

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 11 June, 1982

Time — 10:00 a.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 Flin Flon.

**MR. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, I see the Minister of Northern Affairs and Environment just entering the House. I believe he has a statement to make.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand there are statements available for the Opposition. Does the Clerk have them?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are there any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports that we can proceed with while we are waiting?

**HON. J. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some difficulty with the obtaining of the statements. Perhaps I can ask permission to revert back for Statements at a later point in the proceedings, leave to do so, while I get copies of the statements made for members opposite.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If the Minister wishes to ask for leave at a later time, I will put it to the House.

Notices of Motion . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. J. COWAN** introduced Bill No. 57, an Act to amend The Workers Compensation Act, and Bill No. 58, an Act to amend The Workplace Safety and Health Act.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER** introduced Bill No. 60, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1982, and Bill No. 61, an Act to amend The Rivers and Streams Act.

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

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, I would like to go back to the beginning of the Order Paper and introduce Bill 56 if that is permissible?

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

**HON. S. USKIW** introduced Bill No. 56, an Act to amend The Registry Act.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where there are 23 students of Grade 5 standing from the Montrose School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Conger, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

There are also 18 students of Grade 10 standing of the Fisher Branch Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Pona. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** My question is for the First Minister. In view of the fact the House has now been in Session for three and one-half months, can the First Minister advise the House why it is necessary to be introducing so many bills at this late stage?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised at the nature of that question because I've been in this House since 1969 and the record regarding the introduction of bills in this 1982 Session is, I believe, at least equal to that of any other Session that there's been any time since 1969.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the performance of the previous government for the past four years was never adequate for this government; now they seem to be content with the standards that were set. Can the First Minister advise how many more bills it's his intention to introduce?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think that our record is relatively well. We've been in office six months, we've introduced legislation, indeed, at a record of introduction which is much much better than that, for example, of two years ago when I remember all the bills that were brought in that ended up being butchered and withdrawn. Do you remember the year of the butchering and the withdrawal that took place two years ago in this House? So I think our

record is reasonably well, not as well as we would like it to be. Mr. Speaker, besides, who is speaking in terms of it being the end of the Session? We can continue to sit in order to deal with the legislation in a proper manner. I don't think there's any deadline on us; we haven't even called the Speed-up.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister advise us how many more bills he intends to introduce into the House?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, there are not very many at all that have to be called. I would point out to the former Minister of Finance that we have yet to introduce Speed-up on top of it, so it's rather interesting the reaction of the former Minister of Finance this morning.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, does the First Minister know how many more bills his government intends to introduce this Session?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the exact number, no, and the House Leader will let the Member for Turtle Mountain know.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** My question is to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. In view of the report that over 1,000 workers have filed claims totalling approximately \$435,000 for unpaid wages and in view of the fact that the government has budgeted \$150,000, could the Minister indicate whether he will be asking for additional funds and if so, how much money does he believe is required to carry out this program for the fiscal year '82-83?

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, that matter is currently under consideration. As the Member for St. Norbert knows, there's also some recovery and it appears that the recovery isn't nearly adequate to meet that kind of an amount. At the time when the Department of Labour Estimates were before the House, I had indicated that for last year it appeared about \$150,000 was being spent, that we weren't sure, in fact at that time we were a little bit uneasy about the numbers, and that we might have to increase them. Certainly, it appears now that is likely to be required.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the reported statements of Mr. Martin of the Manitoba Federation of Labour and concerns expressed by members opposite when they were in Opposition with respect to this program, could the Minister of Labour indicate whether or not he intends to make any changes in the plan?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Not in the current Session, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister in view of the absence of the Minister of Community Services and Corrections.

Mr. Speaker, it was reported yesterday, in yesterday's newspapers, by statements of certain officials of the Children's Aid Society that 60 children, including two who were to join siblings, had been prepared for adoption and as a result of the moratorium placed on the adoption of Native children by the First Minister's Government, some 60 children are now being held in various institutions and foster homes and not being placed for adoption. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that one official of the Children's Aid Society, Chris Buchel, said we're forgetting about the child, would the First Minister indicate today that he will lift the moratorium so that the interests of these children can be looked after and they can be placed in homes where the parents are willing to look after them and care for them?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. I'm sure that appropriate means can be undertaken to ensure the children are well taken care of. I think the Indian people of this province have demonstrated a rightful concern about past practice, and I think it would be a breach of faith with the Indian people of the Province of Manitoba if we were to do otherwise. I see no reason why Manitoba, with the facilities that we have in Manitoba, that we cannot ensure the children are well taken care of. Besides, Mr. Speaker, the very reason for the establishment of the Kimelman Report was to bring in recommendations as to whether or not the past practice ought to be resumed or not, or whether or not we indeed work with the Indian and Metis families of this province and their organizations to ensure that Indian and Metis children are placed within Manitoba, within a culture and environment that they are familiar with and will best relate to.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement by a Colette Goerwell, a Children's Aid Society Director of Children's Aid Services, who said: "Now newborn Native babies have to be placed in foster homes because there is not one Native adoption home in the registry"; and in view of the reports from the Community Task Force on Maternal and Child Health Care who have emphasized the importance of bonding, of placing babies in their adoptive homes as early as possible, would the First Minister, in view of the fact that there are no Native adoptive homes on the registry of the Children's Aid Society and these children are being placed in foster homes and in institutions and the Community Task Force on Maternal and Child Health Care have emphasized the importance of bonding, of placing babies in their adoptive homes as early as possible, not reconsider this moratorium in the best interest of the children?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Norbert appears to ignore the fact that the very reason for the Kimelman Report was to ensure a system is

developed that is in the best interests of the Indian and Metis children of this province.

The Indian people made it very very clear, and properly so, that - I hear interjections across the way, Mr. Speaker, and I am not intending to shout in order to make myself heard above those interjections. I don't intend to speak louder to make myself heard above yells from across the way.

Mr. Speaker, it should be very clear that the purpose and the reason for the Kimelman investigation is to deal with the very serious concerns, the very serious allegations of parents of the Indian Community in regard to past practices in regard to the adoption of Indian children. It is in the interests of the Indian children, not in the interests of any other group in the Province of Manitoba that the Kimelman Report is presently being compiled.

I've every confidence in Judge Kimelman; that Judge Kimelman's recommendations will be of such a nature that any responsible government, indeed, any responsible Opposition would wish to support.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that representations have been made by Indian groups, Native groups, to Judge Kimelman's Committee that they require time in order to develop plans to arrange for homes for the adoption of Native children in Native homes, and in view of the fact that everybody connected with the Children's Aid Society have expressed the view that it is most important these children be placed immediately in adoptive homes, that you can't put them on a shelf, would the First Minister stop playing politics with the children of this province and lift his moratorium?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I find it despicable on the part of the Member for St. Norbert that he would make no effort to add his weight to the legitimate concern that has been expressed by thousands of Native residents in the Province of Manitoba about a practice that has taken place for many many years, not only during the term of this government but a practice that took place prior to his government's term in office.

I am very surprised indeed that the Member for St. Norbert, despite the legitimate concerns that have been expressed by those of Native culture in the Province of Manitoba, that he would say forget what is taking place in regard to the Kimelman Report, forget about its ultimate recommendations and government; you just go ahead and proceed on your own as to placement. That is what is being said.

Mr. Speaker, we would be prepared to speak to all those who are most interested and most concerned about this problem to satisfy ourselves indeed if any interim measures need be undertaken. The Minister will do that; I will ask the Minister to do that if indeed there be the concerns involved.

Mr. Speaker, there are legitimate concerns, and I stress this again to the Member for St. Norbert, on the part of the Native people in the Province of Manitoba about a practice that has taken place for years and years. It's for the kids, Mr. Speaker. I wish that the Honourable Member for St. Norbert had been present

when I had spoken to some of the Indian and some of the other Metis people in this province about this very question —(Interjection)— About what?

Mr. Speaker, I again remind you I am not going to try to shout over the noises across the way. Mr. Speaker, are we to carry on a debate back and forth and attempt to shout over voices?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I don't believe that it should be necessary for any member to shout. The microphones are quite sensitive enough to pick up the normal speaking voice of any member.

The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it is for the Indian children in the Province of Manitoba that we are doing this very investigation under the auspices of Judge Kimelman. I have spoken to Native people in this province and Native organizations that have the most direct contact. I know the Member for St. Norbert, as well meaning as I'm sure he is, has not had opportunity to have the direct contact with this situation that Indian and Metis families have to have explained indeed what has sometimes happened to children who have been exported to homes south of the border and to various environmental situations where they are removed, where they're isolated from their cultural background, the frustrations that develop and the fact that indeed in some instances they come back to Canada despite the fact they've been placed south of the border because of not being placed within their cultural surroundings that they're most comfortable with.

So, Mr. Speaker, rather than working against the interests of the Indian children, we're working for the interests of the Indian children. I am pleased indeed the organizations that have most intimate contact with this very difficult problem have applauded the government for the establishment of the Kimelman Report and have applauded the government for ceasing the exporting of Indian children south of the border.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I have not said that there are legitimate concerns that should not be investigated. I've not said that the committee should not undertake its study and hold its hearings. All that I have said is that the moratorium should be lifted while these investigations and studies take place in the best interest of the children.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to revert back for Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. I hesitate to do so, however, given the nature of the report that I am tabling today. The Opposition may want to ask questions on it during the question period and I would hate to eliminate that opportunity for them by tabling the report at the end of the question period by leave. I do apologize for the temporary delay, but I do ask leave to be able to do it at this time so as to enable them the opportunity to ask questions of the statement if they wish.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** No, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to ask a question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to help the Minister out in order that he can make his statement, providing the time of course is not deducted from Question Period.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Honourable Minister have leave to make his statement? (Agreed)

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I firstly want to thank the House for leave and I do appreciate the assistance which has been offered by the Member for Turtle Mountain on behalf of his colleagues so that we can get this statement into the public arena at this time and so they have an opportunity to ask questions if they feel it's necessary.

Mr. Speaker, as Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board, it is my pleasure to table a report on the Workers Compensation Board of Manitoba. This report includes a synopsis of the findings of the investigation carried out by RCMP Inspector Cleve Cooper into a number of public accusations that were leveled against the board last fall. The report also contains our government's responses to these findings and some of the recommendations of the Lampe Committee.

These recent reviews have clearly indicated that the Workers Compensation Board is in immediate need of a number of reforms. It has been suggested that serious administrative difficulties do exist in the Workers Compensation System. These findings confirmed a number of the accusations that were made. However, it was concluded that most of the problems were the result of poor management and a poor communications structure.

It is our intention as a government to begin today to resolve the problems that exist at the Workers Compensation Board. I would therefore like to outline the following initiatives that we are immediately undertaking:

(1) The appointment of a full-time Board Chairperson and two full-time Commissioners. This restructuring of the Board will better monitoring of the management practices at the Workers Compensation Board. Ms. Sonny Arrojoado has been appointed Chairperson, and Mr. Thomas Donald Bulloch and Mr. Al Fleury have been appointed Board members. That will be effective July 1, 1982.

(2) As a government we have also appointed a management consulting firm to assist the new Board in reviewing the existing practices and systems of the Workers Compensation Board.

(3) I would also like to announce the establishment of a Special Workers Advisors Program to assist injured workers with their claims. This new program will consist of a new Workers Advisors Office head-

quartered in Winnipeg, with regional offices in Brandon, Flin Flon and Thompson. It is anticipated that in total there will be seven full-time advisers by the end of the year.

It is also our intention to introduce amendments to The Workers Compensation Act at this Session of the Legislature to enable us to further address some of the problems inherent in the Workers Compensation system.

We are also establishing a Workers Compensation Board Advisory Committee to begin reviewing of the rehabilitation practices of the Workers Compensation Board.

We are asking the new Workers Compensation Board to undertake specific actions to deal with certain situations. These include appointing an independent audit firm to review the assessment procedures; a review of existing directives and policies; an examination of the recommendations of the Lampe and Cooper Reviews; the development of a list of interpreters to assist claimants; and the provision of written decisions on certain cases.

A survey will be conducted of the medical profession, employers and workers to solicit opinions and suggestions on possible improvements to the Workers Compensation system. We are encouraging a greater use of the physician to assist the Claimants Section of The Workers Compensation Act to help workers with special cases.

I would like to emphasize that these reforms are only our first step in tackling the problems that appear to have developed in the Compensation system in Manitoba over the last number of years. It is our intention to restore public confidence in the Workers Compensation Board and to ensure that its operations are serving the needs of all injured workers in Manitoba.

I also want to thank the outgoing Board of Commissioners and Chairperson of the Board for their dedication and their commitment to serving this province's workers. I know they will continue to serve in different but equally important ways in the future. I'd also, at this point, like to thank my staff and the other staff who have been involved in the preparation of this report for their long, hard hours over the past number of days and their dedicated commitment to making certain that this report was available to the Legislature today.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to close by saying that I look forward to public comment on the report's findings and our major alterations to the Board.

Thank you.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, we are thankful that the Minister has finally done something with respect to this matter, but we are not particularly satisfied with the way in which he has conducted the review of the Workers Compensation Board. We would associate ourselves, Mr. Speaker, with the criticism of the Ombudsman who stated that a public inquiry was the proper way to handle the allegations that were made against the Workers Compensation Board. Now we are presented with what would appear at first glance - we haven't had an opportunity to review it because it's just been distributed - a synopsis of some few pages

which apparently summarize a report that I'm led to believe may very well be approximately 300 pages, Mr. Speaker. So I'm not particularly satisfied, certainly at this stage, that what is summarized in the Minister's document is a full and complete report on the private investigation that was carried out by Inspector Cooper. We will have to, of course, have an opportunity to examine the little information that we have been given in order to respond to the action that the Minister is taking with respect to the report.

We note, firstly, that the Minister has apparently fired the existing Board and replaced them by a Chairperson and two full-time Commissioners - I take it appointed by Order-in-Council. As I understand the situation, there was representation from both Management and Labour on the Board before and we're going to have to examine the changes that the Minister has made in greater detail. Certainly we would welcome any improvements that are made in the operation of the Board in assistance to workers in Manitoba through the Workers Compensation Board.

Mr. Speaker, I think before any further comment is made we're going to have to have an opportunity to review the report and examine the legislation that the Minister brings forward, hopefully very shortly, and review the recommendations that he has given to us in the report.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister reporting for the Workers Compensation Board. As I take it from the statement that he has just delivered to the House, he is indicating that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council has discharged the present Chairman and Commissioners of the Workers Compensation Board and has appointed three new people including a new Chairperson, a Chairwoman, the head of the Nurses Union.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Labour revolves around the Workers Compensation Act which states that the Chairman holds office during good behaviour but may be removed at any time for cause. Is the Minister suggesting that he is removing the present Chairman from his office for cause, or by what authority does the Minister purport to remove the current Chairman of the Workers Compensation Board?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Yes, I thank the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for that question. It allows me to clarify the situation.

The present Chairperson of the Workers Compensation Board had taken over that position on request of the previous administration for approximately a one-year term, because the previous Chairperson of the Workers Compensation Board had retired. When we came to office the present Chairperson asked to retire and I requested that Chairperson stay on until we have had an opportunity to table the Cooper Review and our recommendations in respect to the Lampe Review as well. He did so, and I appreciate the fact that he did decide to stay on because I think that it

points out very clearly his dedication and his commitment to the system. He had asked to retire, I believe, back in December or early January. We had requested that he stay on in recognition of his experience and his long years of service. He has since then, just recently, sent another letter to me again asking that I accept his resignation and that he be allowed to retire and I have done so effective July 1st.

I do not wish the fact that we have changed the structuring of the Board and changed the members of the Board to be construed as any reflection upon the previous members of the Board. I think they did a dedicated and committed job. I think they served this province as workers well. I know they will continue to serve this province as workers well, albeit in different ways, but equally important ways and I want to make that very clear. I have great faith and trust and confidence in them, as I have great faith and trust and confidence in the new Board.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the response to the question and the confirmation that the present Chairman is not being fired by this government as a number of chairmen have been fired, but rather is retiring on his own voluntarily. Furthermore, I appreciate the - and I'm sure that the public will appreciate - comment by the Minister that the change that he is making in the Board is no reflection whatsoever upon the integrity of the former Board or upon the manner in which they carried out their responsibilities.

That being the case, can the Minister indicate why it is that the former part-time members of the Board, who were largely there - I think they were appointees in most cases by the Schreyer government - why those part-time members are not being left as members of the Board to ensure some continuity in the work of the Board, because the members who are being appointed are largely new to the work of the Board?

**HON. J. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. The new structure of the Board makes it a full-time Board which we feel is necessary to allow the Board to more accurately ensure that problems such as exist today in the system do not continue to exist and new problems do not begin to exist in the future. We have undertaken that action with a great deal of consideration about the possible advantages and disadvantages of such a system. I believe we have undertaken the correct approach.

I must, in answer specifically to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's question, give a brief bit of background. He is absolutely correct when he says that part-time Commissioners were recommended to government by certain organizations. Three of them were recommended by the Manitoba Federation of Labour; one was recommended by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association; one was recommended by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and one was recommended by the Manitoba Mining Association.

I know some of those people personally. Some of them are close friends and go back way beyond my involvement in politics. I feel very badly that they, in

fact, have to step aside - that I've asked them to step aside - to allow this new Board to come in but I did so for a very specific reason. The fact that these persons were appointed by specific groups made them beholden to those groups. They in fact had to represent the interests of the Manitoba Federation of Labour and had to represent the interests of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association or the Chamber of Commerce or the Mining Association. That created an antagonism in the system. They came forward and they were representing very solid views and they could do no other if they were honest and committed people and they were.

The Workers Compensation System is not meant to be that sort of a system; it is meant to be a consensus system, a co-operative system. So what we have done is we have removed from those organizations the right to appoint members to the Board in that manner and we are appointing the members to the Board. I think we have made good choices; I think we have made a choice of three individuals who can work very closely together: one bringing a management perspective to the Board, Mr. Bulloch, who has owned a light manufacturing firm in this city for decades; one bringing a labour perspective to the Board, Mr. Fleury, who has been involved in heavy industry and is also a tradesperson, so brings that perspective to the Board as well and has been involved actively in the union movement in this province; and one bringing a public sector perspective to this Board, as well as a health care perspective to the Board.

So, for those reasons, I think the Board can work more closely together. The changes that we have made are philosophical changes in the structure to allow the Board to work together in the future, instead of having internal fights which sometimes, not because of the individuals but because of the structure, prevented the Board from doing the most efficient job.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, now that the Minister has confirmed that he has reconstituted the Board along lines which suit him and his government ideologically with two union members and a person from business, will he still give us some justification for firing the part-time members who, while they were nominated by the various sectors from whom he speaks, I'm sure, carried out the responsibilities without feeling beholden, as he would feel they were, to the particular groups who nominated them.

How is he going to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that the two union people that he has appointed who can now outvote the one business person if, in fact, people are so factional as he says they are; what kind of a weight does this give to the Board and what are the costs of these changes whereby he is making three full-time members of a Board, which heretofore had only one full-time member, and he's going to be staffing it up with seven or eight people? What is going to be the cost to industry and to business in Manitoba to carry through these ideological changes of my honourable friend?

**MR. J. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I guess time will tell whether we have made the right choice in respect to the individuals and I would hope that the members opposite, as well as the injured workers in this prov-

ince and the employers and employees, will allow that Board the time to prove themselves either adequately able to sit on the Board or to prove themselves not adequately able. If it proves to be such a case, then action will have to be taken.

The cost is a significant cost in respect to the Workers Advisors Program. I don't have the specific details but I can assure the member opposite that it's going to be close to half a million dollars a year once that operation is in full operation. The cost of the Board is not going to be significantly higher, in that the part-time Commissioners received remuneration for their activities, and there were six of them, and we're now only talking about three full-time Board members, however, it will be higher. It will be higher and that would be in the order of probably \$20,000 or \$30,000 in total, but it will also be higher because that Board will be going outside of the city and into the rural communities which they represent and into the northern communities and will be bringing the Workers Compensation Board to the workers in this province. If we have to spend money doing that, Mr. Speaker, then that is money well spent.

If we talk about money spent and we talk about workers' advisers being able to assist claimants to get their true due from their injuries, then I think that \$500,000 or whatever it may be - it may be more, it may be less - I think that money is well spent because what we are doing is we are removing the burden of spending that money from the injured workers, who had to spend it because they couldn't get their cases presented properly, and placing it on industry as a whole which is where it should belong because of the way in which the system is set up. No one in this room, I believe, would suggest that the insurance system of Workers Compensation is set up improperly in concept. What we are doing is we are shifting the burden for payment from the workers to the industry as a whole.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is opportunity for debate on other occasions in the House and that during question period the opportunity is to ask questions and receive answers to those questions. I suggest that the Honourable Minister is engaging in debate.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A further question to the Minister in charge of the Workers Compensation Board. The preface of course to the question is to remind him as gently as I can that the money that he is spending is not his money. It's not the taxpayers' money; it's the money of industry. This is not a tax-funded organization, so my honourable friend had better freshen his mind about his trustee concept before he rushes off spending somebody else's money like a drunken sailor.

Now, my two questions to the Minister: No. 1, has he had an opportunity to canvass, before he makes these decisions, industry and business in Manitoba

about these fundamental changes that he is making in the Workers Compensation Board? No. 2. I presume that he is aware of Section 47 of The Workers Compensation Act which says that full-time members of the Board "shall not directly or indirectly have, purchase, take, or become interested in any industry to which this part applies or any bond, debenture or other security of any other person or corporation owning or carrying it on." That being the case, has he made sure that the people whom he is about to appoint or has perhaps already appointed are in conformity with that section of the Act?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** The people who have been appointed effective July 1st, to my knowledge - and I will certainly double-check to make certain but I have approached this subject with them - would be appropriate given that section of the Act. I will go back and make certain that, in fact, is the case and report back to the member. I do apologize for long answers and if I do get a bit carried away, but this is a subject which I think is important to all of us and should be clearly understood.

I would refer the Leader of the Opposition to one allegation in the report, Allegation No. 8 if he would turn to it, which says, "The Claims Department Staff shifts the onus to workers to assist themselves by obtaining doctors' reports and information from their employers." The report summary, of course, was that this allegation was substantiated in the review of the person undertaking the report.

I will also refer the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to a report which was made when he was First Leader of this province and that was commissioned by his government, the Lampe Report, which very strongly recommended the Workers Advisor Program in much the same way in which we have implemented. They did not act on that report even though they had the opportunity. So it is not arising only out of this recent review, but it is rising out of a report that they refused to act upon and a report that was undertaken by a series of public hearings where industry, employers, injured workers, employees and unions all had an opportunity to come forward and present their case and they did. The recommendation for it was for exactly the same type of work as the Advisors Program we have today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden. Order please.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable First Minister and I want to ask him this question in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture. Since the Minister of Agriculture has been unable to ascertain what the cost of production is in the beef industry, could the First Minister provide some additional staff to the office of the Minister of Agriculture, so that the program that was put in place by the Schreyer Government, the Beef Income Stabilization Program, so that payments to that program from the final quarter of last year could be made? I ask this question, Mr. Speaker, because of the interest

that the Minister of Agriculture has in introducing a new program, but I suggest to the Honourable First Minister that he complete the old program before he starts a new one.

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, sometimes really, the questions of the members of the Opposition become as though we are living in some sort of Alice in Wonderland situation. It was only two minutes ago that the Minister responsible for the Environment was being chastised for spending approximately \$20,000 extra, because of what I say is some very very serious findings arising from the workings of the Workers Compensation Board. Rather than discuss the findings, we have an Opposition that's complaining about an extra expenditure of \$20,000 to try to come to grips with how injured workers have, unfortunately in many cases, been unjustly treated over the last few years.

Mr. Speaker, now we have the Member for Virden urging, near demanding, that I call upon the Minister of Agriculture to hire additional staff within his department to do calculations, to spend more money in that respect. Mr. Speaker, if indeed that be justified, I have no objection to it, but let us for sure ensure that the members of the Opposition at some point during this Session get their act together. Either they're asking for us to reduce expenditure or, on the other hand, they are indeed doing as they have been demanding throughout the Estimates and throughout the questions this Session for us to expend hundreds of millions of dollars additional in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary question to the Honourable First Minister and I think the First Minister knows my concern for frugality is probably much greater than his. Since there is a certain reluctance on the part of the First Minister to provide the expertise to the Minister of Agriculture which he obviously needs since he doesn't appear to have it himself, would the First Minister consider another alternative and get a new Minister of Agriculture?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I must acknowledge that I was somewhat anguished a few moments ago about the inconsistency that we hear from across the way and if indeed I appear to be overly distressed, I hope that is understandably understood by members across the way. But I do think it was an understandable anguish because of the contradictions in the last few minutes that we've been witnessing.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that we have a Minister of Agriculture that is consulting with the farmers of Manitoba, and that indeed is a first in the last five years, and a Minister of Agriculture that is doing his best within the capacities that are available to him in very hard economic times to develop programs in respect to rural Manitoba that it can improve the lot of the family farm.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Honourable Member for Virden, why would I dismiss a Minister of Agriculture that I believe has demonstrated in six short months, competence, caring and innovation, in his efforts in carrying out the responsibilities of the

Department of Agriculture.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** A supplementary and I would remind the Honourable First Minister, since the 31st of March, questions have been asked of the Minister of Agriculture, if he would give us the prescribed price for the final quarter for 1981-82. We are now into June and the Minister of Agriculture has been unable to find that figure or compute that figure. Would the Minister reconsider and get us another Minister of Agriculture?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I wish really that the Member for Virden wouldn't attempt to reduce it down to the personality of the Minister of Agriculture, for the reasons that I have earlier commented upon.

If the Member for Virden is having some difficulty obtaining information, certainly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to assist him in insuring that information is made available as soon as is possible and I will take that aspect of the question as notice for the Minister of Agriculture. But, please, don't associate a legitimate and justifiable request for information, which may indeed take some time to provide, with a reckless demand in this House that one of the top and competent Ministers in the Treasury Bench be fired.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, in referring back to the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board, I have asked him a question, which I don't believe he answered, as to whether or not he had consulted industry before he made these fundamental changes in the Workers Compensation Board. So that is my first question.

My second question is, has he consulted Mr. Dick Martin or any of the Executive of the Manitoba Federation of Labour before making these fundamental changes?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Yes, I have talked to various groups, including the old part-time Board of Commissioners, the new Board of Commissioners; I have talked to different representatives of different organizations over the past eight, nine weeks, as we have brought this report or attempted to bring this report here. I made the decisions on my own with my Caucus colleagues and my Cabinet colleagues and I assume full responsibility for them. I asked for opinions in the way in which one should ask for opinions, for advice, some of which I accepted, some of which I rejected.

However, I do point out to the Leader of the Opposition that he is making such a hullabaloo about half a million dollars, and it may raise to \$1 million or more, program that was recommended out of a report which took 18 months to write in a public way and we're following it in many instances, following it directly when we apply the Workers Advisors Program to the recommendations that were made by Dr. Walter Lampe. He talks about \$500,000; \$1.00 per worker in this province per year. If by having \$1.00 per worker in this province assessed to the industry of this province,

we can prevent some of the heartbreak and we can prevent some of the tragedy that has existed because they were afraid to act for four years, then in fact I think we are spending that money not only wisely but efficiently.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I again ask the Minister responsible for The Workers Compensation Act if he consulted with industry who pays the tab for The Workers Compensation Act before he made these fundamental changes in the Act and in the appointees to the Board. No. 1, did he consult with them about the names of the people, their suitability and so on? No. 2, did he consult equally with Mr. Martin of the Federation of Labour, who has been seen lurking about the halls here in recent days.

**HON. J. COWAN:** You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if it's unparliamentary, but I certainly know that it's unappreciated and it is impolite for him to talk about a member who is not in this House to defend themselves and to say that they are lurking around these halls. I think that's just indicative of their prejudicial approach to governing and their lack of courtesy as well, but I'll answer the question.

I have talked to industry; I have talked to unions; I have talked to workers. I have talked about these matters in general and specific terms. Sometimes, I talked to them before I made a decision; sometimes, I talked to them about the decision and, in fact, I have listened to them, but I take full responsibility for the decisions. They are not in this House; they don't have to take responsibility for the decisions. They are my decisions and my government's decisions and we take the responsibility for them, but we listen and we listen carefully to what people have to say to us. I would defy the Leader of the Opposition to bring forward, when these bills go before committee and he will have an opportunity to have people coming to talk, to find one person from industry that will come forward and say, that person does not want to spend \$1.00 a year per employee to insure that employees and employers are receiving the full benefits from the Workers Compensation system in this province. I don't think he can do it. I think maybe he feels that way, but I don't think he has many friends on this one, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for question period having expired, Orders of the Day.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Government House Leader. Order please, order please. Order please. Will the government please indicate what it wishes to proceed with next.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

## MESSAGE

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a message from Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, Estimates of further sums required for the services of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983, and recom-



mends these Estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health that the said message, together with the Estimates accompanying the same be referred to the Committee of Supply.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, before calling the next order of business, I would like to announce that we would like to proceed with the Second Reading of the Adjourned Debate and then, if there's any time, call the Supplementary Supply.

**ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING**

**BILL NO. 40 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, Bill No. 40, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Speaker could confirm, do I have 38 minutes remaining?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member, indeed, has 38 minutes.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity that's been given to me to speak on this bill and I appreciate the fact that when I was absent from the House yesterday, when it was called, that members opposite, by leave, agreed that it could continue to stand in my name.

I was anxious to have an opportunity to speak, particularly when the Attorney-General had made reference to the fact that he wanted some discussion of the issues at stake in the passage of this bill and not to clutter it with unnecessary rhetoric, although I have to say that I believe that members opposite have certainly taken their liberties with the issues at stake and in many ways have attempted to cloud it with rhetoric.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that although the Attorney-General had indicated or feigned or in fact expressed a great deal of concern about references to payoffs and references to actions that are taken in response to significant groups who may or may not support the New Democratic Party, the reasons why this sort of legislation is deemed necessary in Manitoba at this time, I don't think that there's any question from the various pieces of literature and information that have been referred to in this House that there is an element of payoff contained in this type of legislation. I do not believe that Manitoba, given its competitive position with other provinces, given its circumstances and its need to attract investment and business opportunity in this province, needs this type of legislation at this particular time.

Let's face it. The Member for Sturgeon Creek referred to that article in Canadian Labour, January, 1982, in which a variety of different claims were made

about the effect of organized labour and electing the New Democratic Party in Manitoba in November of 1977. I'll quote a couple of things that perhaps were not quoted. Here's one that says, "Manitoba New Democrats saw and participated in the kind of partnership with labour that people dreamed about in 1961. I hope that the spirit of that partnership will continue in the months and years that lie ahead," Howard Pawley, Premier of Manitoba. Obviously, the spirit of that partnership is resulting in certain legislation, certain actions by this administration that are no doubt in recognition of the debt that this government owes to organized labour in this province. I believe that the response of the first contract legislation is purely in repayment of a debt that is perceived to be owed to organized labour in this province.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the debt is not to those half-million Manitobans who work in Manitoba - I'm not sure what percentage of those are involved in organized labour - but I believe it's purely to the leadership. It's to those leaders who want to have the power, the power to influence the government, the power to say to their workers that we have come through for you, we have moved the government to bring in first contract legislation because we believe that it's in your interest to have that in the province.

Another quote from that same article, Mr. Speaker, "During this time the Federation and the CLC were carrying out their regular pre-election activities, raising money from unions for the Manitoba NDP election effort and arranging the release of people to work in riding campaigns." Of course, the time they're referring to is the time leading up to the November, 1981 election and the activities that they're referring to are the activities that organized labour very proudly has indicated were made on behalf of the New Democratic Party to ensure their election. As I say, there's no question of how strong the ties are and there's no question of the response that we're now getting from this government to the activities of organized labour. It's the leadership I refer to again. The leadership is heavily involved in the policy decisions of this party and the leadership is calling the markers in now to try and draft legislation that in many ways, I believe, is anti-business, anti-investment and anti-economic development in this province.

I'm surprised that the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism is not standing forward and being heard on this topic because I don't think there's any question that, yes, we could assume there might be no harm done towards investment in this province. If this Act and this provision in the Act is administered in the most responsible - perhaps I shouldn't use the word - but conservative way, there may well not be any need for it to exist. —(Interjection)— Well, if that is the case and members opposite have said that it's almost never been used in British Columbia, it's rarely used, therefore, why do we need it? Because when we look at the potential for people to invest in this province, when we look at the potential for economic development in this province, it's not just the rational pluses and minuses that people come up with when they decide to invest in a province, it's a very fragile kind of attitude that they look at.

One only has to look at what's happening to the Canadian dollar today and one can't relate that specif-

ically to policies; one can't relate that specifically to things that the government is or isn't doing. What the investor is doing, what the financial markets are doing in selling Canadian dollars, in allowing the Canadian dollar to slip vis-a-vis the American dollar is in response to their lack of confidence of our government's ability to handle its economic and fiscal affairs. Therefore, by comparison, the American dollar is strengthening with respect to the Canadian dollar. All it is, is that undefinable attitude of confidence or non-confidence towards a government and its ability to provide a stable environment in which somebody can realistically make an investment and get a fair and proper return. That same situation will prevail when investors look at Manitoba in the future. They will look at the attitude and the confidence that they can have in making an investment here with respect to the government's position that is manifested by the actions that it takes in things such as this.

I think we have already had a great deal of discussion and concern expressed about this government's attitude toward economic development, the fact that virtually every move that they have made since coming to government has been one which is negative toward business development and investment in this province. We have talked at great length about the imposition of the 1.5 percent payroll tax, a tax that occurs nowhere else in this country with the exception of Quebec; we've talked about the government's attitude in economic development; and the Minister's statements about capitalism being in its late stage; the Attorney-General's statements about capitalism being dead and all of the various statements that have been made by members opposite about the need to reform our economic system in this province. That involves more government regulation, more government intervention and less private enterprise and so on and so forth.

I don't believe that any of those attitudes and expressions are conducive to attracting investment, whether that investment be from Manitobans who currently have their money in savings accounts and Canada Savings Bonds and other instruments, or whether that be people from outside who take a look at Manitoba as a very, very fine place to set up an opportunity for manufacturing, for other industrial development, for distribution, communication or what have you. We have talked at great length about the many things that Manitoba has going for it in terms of potential for economic development. We know that during our administration, during the past four years, the manufacturing industry in this province was growing at a rate of something like 30 percent a year because there are indeed advantages for people to come into Manitoba.

What has happened in the last six months, since the election of this New Democratic Government, is that virtually everything, from the things that they have said on the record, some of the Ministers, to the things that they have done; such as the payroll tax; such as their total lack of understanding of which types of businesses are having difficulty in the marketplace today surviving and their inadequate response, in terms of the parameters of their Mortgage Interest Rate Relief Program for businesses, which have shown that those who need the assistance, because they

have a heavy debt load as a requirement of doing business - I am talking about those in the retail and wholesale - cannot qualify by virtue of the \$350,000 gross income limit that has been put on. Those who really shouldn't have a need for major lines of credit and major bank borrowings are able to get that kind of assistance, but don't have the justification for it. So, as a consequence, we have only 41 businesses who have qualified and we have many others who, day by day, are going bankrupt. The list starts to mount because the program totally does not respond to the needs of the marketplace, those people who are in business. That kind of attitude towards business and investment has to come through when people make their decisions as to whether or not they ought to invest in Manitoba.

So here is one more thing. In and of itself it may not be a very damaging or harmful piece of legislation, but taken in the context of an anti-business, anti-development attitude of this government, it will be discouraging to anyone who wants to invest in Manitoba. There is no question about it because, as they look around, it's not in our sister provinces; it's not in Ontario; it's not in Saskatchewan. What does it do? It gives full and unlimited discretion to the Labour Board to impose a contract upon them, if they are asked to by either one of the parties in a collective bargaining situation who are unable to arrive at an agreement.

What are we doing? We are giving full and unlimited discretion to a government appointed board. The Minister of Northern Affairs just said today that the reason that he was dismantling the Board of the Workers Compensation system of this province, the existing Board, was because the people appointed on that Board were appointed by certain groups. He referred to the MFL; he referred to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and others. Therefore, that made them beholden to those groups that had appointed them when they were reviewing their cases and making their decisions.

The same thing pertains with respect to the Labour Board. The Labour Board is a child of, appointed by this administration, this government, and it will therefore carry the biases and the influences of this particular government when it makes its decisions with respect to anything under its jurisdiction. Now, we are giving them the authority to impose a first contract on a particular business or industry who has not been able to achieve, through the collective bargaining process, an agreement with its union on a first contract.

If you have an anti-business, anti-investment government who appoints that Board, philosophically attuned to its desires, then it's the same thing as saying, well, you have appointed a board whose bias is in favour of labour. Therefore, why should the union, in an effort to arrive at a first contract, bargain in good faith at all, when they know that if they allow it to go beyond the 90 days and they apply to the Minister to have the Labour Board impose a first contract, chances are they'll get a better settlement than they ever could have by the free collective bargaining process. That's exactly the kind of situation that will pertain as a result of this legislation. It can be totally one-sided and it will be undoubtedly destructive to the free col-

lective bargaining process. There is no question about it. In fact, it will guarantee that bargaining is not carried out in good faith because that Labour Board will carry the biases of the government that appointed it when it arrives at its decision.

At the same point, if we were to assume that because of a change in government another government, that was philosophically attuned in favour of business, appointed the Labour Board, then the same criticism could occur. The people on the business side, on the industrial side, of the coin when they were entering into free collective bargaining - and I note that the Member for Kildonan is making copious notes of my speech because she intends to refute it when we have an opportunity to debate it later this afternoon. I am giving her the full liberty of all of the information I can give her so that she can have a better opportunity to debate it with me this afternoon. My colleague from St. Norbert says, she'll look better than me on TV. That's true, whether she has the information or not.

In any case, getting back to the —(Interjection)— my colleague from Fort Garry says I look better in black and white. Well, that's true. In any case, getting back to the point, if we were to assume that under a different government that may have a pro-business, pro-investment bias, the same thing could pertain. The employer could say, I am not going to bargain in good faith; why should I, because if I hold out the Labour Board will settle it for me and they'll give me a better deal than I could ever get through the free collective bargaining process and that is exactly what will happen. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I've had experience with that kind of thing.

There is also the other opportunity and that is, that the leadership of the unions may feel that if they are not in a strong position to get a good settlement that by giving it over to a third party it takes them off the hook. So that whatever the settlement is they can say to their people, well, you know, we couldn't arrive at it; we had to go to the Labour Board and look what they imposed on us. Those doggone guys just didn't get the point and it's their fault; it's not mine. If you want any proof of that —(Interjection)— that's right. It takes them off the hook and they look like they are good guys and they don't have to take the responsibility for themselves. If you want any proof of that I happen to have served on City Council here for a couple of terms and was involved through the Executive Committee in arriving at decisions on contracts with unions for the city. I can tell you that when it came down to the crunch - in several instances where we were faced with very, very strong conflicts between the union and the bargaining committee - there were times when many, many in the group advocated that we ought to let it go, that we ought to ask for compulsory arbitration, say, we'll give in, because they did not want to be on the hook for having accepted a settlement that perhaps was beyond the city's means; that was richer than the city wanted and they did not want to face the taxpayers having approved that settlement. So they said, well, we're better off to let it go to compulsory arbitration because then we can always say, well, we wouldn't have given them that much, but the arbitrator did.

I tell you, without revealing confidences, that was the mentality; that was the expressed opinion of peo-

ple who had the authority to make a settlement, but did not want to have to take the responsibility for it. That same thing will pertain, because of this kind of legislation, in the first contract legislation that's contained here. Union leaders who do not want to have to face their members, having perhaps accepted an agreement that is not as good as that which many of their members thought they should have achieved, will be able to foist the responsibility off onto a third party who is the Labour Board who will settle it for them.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things about this bill that are open to question. I believe that, notwithstanding the fact that it will be damaging to our investment opportunities in the future, to business development, the fact that, by comparison, sister provinces don't have it and, therefore, the climate will be more receptive in other provinces than it is here for a business seeking to locate, one has to wonder why this bill is being taken retroactive to situations that may have commenced effective March 31st, 1981, over a year ago. One has to wonder why that kind of retroactivity would be put in, other than to enable the government to impose a settlement on certain pre-existing situations that they might have a commitment to.

You know, the old saying is that hard cases make bad law, and if this legislation is in fulfillment of a promise during the election campaign to help certain people out who were not able to achieve a settlement way back a year ago, then I say that there is something drastically wrong with the governmental process here. That we would go retroactively over a year back to settle a pre-existing situation that was entered into when no such legislation existed when neither the employer nor the employee was in a situation that he rightfully could expect government intervention, is now having this imposed from afar. From over a year hence, he's having something imposed upon him. I say that is as strong an indication of this government's bias against business and in favour of organized labour as any that I could pull out to show.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us on this side have no hesitation in supporting the free collective bargaining process for settling industrial disputes. We have no hesitation in saying that there is a place for it; that it has served the country well. It has served people well on both sides, because the strongest possible position that two people in conflict trying to arrive at agreement in resolution, the strongest possible position in which they can be is if they have equal power; on the one side, the power to go on strike and obviously have some serious economic consequences to the business or industry in which they serve; the power on the other side to say no. This is as far as we can go. We cannot afford any more in order to protect the viability of our business. That is a strong position where they are both equal.

We are now removing that equality of position. We're putting people in a position, and particularly the investors and the businesses, of having imposed upon them a settlement which they may not be able to afford, but have no choice in entering into it because it's being imposed by somebody else. You know, that's the ultimate bottom line for businesses and industries who are faced with demands that they can't afford, is to simply say, no, I can't afford it. But in this

case, they don't have that choice because somebody else will impose it upon them, whether or not they can afford it and they have no bottom line fallout from that.

You know, I believe that this will not add to the harmonious relationship between employers and employees. The Minister has indicated that this can only be done for one year; that there is obviously just a one year sort of staving off of the ultimate conflict. If the employer and employee can't settle it the first year, it's imposed. But then again, it's only imposed for one year and the following year then they have an opportunity and the responsibility to, through the free collective bargaining process, arrive at their own settlement from then on.

The fact of the matter is then, why have it at all, because you're only giving another year for the animosities, for the anxieties, for the frustrations and the conflict to build up; because if either side is terribly unhappy with the settlement that's been imposed, then that is going to make the atmosphere far more poisonous for trying to arrive at that first contract the second year around than it might have been the first year around. That will just allow one year for the tensions and frustrations and animosities to grow and to make the climate and the process far more poisonous than it ever would have been the first year around.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is not good, is not in the interests of Manitoba and will be, in the long run, detrimental to the free collective bargaining process in general. It delays the confrontation for a limited period of time, just allowing that extra year for the aggravation and the resentment to build up. Voluntary is always better than compulsory and, you know, this proposal has an element of compulsion that is not in the interests, I believe, either of the workers or of the businesses with whom they are going to bargain in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore have to speak against the bill. I have to say that I do not support the bill and that I would hope that the government would reconsider and would not proceed forward in such a steamroller fashion with legislation that I believe is not in the long-term interests of Manitoba.

Thank you, very much.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I direct the attention of honourable members to some visitors in the gallery, where we have 22 students of Grade 5 standing of the Winnipeg Beach School, under the direction of Mr. Larry Moore. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli.

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

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister will be closing debate.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I introduced the bill I had explained it in some detail so I don't propose to be very long in closing debate. I do have several comments, however.

The Member for Tuxedo has just indicated that he feels that this would worsen the climate of labour management relations in the province. The Member for Sturgeon Creek previously indicated that this

would create class warfare. That is, in general, the kind of statement that has come from the Opposition benches in terms of opposing this bill in principle.

There has, however, only been one instance of which I am aware of a union management negotiation being in any way affected by this bill and that is the one at Boeing. It was affected by reason of the fact that two years ago, or so, the New Democratic Party made a commitment that, if it was to form the government, we were going to present this type of legislation to prevent the kind of bitterness and viciousness that had been occurring in our work sites in the Province of Manitoba. We were going to do so in a way similar to what has happened in British Columbia; similar to what has happened in Quebec; similar, in fact, to what happens for workers in the Province of Manitoba today who are under federal jurisdiction, because the Federal Government has similar legislation.

So some Manitoba workers and employers are under this legislation today, but they don't make any mention of that fact. They don't make any mention of how that legislation is working. Wouldn't it be nice, Mr. Speaker, if they had some opposition to this legislation, if they could come in here and give us examples of how it's not working? They couldn't do that. They make threats about how somehow this is going to dampen the labour management relationship in Manitoba, how people won't come to the province, etc., but they have nothing concrete to offer to us, although this legislation is in effect and has been for a long time in other provinces.

So it seems to me that, where that is the case - if we were bringing in legislation that had never been tried elsewhere - then maybe they would have a point in raising those issues without proof. When they do so when we have that legislation affecting close to half of the provincial workers in Canada and all of the federal workers and employers in Canada and they can't come up with any evidence that it is having any negative impacts on employers or employees, then I think they should be ashamed of themselves for raising those kinds of fears.

Let's look at Boeing again. November 16, 1981, Boeing workers were on strike, as they had been for some time; Boeing wasn't producing, as it hadn't been for some time. Boeing couldn't fulfill its contract for some work. I don't recall the exact details, but we were losing, Manitoba was losing, production at Boeing; Manitoba workers were losing income.

What happened after November 17th when the New Democratic Party won the election? The first thing that happened, the workers at Boeing said, well we're going to be getting first contract legislation so we can go back to work. They went back to work; the employer accepted them back. He could have locked them out. The employer did not do that; the employer accepted them back. Fortunately, as happened in Quebec and B.C. in almost every instance, they worked out an agreement later on. But they recognized that, in view of the fact that we were bringing in this kind of legislation, that we were committed to bringing it in, it would be foolish for the employer to lock out the employee or the employee to be standing on a picket line when they knew that if they applied to us they could come for this kind of a negotiated and arbitrated settlement the first time around at bottom

line. Between that point and the point where they would come for arbitration many other procedures would click in. Certainly, we have every intention of that being the case in the future.

So the one example we have is one where labour relations in this province and production manufacturing in this province has improved, rather than declined as a result of the contemplation of this very legislation. Now, how can they, in the face of that and in the face of the successful implementation of this legislation in other jurisdictions, argue that this will somehow have a deleterious effect on employment, on management, on people coming to Manitoba? That is just sheer, utter nonsense and they ought to be able to come up with some indications of how that would work.

Now, we then get the argument that this is a payoff to labour and only the Tories would have the gall, the unmitigated gall, to stand here and talk about payoffs. It is true and we don't hide that fact, that a lot of the members of the Manitoba Federation of Labour are members of the New Democratic Party and, in fact, we are proud of that. We are proud of the fact that a number of the unions are associate members of the Manitoba New Democratic Party; that they campaigned for us; that they paid money into our coffers. We're proud of that fact. We in fact believe that we would not be the government if we didn't have the support of the majority of working people in this province. We have that support and that's why we are on this side and they are on that side.

Who is supporting them though? You know, if they are saying that this is a payoff, what's the payoff that they are making to the banks? Every one of the banks is making contributions to the Progressive Conservative Party; not one of them is making them to the New Democratic Party. Is the payoff to the banks their position of high interest rates? Is that their position on the banks? Is that their payoff? We don't get money from the life insurance companies; the Tories do. What is their payoff on life insurance companies?

You can go through this kind of argument, and here we have on the one hand a party that is based on a broad base of Manitobans, small businesses - you know, in my campaign I had a significant percentage of my contributions coming from small business as well as from union people and others and that happened in general in our campaigns - those people had big business on their side. They had the banks and the insurance companies and the other giant corporations of the country. They had them on their side and they keep talking about payoff to us for representing the majority. Well, what payoffs were they getting for representing the minority?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I wonder if the Minister would direct his remarks in the general direction of his microphone. I have difficulty in hearing when he turns away from his microphone.

The Honourable Minister.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, I was referring specifically to an argument made by the Member for Tuxedo saying this is a payoff. I am pointing out the absurdity of his argument and it really was an absurd argument.

The Member for Tuxedo referred to the Workers

Compensation Board and suggested that there was a similarity and there is a similarity. I would agree with him that there is some similarity between that Board and the Labour Board, but there are some differences as well in that when an injured worker appears before that Board, the worker isn't really opposed by his employer. That is, his employer doesn't come down there and say, I don't want this person to be compensated for this injury because I don't believe it happened on the job; I want to prove it didn't happen on the job. There isn't that kind of relationship there, so there is a significant difference. There certainly is that kind of a relationship when you go to the Labour Board.

When you go to the Labour Board you have a position where you have on the one hand workers who are asking for an increase in salary or they want to be heard on a grievance or an employer is there saying that the workers have been improper in their negotiations or whatever and there is a conflict between the worker and the employer, the individual, but that doesn't happen at the Workers Compensation Board and therefore the change made in the Workers Compensation Board I believe is fully justifiable based on the various reports and I don't think that it is similar enough for the member's argument to be valid.

The member refers to the fact that, in his opinion, this will merely delay the problem for a year and I would say that would be of some concern. There is some legitimacy in that in terms of some contracts will expire and probably won't be renewed and there may be difficulties. But one thing we are doing in Manitoba, and I have said this all along that hasn't been happening in the other provinces, is that along with this legislation we are proposing to come in with preventive conciliation during the course of that one-year contract so that the employer who isn't used to a union has somebody from the outside, a cooler head, who can talk to him or her to explain the new relationship and try to work things out. The union as well can be a new union and have people who don't understand the new relationship either and it's important to have that kind of conciliation during that first year in order that we can prevent the kind of climate we saw developing at Boeing. We would like that kind of climate to be a thing of the past.

We don't expect that this legislation will solve all first contract problems because I'm sure there will still be difficulties. I'm sure at the end of some of the contracts that are imposed, it may well be that there will not be second contracts negotiated. We've indicated that we are not prepared to amend this legislation in terms of adding continuous years onto this and I would urge all members of the House to support this particular move toward more harmonious labour relations in the province.

I should just also add that it has been the experience of British Columbia and Quebec in Canada that there have been very few applications to the Labour Boards in those jurisdictions. Where those applications have been made in the great majority of cases between the time of that application and the time there was anything final done by the Board, there was in fact agreement arrived at between the parties and that I think is something that certainly makes this legislation all the more important for us to pass; so again, I would urge

all members to support it.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is the question on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, Bill No. 40, an Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

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

### YEAS

Messrs. Anstett, Ashton, Carroll, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Mrs. Dodick, Messrs. Doern, Ms. Dolin, Messrs. Eyer, Harapiak, Harper, Mrs. Hemphill, Messrs. Kostyra, Lecuyer, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Pawley, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Storie, Uskiw.

### NAYS

Messrs. Blake, Brown, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Graham, Mrs. Hammond, Messrs. Hyde, Kovnats, Lyon, Manness, Mercier, Nordman, Mrs. Oleson, Messrs. Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

**MR. ACTING CLERK, G. Mackintosh:** Yeas, 24; Nays, 18.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The motion is accordingly passed.  
The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. Had I voted, I would have voted with the Opposition against the motion.

### BILL NO. 21 - THE COMMUNITY CHILD DAY CARE STANDARDS ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 21, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry on a point of order.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I know there was some concern expressed by the Government House Leader yesterday over the fact that we hadn't yet spoken on that bill. I'd like the Government House Leader to know that we're prepared to speak on that bill as soon as it's possible for the Minister to be here.

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

**MR. S. ASHTON:** I'd like to speak on the bill,

Mr. Speaker.

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, we appreciate that. We accept that, but I'm sure the members of the Opposition would not wish to preclude any members from speaking at this time.

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

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly have no problem speaking today on this particular bill, Mr. Speaker. I've discussed my views with the Minister in regard to day care, The Day Care Act. I must say that we're very much in agreement on the basic principles that should be followed in terms of the day care field. I speak today because I wholeheartedly support the principles as outlined in this particular Act, The Community Child Day Care Standards Act, Bill No. 21.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, is aimed at ensuring that all day care centres subscribe to and meet new standards, and it's also designed to enable the province to set new regulations that help ensure all children receive the best day care possible. It will apply to all nonprofit and all commercial day care centres, but it will not apply however to children cared for by relatives, public or Sunday schools, hospitals or recreational programs.

Following the passage of this Act, it is hoped that there will be extensive consultation between the Department of Community Services and individuals and groups in every part of this province to gather constructive ideas about the kind of regulations that should be included as part of this Act. This will help create the guidelines and the standards that are in the best interests of Manitoba's children.

In basic principle, Mr. Speaker, I would think that all members of this House would support this bill. I'm sure during the debate, when it does take place, and during the committee hearings that there may be some suggestions in regard to specific sections of the Act, but in terms of the general principle, I can't see there being too much problem.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, as I've said, it attempts to set standards and regulations but, second of all and perhaps equally important, it leaves open the possibility of the element of freedom of choice on the part of the parents and freedom of provision of day care services by various groups because it does not, for example, attempt to outlaw or prevent day care by relatives, by public or Sunday schools, by hospitals or recreational programs. Because as has been expressed to us by parents, as has been expressed to us by the groups that provide the service to these parents, there is a need for such kind of day care, Mr. Speaker. So it, first of all, attempts to set comprehensive standards but, second of all, does not impose any restriction on the freedom of choice of parents or of individuals who can meet those standards to provide the day care.

Now, in looking at this particular act, Mr. Speaker, one has to take a more general view of the situation because when one is talking about standards and regulations, one must really also include the matter of

funding because one cannot have adequate standards or at least one cannot meet adequate standards without adequate funding. In looking at that, Mr. Speaker, I think one will notice that the funding for day cares, the funding for existing spaces and for new space has been somewhat erratic in recent years.

During the four years of the previous government it started off with 5,404 spaces in centres I believe, Mr. Speaker, in 1977; then it slipped to 5,370 in 1978; it slipped again to 5,288 in 1979. It was not until 1980 that the total began to increase to 6,061 spaces. Of course in 1981, that being an election year, it increased rather dramatically to 7,767 spaces. Now in this year, Mr. Speaker, once again there's going to be an expansion. I believe there are approximately 8,000 children provincially supported now in 225 centres across the province. It's estimated that around 9,000 will be under this particular category after the end of this fiscal year. So, as you can see, Mr. Speaker, the number of day care spaces I think has gone up by 80 percent in the last four or five years alone, rather a major increase.

If one is to look at future trends, I think one will find that there's going to be an even greater need for day care spaces in the future and a greater expansion because there are a growing number of married women now working outside of the home. I believe that latest estimates show that nearly 60 percent of married women with children now work outside of the home. There's also an increased number of preschool children living in single parent households. These are two specific factors in demand for day care spaces and two increasing factors, Mr. Speaker, so it's an expanding field in terms of demand and it's an expanding field in terms of the provision of day care spaces to satisfy that demand.

What about the regulations, Mr. Speaker? Well, regulations regarding day care really haven't changed that much since the 1950s when day care was a minor thing here in Manitoba, in fact, throughout the country; so that's 30 years of changes, Mr. Speaker, in terms of numbers of children involved, in terms of demand for those spaces, 30 years of pretty dramatic change in all areas, but 30 years in which we've seen no comprehensive legislation to set standards and regulations for day care in the province.

With this bill, Mr. Speaker, that will change. There will indeed be regulations set for day care in a comprehensive way. I think the key thing though is that it will not be the government dictating what the regulations are; that's not the flow of things, Mr. Speaker, from the government on down. The flow is going to be quite the opposite direction because this bill is aimed at getting community-based groups involved, getting community-based feedback on standards and regulations, because this government recognizes that what is apt in terms of regulations for one particular area is not necessarily apt for another area.

The Member for Wolsley in her speech on this particular bill pointed out, for example, the situation that existed in Nelson House several years ago - or Norway House - pardon me, Mr. Speaker. In Norway House there was an application made to use a school, I believe, for purposes of day care and because it did not have inside washrooms there were some problems with that. Now in that particular community at

that particular time the existence of inside washroom facilities was rather rare, Mr. Speaker. In terms of community standards that would have been seen as a luxury, but in terms of the way it was perceived at the provincial level it was not seen as a luxury, but as a necessity.

It's this kind of unfair treatment of various local communities that we're trying to prevent by getting community involvement because as I said, Mr. Speaker, what is appropriate in some communities is not necessarily appropriate in others. I know this particularly well myself being from the north, having some familiarity with communities such as Norway House or Nelson House, having some familiarity with the City of Thompson, which is altogether in a different situation, and then again having some familiarity with Winnipeg where there's quite a different situation once again, so the community-based part of it is also important.

There's another part of this Act, Mr. Speaker, which deserves notice because I think it's quite significant and that is the part of the Act in regard to staff qualifications, because I know from my experience in Thompson with the day care centres up there, that this is one area of great interest shown by the administration of day care centres and by the staff themselves. They feel that they're performing a very significant role in society in helping to not only take care of our children, but also give them some advance education, sort of a preschool education before they reach official elementary school level. Even though they are getting totally inadequate salaries, Mr. Speaker - very inadequate, I think, in all the day care centres across the province - they feel a great responsibility towards the job that they're performing. They are very interested in upgrading their qualifications.

There are various programs that do exist; programs that have been modified in recent years to meet this particular demand; programs based not so much now on receiving just a diploma or taking an official two or three or four year course, but on training the staff on a semester basis, on a short course basis when they have the time and when they can have the access, because in communities such as Thompson, for example, going away for further education means pulling up roots, you know, going to The Pas or Brandon for community college education, something that most people who work in day care centres can't do. So there have been movements made in that particular area.

What this piece of legislation is aimed at is providing a mechanism for official recognition of the efforts of staff in obtaining certain levels of qualification and upgrading their levels of qualification. I think, as I said, Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the role they're performing that, indeed, is significant.

Now this Act, as I said, is badly needed at this particular time because of the 30-year delay we've had in updating legislation in regard to day care. It's badly needed in view of the growing demand for and the growing supply for day care spaces in Manitoba, but it's not the only thing that's needed, Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier in my remarks, adequate funding and adequate standards go hand in hand, and I can state once again from personal experience that there have been problems with funding in recent years.

No sooner had I been elected this past November, 1981, than I had rather continuous contact with a number of day care centres in Thompson which were faced not with the threat of cutting back services, Mr. Speaker, because of inadequate funding, but with running deficits in the order of \$10,000 and \$20,000, deficits which would have crippled and perhaps bankrupted the particular organizations. They faced that situation, Mr. Speaker, because of a number of things. They faced it, first of all, because of inadequate funding for particular children. They also faced that problem because of particular problems in funding for special categories of children such as handicapped children or infant children.

So those were the initial problems but compounding this, Mr. Speaker, was a significant problem with the unclearness of standards in regard to day care. There were certain standards set by the day care coordinator in Thompson and completely different standards set by the local authorities in terms of the Fire Department. They were caught in a bit of a quandary because they didn't know which of these two to follow and, of course, they tried to follow the strictest. Then they found that they ran into another problem, because these regulations were in terms of number of staff to look after a certain number of children given the particular ages and of course that varied with the age. What they found was that as their children got older they were faced with the problem that they needed to hire additional staff people because of the balance of the ages in there. As the group grew older, they needed more people to supervise the children and they were faced with the pretty sticky problem of what to do.

Now, if there had not been some improvement in funding, they would probably have had to either hire an additional staff person or else tell certain parents, well, they couldn't look after their children because the regulations said that was it and they didn't have any money to hire an additional staff person.

Well, these options were quite unacceptable to the day care centre, and I must say myself that I find those particular options particularly unacceptable because at that time, Mr. Speaker, there were no alternative areas for the children to go. There has recently been a new day care centre opened up by the Ma-Mow-We-Tak Centre, the KTC, and there were other Native organizations. That has helped ease the problem in terms of lack of day care spaces, but because of the problem they were facing at that particular time, they were faced with a rather tricky dilemma.

Now in the Estimates that were brought down by the Minister just a couple of months ago, that problem was corrected to a great degree because there was a significant increase in funding for day care spaces. There was also a significant increase in funding for special categories of children, particularly in regard to handicapped children. But that's the first step, Mr. Speaker, and the first step only, because the next step has to be to eliminate the second part of the problem and that was the lack of clarity in regard to the regulations and also the lack of flexibility. Because as I've said, the day care centre tried to follow the strictest set of regulations, but they felt often that those regulations were rather unreasonable. What I'm hoping to see now with the passage of this Act and with the

Session coming to a close is that the hopes of the Community Services Department will be met and that in fact there will be time available for consultation with community groups and with individuals involved in the provision of day care spaces here in Manitoba.

I would hope, too, that they would go to all areas of the province because, as I've said, some of the bigger problems, some of the more unique problems, exist in northern communities such as Thompson or the Norway House situation as well. When they do go up I hope they will speak to the people in such day care centres as the Thompson Day Care Centre and the various other day care centres we have in Thompson because there's a wealth of experience that exists there and a large number of recommendations these people have in regard to day care standards. I think if we can work closely between the local groups and the day care administration under the Community Services Department we might be able to tackle a number of these problems.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that with this growing demand for day care spaces we cannot assume that just because a number of the problems have been rectified this year that they will disappear in upcoming years. We have to keep a continual eye on the funding situation. In doing so, we have to look at the specific problems faced by specific day care centres because not every day care centre has the same financial situation. Some have their own facilities, some don't; some, for example, use church basements; some have their own facilities, pay mortgages, that kind of thing. So to have one standard for each in terms of providing services, I think, is quite justifiable in that particular case because the needs of the children and the problems that would happen if we just left that open. But then, on the other hand, to ask people to provide the same standard given different financial circumstances I think is rather unfair, if we have a flat rate grant to the day care centres, because given those equal standards some of those day care centres will have to spend a hell of a lot more money.

So I'd like to take this opportunity in debating this bill to say that I'm pleased to see the directions that have been taken, but from my own experience in the constituency of Thompson, I would urge the Minister to keep a constant eye on the funding situation because unless there is adequate funding continuing this year and in upcoming years, we will be faced with a number of problems in regard to deficits and even bankruptcies in terms of day care centres. Given the increasing demand and the shortages of spaces, I think it would be a real tragedy if we lost some of these very fine day care centres at this particular time.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I speak wholeheartedly in favour of this bill and I would urge all members of the House to support it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, J. Storie:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to enter the debate on this bill at this time and express a few comments about the bill. I should indicate at the outset it would be my intention to support the bill knowing and recognizing that times are different than what they were. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if I wanted to in



a partisan way, as indeed they would have done to us had we been government, I could have suggested that it's because of the bad economic situation brought on by irresponsible socialist governments, both federally and provincially, that have to an increasing level have made the two working parents a much more needed entity in our life and, of course, the growth of the single parent that calls for the state or the government to provide the kind of facilities that we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I do have a word of caution and a concern here. There is no question in my mind that over the years, as the regulations become more sophisticated, as the operation becomes more centrally controlled under the department that has the specific responsibility, it becomes more unflexible or will cause instances that will provide a handicap to the provision of day care in certain areas. There is a tendency to make the kind of regulations not always consistent with the area and the district that they serve. It's straight bureaucracy that starts to enter it. All of a sudden, unless you haven't got these kind of basic health standards in a building, you can't operate a day care centre.

Although the honourable member that just finished speaking can speak about the need for day care centres, as no doubt they are in Norway House or in other rural isolated communities in Manitoba, I suggest to you that without some care, without some caution, these very regulations or the provisions - we are not passing regulations here; we are passing the broad legislation that will make it possible for a regulation to be drawn up - will very often become a hindrance, difficult, red tape for the very purpose of the bill; namely, the operation, the running and the daily care of children in the centres that we are talking about.

So, Mr. Speaker, while supporting the bill and in recognizing that it is 1980, it's not yesteryear; permit me however to make the comment that doesn't escape me. I mean our friends of course need to do by government what we in the Conservative ranks feel so intuitively and do so naturally. You know, when you talk about the need for qualified supervision of the children, well, my mother, my grandmothers - grandmothers around the world have been looking after children for 3,000 years and doing a reasonable job of it without necessarily the regulated qualifications that will be spelled out in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, you will be in some instances, not in all, but you see this is what happens - these are the downsides; these are the penalties when government intrudes to the extent you will have to pass a regulation that says only these kinds of people can be entrusted with the care of children and there will be many people who may be much better qualified in a personal individual way, but with not meeting the formal training, not meeting the regulations. The bureaucrats - not you gentlemen that are passing the bill; we're just passing the bill - but this bill now gets into the bureaucratic machine and somebody two years from now, three years from now will find out that unless you have had Grade 11, unless you have had Grade 10, unless you've taken a six-week training course here, unless you've done this, you can't be entrusted looking after our children. That's going to happen.

We see it happening in so many other areas when we as legislators pass certain bills. We pass certain bills affecting in the construction of homes and houses, in the operation of a whole host of things which on the surface make sense and there's a requirement for, but by the time our bureaucrats are finished with it they can in effect sometimes be self-defeating.

Well, Mr. Speaker, without prolonging the debate further, I want to go on record as suggesting that it's this kind of legislation which I'm pleased to support and I believe the party and the group that I'm with are supporting, but legislation that needs to be watched over so that unnecessary bureaucracy does not develop in the running of our day care centres under this legislation.

The other caution that I already mentioned, recognizing that in a province such as Manitoba you have very diverse circumstances and issues simply by how and where our people live. What may seem to be desirable, indeed necessary, for the City of Winnipeg or for the City of Brandon may be totally unrealistic for the community of Woodlands or Norway House or some other area, and yet I know that at the risk of repeating myself - but I simply challenge you - we pass the Enabling Legislation, as you call it, and then it falls into the hands of the bureaucrats who have to draw up necessarily the regulations board but I suggest that all of us as legislators don't pay enough attention to the regulations that get passed - regulations that get passed under The Wildlife Act, under the Fisheries Act, under The Health Act. We pass the legislation, yes - first contract legislation that you're talking about.

I think some of the very obvious and potential abuses that will be exercised in that legislation were expressed this morning by the Member for Tuxedo. But in any event having said those words, I will unto the state the loving care they will have to ensure that children who are put into the day care centres deserve to receive, ought to receive. I hope that by passing this legislation a measurable improvement in the care of the children will be effected, not simply the hiring of 10 or 15 more civil servants - more snooping going on in terms of big government as to how operations are being run - no, really that somebody can tell me five years from now that Aunt Ella who looked after children all her life, did a remarkable job and had a natural affinity for the care and love of children, all of a sudden can't do it because a prissy, smart, very talented, qualified-under-our-regulations person, Ms. Somebody, who perhaps has never birthed a child, perhaps has never looked after a child between the hours of midnight and the morning feeding hours, but nonetheless is qualified under regulations and marches and organizes her infants that are entrusted in her care. I'd like somebody to be able to tell me five years from now that under this regulation our children are being better looked after, not simply the buildings they're housed in, not simply the spaces they're occupying, not simply the depth of the carpet they're playing on, not simply the toilet facilities that have to be provided, not simply the extra toys or books and what-have-you, but the actual care of the children.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** If there are no further comments on this particular bill, I believe it stands in the name of Mr. Banman. Is that correct?

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland that . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On a point of order, the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I think the arrangement was made, while other members were free to speak as is our custom, but the bill stands in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, I think.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That was my understanding as well and the bill will stand in the name of the Member for La Verendrye.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

### COMMITTEE CHANGE

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I believe there is some agreement that we adjourn at 12:30, but before we do, I would like to make a change on the Committee of Privileges and Elections, replacing the Member for Springfield with myself.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health that the House do now adjourn. Oh yes, he's agreed.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is it the consent of the House there be no Private Members' Hour? (Agreed)

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m., Monday.