other resources and other institutions in the community. You can't close down on one hand and tell the surviving agency to reach out and facilitate, because the type of program they're offering cannot be offered by the neighbourhood centre because, again, they have done away with specialists. They're dealing with generalists, and this type of program is geared for a very small segment and needs specialized training and people to deliver it, and make sure that it works.

Those are some of my general comments on this bill, Mr. Speaker. As I've indicated I have some specific comments that will deal with various clauses and I will conclude my remarks and deal with the specifics when it gets to committee.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** I move, seconded by the Member for Swan River, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Bill No. 14, Mr. Speaker.

### **BILL NO. 14 - THE COMMUNITY CHILD DAY CARE STANDARDS ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 14, the Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, I stood this bill for the Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to speak on the amendments to The Community Child Day Care Standards Act. I would like to state right at the beginning that we are in favour of anything that helps to bring more safety to our children, because that certainly has to be paramount when we're dealing with child day care and when we're dealing with licensing.

I would just like to make some comments on some parts of the bill. I am pleased to see that the Minister has simplified the wording, because I think that is a help. I think before there were far too many categories and it's much easier to deal with in this way.

When we get to the exemptions I have some questions that I hope the Minister will be able to answer. There were some, what I would consider significant deletions, and I believe they were dealt with by the Member for Fort Garry; the deletion in the bill in (f) "To care and supervision provided by organizations offering guidance, leadership, recreation and fitness programs to young members, where care and supervision is provided as a part of the regular program of activities for young members."

Then the next part that was deleted is: "To care and supervision provided to children in camps, operated for seasonal or holiday periods," and the next part, "To care and supervision provided by community centres to children as part of the regular program of athletic or recreational activities of the community centre." The Minister didn't really deal with that part in her statement and I would be very interested to hear exactly where they come.

I notice there's a section that's dealing with classes of licence, and I'm wondering if the government is planning to license all these particular programs which would involved camps and community clubs, and just exactly how these deletions are going to be dealt with. I really couldn't find anything in the bill that dealt with these particular categories but I'm sure that the Minister will be able to explain them, at least I'm hoping that she will be.

The responsibility, the part in the bill that is the responsibility to provide proper environment and I'll quote it: "Every person providing day care shall at times provide an environment that is conducive to the health, safety and well being of the children." It's certainly properly stated. It just seems in this day and age, that it's sad that this has to be one of the parts of a bill, that that just wouldn't today be taken for granted, that of course this is what we want. I guess it has something to say about our society today, when we have to put that section in a bill.

As we move along in the bill, there's a part, and it's "Investigation by the Director. The director may, at all reasonable times, and upon producing proper identification, enter any licensed facility." We heartily agree with that part. As it goes on, ". . . or any premises that the director, on reasonable and probable grounds, believes is being used as a day care centre or a day care home, to inspect the facility or premises." I'll just stop there for a moment. I, while at the same time, heartily agree that you must be able to step in on areas - when I see premises of a day care home, that means - and I'll go back to the definitions - and day care home means premises in which day care, either alone or in combination with parental care is provided or

offered at any time and which is the home of the person providing the day care.

I see in here that means that the director or a designate of the director, I would imagine, can, it says, on reasonable and probable grounds believes is being used as a day care centre or day care home. I have no problem whatsoever with a centre, but I do have a problem with someone being able to go in someone's home just on, possibly it could be the suggestion of a vindictive neighbour and you couldn't ignore that, and everyone knows that when you have neighbours that there are problems. I believe in this case that I would feel much better about someone being able to go into a home, I would want them to get in there to see, but I think I would feel much safer, rather than the director doing this on someone's phone call, that an application be made to the court for a court order. Now court orders don't take a long time to get so it's not as if this would hold up proceedings for weeks or months, but I think that in this area we're putting far too much, we're giving the director far too much authority in this area.

I would hope that the Minister would look at that and take the suggestion because the next part is the order granting director right to enter, where a director is refused access to licensed facility or premises, a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench or a Justice, on application by the director, may grant an order authorizing the director to enter the facility or premises and to inspect the facility. I really do feel that even in this part of the bill that it would be wise to have that protection.

People are very funny and while we want to protect these children and we do - there is no disagreement there at all on this side of the House. That is our first aim, but I do think that, even on the government's behalf and on the director's behalf, it's much better if they get a court order in this instance and then you have to have a few facts, that you're not just going in on a neighbour's say so, because that couldn't be ignored and I understand that. If someone phones up and makes a complaint, it certainly has to be investigated, but this is where they believe. It's on probable grounds, 'believes' is being used as a day care centre or a day care home.

The centres I have no problem with, something outside the home, but where you have parents, grandparents, family members, and on the - not the instructions, I guess, but if someone phones up and makes a complaint, that the director could enter someone's home, I have a problem with that, not getting at the problem, but I think that they should have to go to the courts in that area.

Going further on this particular part of the bill, it says further to inspect the facility or premises, the service is provided, and the books of account and other records related to the facility or premises. The books of account, I'm sure are the financial records. Now where it's a government facility and it is being subsidized, I see no problem with this, but the independent operators who get no subsidy from the government have indicated that they can't understand the reason that the director or the government would need to see their financial statements. Everything else, and in the regulations it indicates the record keeping and it says that every licensee shall keep records of child and family

information for each child enrolled for a period of at least two years after discharge; and it goes through the child's name, address, birth date, telephone number of child's parent or guardian, telephone number and address of parent designate who may be contacted in event of an emergency, names of individual to whom child may be released, medical, physical, developmental or emotional conditions relevant to the care of the child - all sorts of regulations.

The independent operators, the people that are working either in their home or have day care centres that are licensed but not subsidized have no hesitation in supplying every record, but they don't understand, and I certainly don't understand why the government needs to see their financial records when they're going in to inspect a premise.

I think that's a back door way of trying to find out what someone is making and what they're doing with their money and I don't think really has any place in this bill; and I'm talking only about the independent operators in this case, so I really question what that is doing in this particular bill. It's almost slipped in, but it's there for everyone to see.

I still want to say that the opposition has no problems with the director going in to a premise that is a day care centre, in any case, which is outside the home, but someone entering another person's home on probable grounds, I think is a little dicey and I think it would be better if the government had that as a court order. I think it would be safer for everyone all around because then people wouldn't be alarmed if someone came to their door claiming to be the director and even with all the proper identification, this could very well surprise and alarm someone and they may end up refusing access. I could see that that would happen very easily and so the director is going to have to go to the court in any case.

In the next part, Order Granting Director Right to Enter, it makes mention again of allowing the director to make copies of the books of account. This seems to be a very important part of the government's bill. I'm surprised at that because I felt that the safety was paramount. I don't see what the financial records have to do with the safety of the child. I'm referring to independent operators who are willing and, under regulation, must give the records. I don't know why they would ask for books of account. Maybe I'm wrong about the regulations but licensees in any case are more than willing to give every kind of co-operation, I would hope, to the director and this bill will certainly ensure it. I would hope that the Minister would take a look at that particular area.

When we go further along in the bill and it's the "Licensee to report" and here again we get into the financial area. It says, "Every licensee shall promptly supply the director with all information and particulars regarding the licensed operation as may be requested by the director." I don't know if that particular area was to include financial information also. Possibly the Minister when she closes debate could indicate what that part actually says.

When we move along to the powers of the provincial administrator, it states, "Upon the appointment of a provincial administrator, the rights of the licensee or its board of directors with respect to the operation of the facility other than the right to appeal are suspended

and provisional administrator has all powers duties and privileges, authority of former licensee of the facility or the board of directors thereof for the purpose of carrying on the operation of the facility. They may enter and authorize others to enter the facility for the purpose of carrying on its operations."

Does that apply, and how does it apply? I think a part of it is in the regulation now. I'm not just sure. What I wonder is, has anyone had to do this and what happens when it's in somebody's home? I have a problem with that area how someone else could operate a facility that is in a person's home. That's another question I have for the Minister.

Then it says, "It shall have the use of all the monies, books and records of the former licensee of the facility which pertained to its operation." I can understand that if it's a government day care, but I wonder what happens here if it's what would be considered private day care, an independent operator in other words, and how you would plan to use all the monies, books and records of a private day care. So I have some questions about that and since part of it was in the regulation before, how it has worked and if there was a deficit like the Health Sciences Centre has, when you take that over, does the administrator also take over the debts of these facilities? That's certainly a question that I would think would interest the government because there may not be any monies and there may be a healthy debt and I'm just wondering how they're planning to deal with that section.

Further on in the bill it indicates that the day care staff qualifications review committee. It presently in the act states, "There shall be a day care staff qualification review committee comprised of nine persons who shall as far as possible and practical be representative of persons employed in day care centres, parents of children receiving day care in day care centres, members of the faculty or of community colleges and universities who teach courses which are credits for qualifications for staff of facilities and the community at large appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for such terms of office as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may fix."

They are suggesting the quorum has been five and that the new quorum be three. Normally, Mr. Speaker, a quorum would be the majority. I believe that five is not certainly too few when you're considering the staff qualification review committee and all these people that it's representing; day care centres, parents, community colleges, faculty, but when you have three, I believe, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council designates one member as the Chair, I think that you have a problem. I don't consider that three is enough to do the business of that committee. We would recommend that that be deleted and five stay the way it is right now in the present act.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House certainly are in favour, and I can't repeat it often enough, of the regulations that strengthen the act to make day care safer for our children. We saw an area in Charleswood, and how everyone was frustrated because they couldn't do anything about it immediately.

So I understand why some of these changes are being made. I think there are a few areas in here that the government is trying to get in the back door and see how the independent operators are doing, and what

kind of monies they are making. I really don't see that that is any concern of the government. In the Minister's remarks, Mr. Speaker, she mentioned that the Crown Council had recommended changes. I wonder if she would mind telling the House what recommendations they specifically made to strengthen the bill?

I have one question here, and I know it's a hard area to deal with, but there was a piece in the Winnipeg Sun and it's "Day care facing red tape," where it mentions that the Charleswood Day Care Centre has applied for private school funding and the answer I see given by the Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Nicholls, was that, and I'm quoting, "It's not possible to say you're operating a private school if you're not, in the city's view, fulfilling all the requirements."

Now I think there are regulations for private schools to start with, that you must have qualified teachers, certified teachers, to get funding, that the curriculum must be okayed, and that the staff can go into a private school. But the reason I'm bringing this up is that if private schools are funded, they're exempted under this act and if the Charleswood Day Care Centre ended up only as a private school, then the problem may well be back at the Minister's door - and I understand that this is a tough area to deal with and possibly she could tell the House just exactly what happens in a case like this.

In the Minister's remarks, when she was referring to the area that I was talking about where the director can enter premises, a private home in other words, she has indicated that these powers - and I'm taking it out of Hansard of Thursday, 16th of May, the Minister has said and I quote, "These powers are necessary to ensure the safety and well being of children in day care, and are the normal powers needed for the administration of a statute of this nature." In the case of the administrator entering the premises of a day care home, I think that goes beyond the normal powers needed and I want to reiterate that I feel that it would be much better if the director had to apply to the court to be able to just go into a home where they suspect day care.

We certainly agree with the Minister when she says that the child day care office needs to intervene promptly, so it's where there are licensed day cares - I don't see day care centres popping up that are not licensed, because I think you would soon know that in a community, soon be aware of it. So the only danger is in the homes.

The Minister also mentioned that the government will continue to look towards parent involvement and ownership of day cares through parent-run co-ops as the primary method of providing day care, and of ensuring high quality day care as the support for children and families.

I just want to say a few words about private day care versus commercial and independent, because I think there's a fine line here and somehow the government seems to be under the impression that everybody that's running an independent day is making a pot of gold, that there's a lot of profit in it. I doubt that very much, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the Member for Fort Garry, when he said that independent day care operators are essentially people who are interested in children.

One of the women, in particular, who made representation to the Minister, the Manitoba Association

of Independent Child Care Operators, has been a teacher for 15 years. She has a real feel for children and is not going to make a pot of money out of day care. I think that the government is letting their philosophy interfere with parents of low-income families from getting day care spaces.

The Winnipeg Sun recently had an editorial saying that the Tories have to choose between two motherhood issues, the protection of free enterprise or the protection of children. This isn't a choice. It goes without saying, they go hand in hand; you can have free enterprise and still have the protection of children because the independent operators agree that there should be regulations. They agree that the government can license and can enter their premises to check up. They agree that the directors can take the lists of records. That isn't a big problem. But one of the problems that we do have is that the independent operators have spaces and with limited funds, their suggestion that the subsidy follow the child is not a bad one — (Interjection) — and the Minister is indicating if there are enough dollars, right. But what has happened here is that - and I've got the day care pamphlet that they put out, "Day Care Information For Parents." Under "Cost and Subsidy," it indicates that the daily cost of day care in provincially-funded homes and centres for all parents is reduced by direct provincial maintenance grants and other assistance paid on behalf of all parents regardless of family income. Well, that's one area that in an independent day care that the government doesn't have to subsidize that, so if they just subsidized the child in a space with an independent operator then that would be a saving right there, because they don't have to subsidize the maintenance or the other assistance that is paid on behalf of all parents. Surely there must be room when you've got 5,000, and maybe that's high - that's a figure that's used in the paper - of a waiting list. I'm not sure if that's an accurate figure or not, but even if it's close, even if it's 3,000 and you've got 3,000 children waiting for spaces, there's got to be some room for both to work.

I'm not talking about what the government might consider commercial, although I don't have a big problem with that either, but I won't even get into dealing with that particular area. I want to discuss the independent operators who are in there, because this is a place too that I'm sure is they're mostly run by women and it's a wonderful opportunity for women to give care in an area that they feel that they have expertise and yet have their own businesses. They're not going to get rich on this. I think that the government should take a better look at what they're doing in case they end up with most of the private operators having to close doors.

I believe the Member for Fort Garry mentioned also about parent advisory committees. There is nothing wrong with independent operators having parent advisory committees that sit and can give advice, can make suggestions. I imagine most independent operators, in any case, take that kind of advice from parents because you're not working in isolation when you're working with somebody's children. They always have that interest, so I imagine that they are making suggestions constantly and to have parent advisory committees is an excellent way to go and something that the government, I would think, even with the mindset that they have, could go along with.

I would hope that the Minister would take a good look at the area of funding the children within the independent day care. If the need is there, surely, we don't want people to be left out, because the government can't afford to open all these spaces because of the extra funding they give. We can understand that when there are limited funds. When there are limited funds, why don't we use them all to the best of the ability and let some go out so that where there are spaces.

There's one more regulation. I guess I have a little bit of a problem with it. It is in the regulation and it's the upgrading. I don't have a problem with the upgrading at all. What I have a problem with is that the government day care has been given a subsidy of \$1,300, I believe. I don't know if it's for every day care worker, but I think it is, yes. When you have women who are working in day care, be it in independent areas or not, they have to upgrade too. I have a bit of a problem that these women are not getting any of that extra money because no matter what the Minister feels about the pots of money, the big profits that independent operators are making, I don't feel that it's there. I know they're not realizing a big profit. I hate to see women who are in day care, whether they're in government-subsidized day cares or not, I hate to see some of them being penalized because they work for independent operators. I think that money, even if it wasn't the whole \$1,300, even if they were able to get a bit of it. I'm sure that they are not making the giant salaries either that the government has wanted day care workers to get when they upgrade.

Already, the Minister has had to intervene and make this subsidy and when the bill was first introduced on child care, I believe the Minister made a question one time, which do you prefer? More space or more, was it, money? I can't remember the exact term now, but even then when the regulations were first being introduced, when the bill was first being introduced that there was an understanding that this was going to cost a lot of money and the money, it was just not there.

We're going to let this go on into Committee and I would like to hear the Minister answer some of the questions and we'll deal item-by-item as we get into Committee. Those are my remarks basically on this bill.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd just like to, Mr. Speaker, make a few comments particularly in response to the comments of the Member for Fort Garry before we move this bill into Committee. I was quite concerned when I read in Hansard some of his statements, particularly, in the area of his suggestions that the principle of these amendments were changing the whole concept of day care. I just wanted to make it very clear that we are basically quite happy with the results of The Community Child Day Care Standards Act with a few minor exceptions that we're now amending.

The concept of people going into neighbours' houses and the fact that people will **not be able** to look after



the neighbour's child or a niece or a nephew or, as the Member for Fort Garry refers, are certainly evidence, I think, of his misunderstanding of the original legislation and there is certainly nothing in this bill to amend the original legislation that would imply that we are moving in that direction.

In fact, the definition of day care in a family home situation is where a person cares for more than four children. So where he comments that - and I quote - "If you prohibit a neighbour from looking after one or two children," and again, on the same page, "so that that little lady who has taken two children for her neighbour, may suddenly have an inspector knocking on her door," etc., etc., I think, indicates that the Member for Fort Garry has quite a misunderstanding of what the definition of day care is. I think when we brought the original legislation in, we made those distinctions quite clear, that babysitting was one thing for a neighbour and child care and family day care homes were quite another and this legislation, of course, covers the latter and not the former, as the Member for Fort Garry is implying.

He also mentions that anyone who is looking after a child except a parent, must be licensed, and that's on Page 2749 of Hansard, at the beginning of his statement. Again, I think that shows his lack of understanding of the lengthy consultation process and discussion process that we had to get the original bill passed in this Legislature and the follow up year's work on consultation and development of the regulations and the marvellous input we had from the community throughout the Province of Manitoba to come up with our final program in Manitoba that is second to none in the country.

So I would hope that the Member for Fort Garry goes back and reviews Hansard on the original bill that this bill is amending, so that before it goes to committee he has a better understanding of the small amendments that we're making, based on the three years of experience we've had since the original bill and some of the few problems that we've had, of course, one of them, and the most major one being the fact that we didn't foresee a situation like the Charleswood one and the complications between the day care legislation and The Public Schools Act. But now, of course, that the court has ruled on that one and this bill to amend is before us, we should be able to clarify any of those circumstances and have the authority to deal quite quickly.

Of course, the reason for needing to deal quite quickly is because it is imperative that children are not left in a hazardous situation and that where we are talking about provisional administrators, there are two forms. One is the taking over of the day care centre so that that centre can continue operations if the situation has been that traumatic, rather than, say, a financial crisis or resignation of the entire board or whatever, when the children have to be removed, of course.

The thing that we'd like the best in those circumstances would be where the children can stay in an environment that they're comfortable with and they know, as long as it's not a traumatic situation, then you would have to look at winding the affairs of the day care centre down; but where, in the best interest of the children, they could stay and it's only a financial situation that is causing the problem and a provisional

administrator could continue to operate with the same staff or whatever, that would be the best of a bad situation. But we have to have those kinds of powers to move in and make the either/or decision at that time.

I was quite concerned that the Member for Fort Garry didn't realize, when he says on Page 2751 of Hansard, that nowhere in this bill does it force or compel parental involvement in the operation of these centres; and I believe that most day care centres have advisory parent bodies, but I think advisory bodies can be very weak and often ineffectual. Again, I think it shows the fact that he hasn't looked at the bill that we're amending and that it certainly requires that all publicly funded child care centres do have parent controlled boards and that the advisory boards are just for those that the Member for Kirkfield Park calls independent ones; so that where there are public funds - and I'd also like to make a distinction for the Member for Kirkfield Park - where our public funds are going into day care centres, they are non-profit parent controlled centres. They are not government day care centres.

They are government funded centres and, as a government, we look at the kinds of funds we have and we decide whether we expand spaces in non-profit centres or whether we give government money to independent centres. We feel that the best model for public money is the non-profit model and yet, if the independent centres can operate at the same quality, the minimum quality that we're requiring in the regulations and the legislation, by all means they can be licensed and they can continue to operate; but where we are expending public money, it should go into public centres.

So it's not a matter of, if we funded independent centres, we could meet the crying need out there for more spaces. Each and every year we've been putting as much money into the balance between the quality of the operations and as many new spaces as we can possibly afford, and this year, I believe it was something like 450 over and above all the other grants that we gave for upgrading of centres, the physical structure and the staff allowance. We've put as many spaces in each year as we possibly can to expand the numbers. Now, whether those are in independent centres or in non-profit centres, doesn't mean that there will be any more spaces that government that provide. The number of spaces will be exactly the same. The line that the independent operators are using to say, we can supply the centres if you just fund those children, doesn't make any sense.

If they have the spaces and there are people that are willing to pay for those spaces at the rates they charge, they can fill those spaces. In the meantime, the 450 we have this year will be filled as well. So, in fact, if they have empty spaces and they're wanting to meet the needs, they can certainly fill them up with people who can afford to send their children without subsidy. The ones we have for subsidy, we will use every last one of those spaces this year in the public, non-profit centres.

So it's not a question of either/or, it's a question we had 450 this year, every one of them will be used up, and if they can supply more at the minimum standards set out in the legislation, all well and good and we're not holding them back one little bit.

The last area that I would like to touch on is the idea that the parental involvement according to the Member for Fort Garry, where we just have advisory parent bodies is very weak and of course the only place we require the advisory committees is in the independent ones, and if the Member for Fort Garry thinks that method is weak, I think perhaps he is on a different side of the fence than the Member for Kirkfield Park.

I think that when you look across the board at the day care program, the amount of money that has gone in in the last three budget years from something like \$8 million to \$22 million, not counting all the training programs, etc. etc., that come out of other areas such as the Jobs Fund, I think that since I participated in the development of The Community Child Day Care Standards Act, which we are now making a few minor amendments to strengthen, I think that the progress has been quite remarkable and quite up to the commitments that we've made for this four-year period.

I, of course, think that there's no way that we can stop working on this in terms of funding and expansion until every one of the children and their parents in Manitoba who need child care receive it and I've certainly given my personal commitment to the day care community that I won't stop until that need is met. I think that the bill that we're looking at today is helping to make our day care program the best in the country.

I was very proud to have gone to Carman on Saturday to open a day care centre that had received not only a \$65,000 community assets grant, but also had a Careerstart person working in that centre and also had two substitute people who were relieving the regular staff who were going to Winkler for the training program.

I was delighted to see that this is happening throughout the province. I opened one at Morden, and the improvements are happening all over the province where centres are being built under other programs, where there's existing centres being renovated, where staff is being trained and where the spaces are opening up dramatically, so I commend the Minister for taking the initiative of bringing in these regulations to strengthen our legislation and her hard work in making sure that we have the best day care program in Canada.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Community Services will be closing debate.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to pick up on a few points that my colleague didn't refer to in response to questions by members opposite. There is no intent to change the overall philosophy of day care, merely to deal with some of the problems that we've had in applying the act that was in existence.

The shift of exemptions and definitions and so on is to give us a more workable system. We put the main types of day care into the definition and then put the seven different varieties into regulations. We've done somewhat the same with the exemptions, with things like camps and community centres, recreational programs, because we found that sometimes the day care will take youngsters for the day or even for an overnight and the question has arisen, are they still subject to the minimum standards. So we felt for ease

of operation and flexibility to cover all the myriad of situations that we would arrange it this way.

But the intent is not to broaden our responsibility beyond what it has been where children of preschool age are cared for in groups of a particular size and up, and where school-age youngsters, 6 to 12, are cared for outside of school hours, again in larger sized groups.

I was pleased to hear the support from the members opposite for protection and for an effective system, and again I value the types of issues they raised. There were a series of questions about the powers of the director. Again we will review each detail and can discuss that in committee. It's been a judgment call to give the directors sufficient authority to protect without having unreasonable or intrusive power. There is, of course, for any procedure, the right of appeal to the ADM, the Deputy, the Minister, and of course to the Ombudsman. So there are quite a few protections built in there.

The right of the director with regard to independent operators was raised. Again, the argument for being able to look at records and books, our desire would not be to be more intrusive than necessary, but access to the names of the parents are required if one wants to communicate with them, and the only area where the financial records become relevant is if it is the only way to check on the standards being maintained, standards with regard to food and nutrition, numbers of staff relative to the numbers of children being cared for. But again, I will listen carefully for fine-tuning suggestions that may come up in committee to see that we achieve the best balance of all.

Minor issues about the number of quorum we should have on staff qualifications review committee, the criteria have been developed for that committee with the larger committee and having three sitting as a quorum rather than five, I think has been recommended to try to expedite service to the people appealing. It's probably in the area of criteria that the broadly-based concerns are best addressed. However, I'll be interested to hear any further arguments there might be.

I can't give off the top of my head the specific recommendations that have been made by Crown counsel, but I will undertake to make those available in writing to the members before we have the discussion at the committee stage.

The general issue of profit day care versus non-profit, I think is grossly misunderstood by the members opposite and indeed by the public. The assumption - again, we prefer the labels, as my colleague, the Member for Wolseley, has used, of profit and non-profit rather than government and commercial, because I think the profit/non-profit gets at the root of the problem.

The understanding of people seems to be that every person who wants day care is entitled to the money and that they should be allowed to take the money and in a sense use it where they choose, in either type of centre. If we were at the stage where we had the day care system at a sufficiently developed stage for that to be even possible, we might well consider that, but for the moment, the real lid on the number of spaces is the total budget and a space that would follow a parent to an independent centre would in fact be subtracted from one of the other centres.

The question, as my colleague has said, is where do we expend limited public funds? It's rather like in the

development of Medicare or Education, back 50 or 60 years where there were not enough spaces or service for people. We've admitted that we're aiming at serving a quarter of the age group - we're currently at a quarter of that. The budget is growing at a rapid rate. The only jurisdiction in Canada that's moving ahead faster than us in total funding has been Alberta. They've chosen to do it by making very hefty administrative grants available to all types of centres. Quite frankly, we have concerns with going that route and we also don't have that amount of fiscal flexibility. The system has grown faster than any other social program in Manitoba during a very difficult economic time and our commitment is to continue the development, but we do feel we must set priority as to where scarce funds are to be spent.

The issue of developing the system more rapidly, I think, needs to be addressed. It's our belief that it could go ahead and we could meet the unmet need within five years if there were a federal commitment to a national day care act with specific funding for capital and to meet the real costs.

The underlying issue of women and the pay they get and their access to day care is, quite frankly, that this is a very valuable service that has always traditionally been done in the home for free. Now we have more women moving into the labour market, wanting and needing day care. There's never been a dollar value attached to it. The people working in the day care system tend to be women; the pay levels are very low; the supply is inadequate. It's still an essential economic service for people in the labour market, but there's a lag. There's a serious lag between the supply and the need.

Now it's beguiling to think that if we just shifted the money and let the money travel around more freely to the profit centres, that we would somehow magically increase the supply. The only counter I can give to that - it's rather like building a highway system by putting a square yard of pavement in front of every hundredth house, hoping in time that they would all link up and you'd have a workable highway system - if you broke it down and let the money follow the parent. You must work with the centres and build them up, prioritizing so that you spread the centres geographically. We are currently nearly balanced, urban and rural, and different areas of the city. But we have some sense of priority and also quality maintenance.

Again, that's a quick response to the questions raised. We can go into the others in greater detail in committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

#### RES. NO. 2 - ABOLITION OF THE SENATE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, the first item on the Order Paper for today is Proposed Resolutions, Resolution No. 2.

The Honourable Member for River East has 20 minutes.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had not originally intended to speak on this but it seems the opposition is extremely interested in hearing

what I might have to say about the abolition of the Senate. — (Interjection) — The title of my speech, the Member for Arthur wants to know. I think we would have to call it "The Heart of Darkness." That sounds like a fitting title for me.

Mr. Speaker, when I first started to think about this resolution a few days ago, I looked around to see what it was like being in the Senate. You know, we've always heard that it's full of old men who don't do much all day and get paid a lot of money, but we can't go simply by what we hear, we have to look into these things and check for ourselves to see exactly what is involved. I guess I was behind the times on the salary; I thought it was only about \$50,000 but it seems it's now \$63,500 a year. — (Interjection) — Yes, it's indexed. That's one set of pensioners that is indexed. I wonder if Mr. Mulroney will index the rest of the pensioners to match the Senate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I was looking to see just what kind of work the Senators were doing to earn all of this money and I noticed that the work week is quite short. It consists of Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays - it seems that the senators need a long weekend to rest up for those strenuous sittings they go through on those Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays of perhaps every week.

If you look a little bit further and you think, how much time on these Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays are the Senators actually working hard at their desks in the Senate? I thought I'd do a little checking on that, Mr. Speaker, and it seems that the average is about two hours a day. Two hours a day - sometimes more, sometimes less. I have to confess that it's not always two hours, they don't have rigid standards.

For example, on April 23rd, they sat for 1 hour and 10 minutes. The next day, they sat for an hour and 40 minutes; I guess that was a rough day because the next day, on April 25th, they only sat for an hour and 5 minutes. So they rested up over that long weekend and on April 30th, they did 2 full hours. That was too much for one day, so the next day they took it a bit easier and sat for 20 minutes. On May 2nd, they managed 2 hours again before heading off for another four day weekend, hard at work in their constituencies. May 7th, an hour and 55 minutes; May 8th, an hour and 45 minutes; May 9th, an hour and 20 minutes. That's a very busy week for the senators, it seems. May 14th, an hour and 40 minutes; May 15th, an hour and 40 minutes; May 16th, 50 minutes.

And all of this only cost the taxpayers of Canada \$35 million a year - \$35 million a year for these tea parties, these little tea parties that they get involved in, Mr. Speaker. You have to sit back and you have to wonder, are the taxpayers getting value for their money? I mean, this would turn Mr. Sweeney green with envy, wouldn't it? Really. And how many of them are there?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is, of course, just a little bit superficial and perhaps a bit silly. But that's the way the Senate operates in its regular sittings. The argument that we often get though, is that the senators really do good and valuable work on their standing committees; the Committees of the Senate do good work. I notice that a little while ago, one of the most recent publications I got from the Senate was called "Soil at Risk - Canada's Eroding Future. A report on soil conservation by the Standing Committee on Agriculture,

Fisheries and Forestry to the Senate of Canada." Actually it's a very good study, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — That's the French side. The French side is always upside down to the English side.

But I looked at this book and I thought about it for a while, and at the very beginning you had this gallery with all the pictures of the Senators on this committee. There's 14 of them and they all have their pictures figured prominently, with their names underneath, and they look quite impressive. — (Interjection) — Yes, there's Senator Gildas Molgat in here. He's on the committee.

So you know there are some people on here - these aren't people that nobody's ever heard of. These are people who have done their work in their times and have retired to the Senate, where they now purport to do good and meaningful work on their committees. But after getting past the pictures in the front, if you go a further few pages, you see "The committee would like to thank all of those who participated and helped," for example, "the diligence of Ms. Sally Rutherford, director of research; and of Mr. Len Christie and Mrs. Lynn Myers of the Research Branch, Library of Parliament, is greatly appreciated. Mr. Dennis Boufard, who provided valuable assistance in his role of the Clerk of the Committee. The hard work of Ms. Eileen Collins, helped to bring this report into being.

"The committee is particularly grateful to Mr. D. Lobb, to Mr. J. LaForge, Mr. H. Morrell, Mr. R. McNabb, Mr. C. Shelton, Mr. R. Deon, for their aid with the farm studies. The committee would also like to thank," Dr. so-and-so, Dr. so-and-so, and on and on and on it goes. These are the real unsung Senators of Canada. These are the people who did the report. These are the people who did all the work, so that these people - a little bit further before - could put their pictures at the front of the book.

Now maybe the senators are providing some input, but we all know in this House how committees really work and we know that this report was not really written by a Senate Committee of 14 people. We know that it was written by the staff. We know that the staff did the diagrams, took the pictures, did the research, put together the bibliography, organized the meetings and shepherded the senators from centre to centre across Canada.

So here we have — (Interjection) — Well the Member for Arthur says I'm against employment. Mr. Speaker, I'm paying credit to the people who did the work. Certainly that's not against employment. I'm against accelerated pensions, like the people who put their names on the front, but not against employment, certainly not, Mr. Speaker.

So when we talk about the Senate providing good and meaningful work, we have to ask on these reports that come out - certainly they're good, certainly they're meaningful, certainly they're valuable, certainly they're worthwhile producing - but did we need the Senate to do it? Couldn't we have gone to the Library of Parliament without a Senate Committee and asked them to do the same thing? Did we really need the Senate to tell the library to do the research for them? I don't think we did.

I think if you take this committee structure a little bit further and look at the some of the work, the real work which goes on in the Senate - and I know there's

a lot of people that say that the Senate doesn't really do any work, but the Senate does do some work. They do a great deal of work, but it's not the kind of work that I think should be done there. It shouldn't be done there at all, Mr. Speaker.

For example, The Bank Act is the only major Act in Parliament in which revisions are initiated in the Senate, and why is that, Mr. Speaker? Because the senators are in the pockets of the banks. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the opposition laughs. When The Bank Act was first drafted, the bank presidents came out and said, we're so proud of it because it was a joint effort by the banks and the Parliament of Canada. It was a joint effort. They didn't say that Parliament did it. They said it was a joint effort. They knew where their bread is buttered.

The Senate of Canada, I would bet - this is an interesting exercise I would like to propose to the members of the opposition. I would propose that you take your list of Senators for Canada over in the Reading Room and pick out the Financial Post Directory of Directors, and then look up each Senator in the Financial Post Directory of Directors and see how many Senators are on the boards of banks, of trust companies, financial institutions, not to mention all the corporations in Canada that are important and need a voice in Parliament.

You know a few months ago, there was a great big outcry in Parliament because somebody had found out that Prime Minister Mulroney had not resigned everyone of his directorships. They found one that he'd overlooked, and that was tremendously terrible on the part of the Prime Minister, one would suppose, and yet we go to the Senate and everybody flaunts their directorships.

In fact, when it comes to The Bank Act, Mr. Speaker, you will find that it's the bankers who sit in the Senate and revise their own act. For example, the senator who is the chairman of the Standing Committee on Banking, is Senator Salter Hayden. Now he's an honorary director of a bank. An honorary director. He doesn't attend the board meetings. He doesn't get paid, but he's an honorary director all the same. If you think that he doesn't have connections with the bank because of that - I mean they didn't make him honorary for nothing, they did it for something.

Or what about some of the other people on the banking committee in the Senate? What about Senator Hartland Molson, a former vice-president of the Bank of Montreal, a former director of the Bank of Montreal? Do you think that because he no longer works for the Bank of Montreal, he doesn't talk to the people at the Bank of Montreal? Do you think the Bank of Montreal, when they want The Bank Act amended in a certain way, doesn't call Senator Molson and say, "Hart, we'd like you to do this. We'd like you to look into this for us. We'd like you to change this; we'd like you to change that." The banks know who to call. They make sure that they get the right people, in the right place in the Senate.

So, Mr. Speaker, what happens is that the Senate, which looks like a superficial and perhaps a silly institution at times, the story of the Senate is it's like a tale by Joseph Conrad. As you peel away those layers of superficiality, you descend deeper and deeper into a heart of darkness, you get deeper and deeper into

finding out what the Senate is really all about, and you find that it is still - still to this day - the preserve of the wealthy, of privilege. It's still there as an institution to represent wealth. They don't make any bones about it. They don't make the senators resign their boards, not in the Senate. It's still for representation of wealth.

We've heard before about how, in order to qualify for the Senate when The BNA Act was first passed, you had to have \$4,000 worth of property just to get in. It was a very exclusive club, \$4,000 was a lot of money in those days. In fact when Thomas Greenway from Manitoba was appointed to the Senate, he had to borrow the money to qualify. — (Interjection) — As long as you borrow your money for your dues from the right club and then represent that club you get safely ensconced in the Senate. That's how the bankers do it, they get their people in; that's how the industrialists do it, they get their people in. We have an institution which represents wealth and privilege.

Most of the institutions that represent wealth and privilege we've done away with already. We abolished hereditary titles - did we? - in the 1920s? Remember you could run all over this country with Sir So-and-So's, or So-and-So. There were all kinds of knights and whatever running around the country, but that was abolished. It was an honorific title, granted, but all we've done is abolish the trappings of privilege. We abolished the knighthood. There's no longer a Sir Rodman Roblin; there was just plain Duff Roblin his grandson. There was no title attached to the status anymore, but when we talk about the real privilege, the wealth, that hasn't been changed. Only the trappings have been abolished. I think that it's probably a good time now to talk about abolishing the real institutions of wealth and power in this country which is, of course, the Senate.

We've heard proposals that perhaps the Senators should be appointed by the Legislatures, make it a bit more representative. Perhaps we should appoint Senators. I guess the Manitoba Legislature would be in charge of appointing six Senators or whatever. Really, when you think about that, that just takes us back to where the United States was before 1912 when they were appointing Senators from the State Legislatures.

Other people have proposed something a bit more progressive. They say why don't we elect our Senators. How do we do that? We get to where they are in the United States now. You have two Houses; you elect people to the Lower House, you elect people to the Upper House. The United States is clearly in a state of chaos. You get wars going on between the Senate the House of Representatives. One party dominates one Chamber and the other party dominates the other Chamber and nothing gets done. Each vetoes the other. That's hardly a situation we need in Canada where you have two Houses and each one controlled by a different party, which is completely feasible under the scheme which is proposed for election of Senators.

Why have it at all? Why have the Senate at all if it doesn't really do anything different from the House of Commons? Why have it? I haven't anyone say what it should be there for. We know that underneath all of this there is an undercurrent of reluctance to abolish the Senate because it would affect the power and privilege of a few people. In reality, we should be looking at abolishing the Senate.

I guess one of the things that really gives me a lot of concern is that we talk about these things in the

Legislature here. We pass these resolutions and I don't think anyone in Ottawa hears. I don't think Brian Mulroney hears. I don't think he knows what we're doing out here. — (Interjection) — The Member for Lakeside says he listens. Do you remember two weeks ago now we passed a resolution demanding that the Federal Government not de-index senior citizen pensions, but did that have any effect on Ottawa? No, no effect whatever.

Mr. Speaker, because it is obvious that the Prime Minister doesn't hear what we say out here, I would move, seconded by the Member for Ellice that the resolution be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words: and;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Assembly be instructed to communicate a copy of this resolution to the Prime Minister of Canada.

**MOTION on amendment presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Ellice.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Don't you burn your bridge, because you may want to get to the Senate.

**MR. B. CORRIN:** Actually the honourable member suggests, Mr. Speaker, that I shouldn't burn my bridges, that I might want to get to the Senate. Of course, members who have had the opportunity to read Page 3 of the Winnipeg Sun might readily realize why I am considering that alternative route if I am. There are times in political life when one has to swallow one's principles.

**A MEMBER:** Thank God you don't have any.

**MR. B. CORRIN:** I'll pretend I didn't hear that last remark.

Mr. Speaker, this is a subject which, I guess, has been around as long as most of the members in the Chamber in terms of the broad discussion of whether or not the Upper House, so called, or the other place depending on who you talk to, is relevant and germane to the political processes of our country. It's a question which we all dealt with, I'm sure, in school. It was, I suppose, one that was raised in terms of public consciousness very carefully and deliberately and oftentimes by the former Member for Winnipeg North Centre, the Honourable Stanley Knowles. Mr. Knowles almost made a career out of tweaking the nose of members of the other place. Of course, he oftentimes, and any opportunity, as I recollect, that he could get, would suggest that this body was, in his humble opinion, irrelevant.

I tend to agree, but where I have a problem, and I think it's a real problem, is knowing that that situation needn't exist. I personally feel that an Upper Chamber has some value in a country such as Canada. I, for one, agree with some of the premises and some of the recommendations made in the Senate's report on itself. I can't believe that the Senate is completely irrelevant because the Senate has, at least at some point or other, come to some grips with the question of its own future and its own relevancy and its own jurisdiction.

In that report, and I must admit that I've glanced at it most superficially and in a very general fashion, the Senate Committee did recommend that the method of selection of Senators be changed and that consideration be given, not only to a different method of appointment, but also possibly to some new and broader role for the Senate, which would make it more germane from the point of view of the public and the political process.

I guess in this regard, one of the things that's always concerned me and I'm sure it's concerned many members is the essential unfairness of representation by population when that type of democratic process is laid on top of special regional concerns. You can have a very valid regional interest, and I guess in the West we've had very noteworthy ones that have to do with agriculture and transportation, just to think of two very obvious examples.

You can have regional concerns, which should be of immediate import to the Federal Government of the Day and which demand attention and perhaps demand pervasive analysis and yet, because we have governments selected by rep by pop, you may have a group of individuals essentially monopolizing power from a particular region who are simply disinterested, for one reason or another, in those other regional concerns; so if you have - as we have had from time to time - a Federal Government dominated by representatives of the eastern industrial regions, you may find that areas of concern involving prairie transportation and agriculture or natural resources development may take a back seat.

I have always felt, and I'm sure many member have felt, that it would be nice to have some form where sober afterthought could be taken and also, perhaps, initiatives could be raised with respect to the potential for alternative means of dealing with problems. Whether that means reform of the House of the Commons or whether it means reform of the Senate, I'm not sure, but we're here today to discuss the abolition of the Senate, because I think that obviously the goals to be accomplished can be accomplished in several different ways. By adopting a more congressional approach, in terms of parliamentary committees, that would be, I think, one solution.

Another solution would be to have a Senate which had a regional representativeness, which was based on either popular election or appointment by local legislative authority, and I guess, notably, the Provincial Legislatures.

If we go the latter route, my impression would be that the latter route would offer the benefit of having a direct pipeline between the reigning, ruling, governing provincial assembly in government and the representatives of that region or province in the Senate itself. The downside, the disability of that approach to the problem, in my submission, would be that you obviously would not allow people to participate in the decision-making process which places and puts people in the Senate and gives them that responsibility and authority.

I personally favour, for what it's worth, a popular electoral process which would have provincial constituencies with representatives going to the Senate through election processes. I think that would put the local representative in touch with his or her constituents; I think it would bring a measure of politicization into

the Senate and I think that it would bring forward very strong regional interests because the people who were elected would obviously have to speak their minds in order to retain their seats.

I'm not sure that's the only way we can do it, but I think if we're going to do something to make it relevant and we're not going to abolish it, that's the only halfway house Senators can adopt.

I have the privilege of knowing several Senators personally. I've come across them, I guess, various ways, mostly through business association. They're all reasonable people. The people I know are all reasonable people; they're all, in my opinion, people of some experience in financial and community affairs. In many cases, they do come from broader experiences than many people would credit them with, but realistically, on the other side of that same coin, the obverse side of that coin, Mr. Speaker, they tend to be removed from public participatory processes.

They ironically, in many cases, have considerable interests in various areas of government. As a matter of fact, I've been quite surprised when speaking with some of the people to find that their interests range quite extensively, as a matter of fact, in areas which I would not have credited them with in terms of interest.

They too complain of the limitations of their position. They too feel somewhat redundant and irrelevant. A lot of them, frankly, feel that they're there for the wrong reasons and wish that, once appointed, they could take more relevant positions and more expressive roles as officials within government.

I'm just thinking generally of ways that the Senate could currently and contemporaneously prove their worth. I can think of no better way that they could serve the public now than by taking a position with respect to the de-indexing of the old age pension. I use this as an example because I guess I have a feeling that must be a pill that would be very difficult for a lot of people, who are members of the Senate, to swallow.

Given the nature of their sinecures, and I say that respectfully, but they are sinecures, their appointments for life, given the structure of their own salaries and their own pension plan — (Interjection) — and the member reminds me that they're most probably indexed, I think that they could demonstrate their own concern by taking a concerted position by way of resolve of that particular House against the plans of the Federal Government to de-index the old age pension.

I think one of the problems the Senate has had, Mr. Speaker, and this is why the amendment is important in terms of transmitting this resolution to the Prime Minister of Canada, one of the problems the Senate has had is it's not been vocal enough; it's not been expressive enough, in terms of trying to identify its own interests and trying to identify any sort of political context and perspective.

Although I respect those figures that were related by the Member for River East and I'm sure those figures are accurate about sitting time in the Senate House, I also know that not all the work of people involved in politics at any level is done in the Assembly. I'm not naive. Having been at this game for eight years here and three years before somewhere else, I know that a lot of the work of the journeyman politician happens away from this Chamber and I credit politicians for having the energy and the forbearance to be able to conduct these affairs as well as **those**.

I don't think it's enough to simply say, well the Senators are underworked and overpaid and the demonstrable evidence is in the sitting hours. But I do think it's fair to suggest that the Senate has not been particularly critical of many things which have happened in this country through the years, and therefore it is fair to assume and to deduce that the Senate has become somewhat out of touch with the people it is there to protect as the senior house of sober second thought.

The question is a serious one. I think that we stand between pillar and post, as a country governed by a parliamentary system, which, in some circumstances and in some occasions, has proven itself now to be dysfunctional. I think we have a lot to learn from congressional system in the United States. I think that we, as politicians, should be involved in the process of exploring reformatory mechanisms to enhance the processes of government. I guess one has to say that it's time that the issue is dealt with. — (Interjection) — Yes, that's coming too soon. That issue shouldn't be dealt with. It's only with great strain that I can manage this laughter. A jocular interchange between members of an honourable profession.

So I'm pleased to have participated in this debate, Mr. Speaker. I commend the resolution to members opposite. I certainly commend the amendment as well. I think that they, once again, should forge links with the Government of Manitoba, link hands in order to bring forward good ideas to the powers that be, their brethren in Ottawa.

Thank you very much.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wasn't intending to speak until the member - in fact I wouldn't have had the opportunity to speak - had not the Member for River East moved that tremendous amendment, but beyond that the banter across the floor, suggesting that it is a sacred trust for Brian to be listening to us at this very moment, is something which irresistably required that I would have to get up and speak, Mr. Speaker, through you to Brian, on the amendment of course.

I think that it's an excellent amendment. I would suggest that once we've passed this resolution that we will pass it on to Brian.

**A MEMBER:** Dear Brian.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Yes, one could compose a letter, Dear Brian, and tell him why it is that this particular body should be buried. It should be buried so deep that we could never find it again. There are people who suggest that Senates can be useful, or that bodies of second opinion can be useful, and they've made suggestions about the American model and other models, and so on. But that is another issue.

I would be happy to debate the question of an elected Senate. I'd be happy to debate the question of an appointed Senate, a Senate appointed by the provinces or by the municipalities or anybody else, but that is not the Senate we have today. Today we have a Senate

that is appointed by the Federal Government. It is a Senate that has done no useful work in many many years, and I think that's been amply demonstrated by speeches in this particular Chamber, outlining the achievements of our Senators lately, and I agree with the Member for Ellice that they're fine people. Nobody says they're not fine people, but they could be doing something useful, rather than wasting their time at that anachronism, and it costs Canadians many millions of dollars a year to keep those fine old gentlemen in that

**A MEMBER:** They're great gentlemen.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** That's a sexist remark.

**A MEMBER:** Are there women there?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Well there might be one or two. I don't know the numbers.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** You don't know what you're talking about. There are several very well qualified outstanding Canadian women.

**A MEMBER:** Name one Jimmy, name one.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** I could sure name quite a few.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**A MEMBER:** Sarah.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** He's the one that's got the floor

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I will accept that there are fine women and fine men in the Senate but they're not doing anything useful while they're there, and for that, they should apologize to the Canadian people. They should not be there. That body should be eliminated. I would suggest that there is more of a waste of money right there by that Senate than, just for example, we could eliminate that identification with the 19th Century, take that \$20 million or so a year, put it into a manufacturing technology centre in Winnipeg and do something for our young people for the 21st Century. That would be moving ahead. That would be doing something useful and we could then take a look at some body of second opinion that is elected, that is nominated by different groups, that is representative of different groups and so on. We could take a look at that, but that's not what we have here, and those people who are in Ottawa today are not the people who would be chosen, either by way of election - but we can talk about some of the people who attempted to get elected democratically in the prairies and were unable to do so and finally wound up in Ottawa as a result of the Liberal Government's appointing them over the last number of years.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** How's it getting along in Ontario, the Liberals and NPD, Vic, you like that one, do you? You can go . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, for too many years the NDP in Ontario propped up an incompetent aging, old Tory Government and they finally got rid of that incompetent aging, old Tory Government. We'll see what happens now.

But we now have a Senate which, as the Member for Eliche has suggested, has done nothing and will do nothing about the de-indexing of pensions for old age pensioners. I've heard not a word from them. I've heard not a word and I expect I won't hear a word from our senators to protect Manitobans against the changes with respect to capital gains, the changes with respect to RRSPs, and so on. The costs to the Federal Treasury of those changes are more, Mr. Speaker, than the benefits to the Federal Treasury of the de-indexing, but I bet that you will not hear the Senate move a motion to turn those two things around and get the money back to the old age pensioners and do away with those kinds of gifts at a time when we have difficult times for government, when we need money and they're giving it away to the wrong people. We will not hear those Senators talking about that issue. We will not hear those Senators even talking about regional development. Why this very day, Brian, - or was it yesterday - announced in Manicouagan the building of a \$60 million hotel. A penitentiary they call it but the mayor of the town involved said they won't have any nasty people in there. That's right. He was quoted in the Globe and Mail as saying they're not going to have nasty people in there. We want to keep these prisoners away from the others. It'll be informers and there'll be no real problems here.

A nice project for a place like the Interlake in Manitoba. It would be a nice project for the Maritimes. It would be. In fact, — (Interjection) — So is my time. In fact, — (Interjection) — I've got 10 minutes on this one that if somebody moves another amendment I'll get another 20 minutes yet. This particular prison, so called, was scheduled apparently for the Maritimes. — (Interjection) — No, it's not off the topic. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that this particular Senate will do nothing to stop that. They will do absolutely nothing to prevent the Prime Minister of this country from boosting up his riding, not on the basis of something that has been long-term planned, but on the basis that it's his riding. — (Interjection) — I recall, during the election campaign, the Prime Minister was riding around on an airplane called Manicouagan 1. If one were a sportscaster, one would think today it's Manicouagan 1, Maritimes zero. While Brian made that announcement, at the same time he made that announcement, he said this is the first of many in this particular town in that particular constituency.

Do we have a Senate that protects regional interests? I say no. I say we don't have a Senate that protects regional interests at all. Let's get rid of it. If you want a Senate that — (Interjection) — does that kind of thing, then let's bring on a new one. Let's discuss how to bring on a new one. It may be that people can convince us that there is some form of body of second opinion that could be useful. I don't know. What we do know — (Interjection) — What you haven't said is that you're prepared to vote to get rid of this one. The Member for Lakeside says he's voting with us. I'm

pleased to hear that because my understanding of his speech was that he basically thought we would have to keep this group — (Interjection) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** . . . Oh, on the Senate you're with us? Because it's Private Members' Hour maybe we can have a private conversation while I'm finishing up. I've got another seven or eight minutes to go, I believe. — (Interjection) — 10 minutes.

**A MEMBER:** Mr. Speaker, could you keep him on the subject?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** On the amendment — (Interjection) — Back to the amendment. If you're not careful, we'll have somebody else wrapping it up for another 15 minutes so keep that in mind.

When Parliament gets that message — (Interjection) — I hope they will act. I don't believe that Canadians want this Senate to continue on. I believe Canadians realize that Senate has been a complete failure over the years, that it has been an award, in some instances, a political plum for people who didn't fit in well with the party in government. I think of people, for instance, not working out so well in Cabinet and suddenly winding up in the Senate, works out very conveniently. People winding up in some difficulty or other in their relation to other people in the party in power and winding up in the Senate and basically not being heard from after that.

There is no accountability by these people, none whatsoever. Some, unfortunately, contrary to what some people on our side have been saying, are not old people. There was one appointment very recently, one individual appointed in his early 30s by the previous government to last 40 years without the requirement to check back with the Canadian people and pick up indexed payment of - what is it? - \$63,000 a year now for that period and, of course, indexed against inflation with no requirement to come back to check to see whether he's doing something appropriate, inappropriate. With us, every four or five years the people make up their minds and that's appropriate. We do our best while we're here. Some of us are here longer than others. Sometimes people decide they want a new member and so on. You have no such choice with this particular Senate. I think it behaves accordingly.

I did a letter the other day - talking about the amendment - a letter to my constituents asking people whether they could identify several people who happened to be Senators right now, have been Senators for many years from Manitoba. People couldn't identify them. I checked around afterwards. People simply could not identify them. There there are supposedly acting in the interests of Manitobans and yet we don't even know who they are. When we have a problem, our constituents don't contact a Senator. Have you ever had a copy of a letter when your constituent had difficulty with a nursing home, with a pension problem, with an unemployment insurance cheque? Have you ever had them send a letter to their Senator and send a copy of it to their MLA? It happens with city councillors, it happens with Members of Parliament, it



happens with Members of the Legislature, it happens with a whole host of other even non-elected people in the community, people they know they can go to.

There are all kinds of volunteer agencies that people go to when they're in trouble, but the one group they will not go to is the senators because they don't even know they exist. And if they did know they existed, I'm not sure they would contact them anyway, because they are basically not answerable to the people in the way your local organizations are, the way your elected officials are.

How, in a time of restraint, people can go on appointing people to that Chamber, wasting that kind of money, having those people when they're in office spending an hour or two a day, as the Member for River East pointed out, most of the time they're not there and the other times they're travelling up and down the country at your expense and mine - which is probably even worse than having them sitting there doing nothing - which is an awful option, isn't it? They're either travelling up and down the country first-class, on our aircraft, staying in our finest hotels and so on, spending our taxpayers' money, or else they're over there eating in subsidized restaurants — (Interjection) — taxpayers indeed - they don't pay their way.

That's not the way ordinary Canadians live and that's not the way ordinary Canadians work. Ordinary Canadians do not believe that that institution is worth saving. When it is put up against the cuts that were made in this last Budget, it is only perverse to suggest that they should stay where they are now. They should be sent home. They should be asked to do something productive for their country. Put those people back into private industry; put them back into wherever they were, those who are still able to, those who have the health to be able to continue on could possibly do something useful, possibly create employment for Canadians, possibly create employment for Canadians, possibly solve some problems that we have. Certainly they're not solving them there, so I think it's important that we give those people - we free them up from the Senate; we give them the opportunity to once again contribute to a stronger Canada.

We do have times of difficulty where difficult choices have to be made by governments. We do have to shut down some services here and there, services that are hopefully by any level of government, peripheral to people's needs. This is one that basically would be a positive, in terms of closing it down, on the one hand saving money, on the other hand freeing up the energies of all those people so they don't have to go back and forth on the airplanes across the country, week in and week out from Vancouver to Ottawa, and Edmonton to Ottawa, and Winnipeg to Ottawa and so on and going on their various junkets, but rather being in their home areas working again, as they did before they were put into that place, to improve their communities. If they were chosen, as some people have suggested, on the basis that they were highly qualified individuals, let's get them back into the community and again give us a hand in improving our communities and our country, because it's not happening in the Senate.

The question of having the Prime Minister notified of the passage of this amendment - I think that this is an extremely important addition. It is one that I'm sure all members will agree with. I hope that not only will

the Prime Minister listen because, as the Member for Lakeside suggests, it's a sacred trust of the Prime Minister to listen to every word that we say in this Chamber - what we also want to have is the Prime Minister doing something, and doing something that will be of benefit to the Members of the Senate, free them up to do something useful, do something that will be of benefit to Canadians, save us some tax money.

I think it would be just a tremendous move on the part of the Prime Minister to not only listen, not only read the resolution, but to act on it. The member opposite suggests - he was referring to \$115 million in equalization payments - I just want him to remember that in 1985, the Prime Minister of Canada is sending us roughly \$22 million less than that evil Pierre Trudeau sent us last year, and next year is intending to send us another \$20 million less than he's sending us this year. So let's not think that the Prime Minister of the country is Santa Claus. He's not Santa Claus. He's doing his best; he's got a difficult job; we all know that.

Certainly, we will help him along where we think he could do better. Not all of his announcements should be made with respect to Domtar and the petrochemical industry and the prison and so on, in the Province of Quebec. We think occasionally an announcement should be made in the Province of Manitoba and we think that it should be in respect to all kinds of economic development areas, including - and the kind of announcements he's made up until now, we've not been very happy with in Manitoba when it comes to economic development. The manufacturing technology centre which would give jobs for young people for the 21st Century. There's nothing happening with respect to the research in the North, those kinds of things. We want to hear those kinds of responses and we'll trade in the Senate any day for the manufacturing technology centre.

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

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's a pleasure once again to enter the debate on the value of the Senate and of the amendment that we have presented today, a wise amendment suggested by my honourable seat mate, the Member for River East, that the resolution be forwarded on to the Prime Minister of Canada. I think it's worthwhile to dwell for a minute or two on why that amendment has so much importance with this resolution.

We see, and we wonder right now whether there is a role for the Senate. In my last presentation before this House on this general topic, I said that I thought there may be a role for the Senate. I wasn't quite sure that that same role could not more adequately be served by the House of Commons, by perhaps a restructuring of the House of Commons and even an electoral process, of moving towards proportional representation across the country so that then we would have a better representation of the national political spectrum in Ottawa than we have presently, and certainly it's probably the most exaggerated misrepresentation for the wishes and the expressed wishes by the people of Canada from coast to coast in the present makeup of the House of Commons, with a party that I believe got

just over 50 percent of the vote ends up with 77 percent of the seats overall, and other parties who had a much larger indication of support from the general public for what that party stood for, in various areas are very much under-represented by this present electoral system to the House of Commons.

The Senate was supposed to be there to protect regional interest, and also not just regional interest, but also so often referred to as a second thought, or a chamber for review, a chamber to make sure that the House of Commons in its initial stages did not move in excess in introducing legislation that may be harmful for the country.

I think right now the Senate has a golden opportunity before us, before this nation, to show that it does have some worth, and yet it's been a week and a half now, I believe, since the Federal Budget has last passed; I'm not even aware of whether there has been debates in the Senate on that Budget yet. We have an instance where the Senate, in the powers that are currently entrusted to it, can attempt to put some sense in that Budget by sending it back to the House of Commons with several amendments to that bill for the House of Commons' reconsideration.

If the Senate ever hopes to regain any kind of respect, be it for the appointed Senate, which most Senators even agree, I believe, should possibly be changed or should be altered and moved towards an elected Senate. They are even in some ways, I think, from the Senators that I have known, are not exactly embarrassed by having the position, but are perhaps a little bit, I guess, flushed - they're flushed for sure with the pay that they get compared to the average Canadian, the ordinary Canadian. They are themselves questioning frequently whether or not their Chamber should be altered.

Mr. Speaker, today, in these days as they pass, I think they are missing an opportunity to show most clearly that the Senate does have a possible role.

We had the de-indexation of pensions. We, in this Chamber, have shown the Prime Minister, through the resolution that passed this Chamber showing our lack of approval, and our total disapproval I must state, or unanimous disapproval for that measure.

We have a Senate that is primarily made up of pensioners, people who would ordinarily in life be pensioners at least. Most of them are over the age of 65, and yet we haven't heard a peep from any of the

Manitoba Senators on this Budget. Has Nate Nurgitz said anything? Has a Senator who's a Member of the Cabinet as well, the Honourable Duff Roblin, a former distinguished member, to say the least, of this House, probably the last of the real progressive Conservatives this province has seen. Certainly, there is such a vast vast difference between what the policies of Duff Roblin were in this province compared to the policies of the Official Opposition that we have in the province today representing and carrying the same cards that he, in effect, almost initiated back in the late 1940s and '50s.

The Senate has this opportunity to say to the Government of Canada, no, it is wrong to try and fight the problems that the country has on the backs of those whose incomes are the lowest in the country, whose incomes are fixed, who do not have an opportunity to go and negotiate through their labour organizations any additional amount of funding; who do not have the ability of other citizens in their workplaces if they have money invested for instance. Most of the pensioners, who are dependent just on the Canada Pension and the Old Age Pension and Supplement, don't have money in the bank that they can draw out to meet rainy days as they need it, be it for house repairs, be it for perhaps even something for their children, to be able to bring their children home and give them decent meals. A lot can't even afford to do that, especially if they're trying to maintain their own homes. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have heard nothing from the Senate on that critical issue.

The whole country is most vocal in opposition to the Government of Canada's proposal to start cutting the deficit on the backs of the poor and of the elderly, and yet the Senators themselves, we have yet to hear a peep from them. We have half a million dollars, which a good number of them may well have stacked away of capital gains which will be exempt from income tax, and yet we do not hear them say that it is unfair to increase or decrease pensions for giving such huge tax gifts to the wealthy.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. When this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have 14 minutes remaining.

The time being 5:30 and adjournment hour, this House is now adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).