

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 30 June, 1982

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Waiding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . .

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to make a non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I would invite members of the Legislative Assembly to join with me to extend congratulations to the Neepawa Co-op Service Station at Neepawa who have been presented with the Excellence Award by Federated Co-operatives Ltd. in recognition of their high standard of service to the motoring public for the 11th consecutive year.

The staff members are Neil Rempel, service station manager; Earl Harding, Dwayne Chapman, Diane Zaruk and Terry Lostay.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. In view of the reports that the Port of Churchill is not going to be fully utilized or there is a possibility of it not being fully utilized, what has he or his government done to ensure those people who have been long-term supporters of the port and the farm community that use that outlet for their grain that it in fact will be maximized and fully utilized this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is one of the items that I intend to discuss with the Minister of Transport for Canada.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the grain is now being moved through the Port of Thunder Bay which I'm not against, but I'm wondering if that may not be too late. If he doesn't, Mr. Speaker, would he not put an immediate request to the Canadian Wheat Board as well as the Federal

Minister of Transport requesting that Port be fully utilized immediately?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, there is the short-run consideration; then there is the long-term future of the Port of Churchill that is in question and put in question by a number of people that have some following in this country including members of the Conservative Party in the Federal House. It's my hope that we get some clarification from the Government of Canada as to what their intentions are with respect to the Port of Churchill.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would agree there's a short-term and a long-term situation, but would he not agree, and I ask him directly, that the ultimate, long-term use depends on what amount of grain that has been put through in the immediate years? I would think there is some urgency for him and the Government of Manitoba to put a request through to the Federal Government asking for full utilization of that particular Port. It was done other years under our term of office, Mr. Speaker, and with, I would say, pretty good results so I would request or ask the Minister if he wouldn't consider putting an immediate communique through to the federal officials as well as the Canadian Wheat Board?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member implies there is no ongoing dialogue with respect to the Port of Churchill. That's been something that's been with us for many many years as he knows, long before the last term of their government, Mr. Speaker, and it's been a problem that we've not been able to sort out with the Government of Canada. Millions and millions of dollars have been spent at the Port of Churchill, federal and provincial, on the basis that Port authority was going to continue; on the basis that the town site was going to have some future and notwithstanding those commitments, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada at the same time, has reduced its economic involvement in that area.

So we are in a situation where we can't read the intentions of the Government of Canada. They seem to be rather ambiguous and it is one of the items that I intend to discuss with the Minister when we meet on the 15th of July.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, specifically to the Minister of Highways and Transportation. Will he, today or immediately, put a communique through to the Federal Minister of Transport and the head of the Canadian Wheat Board requesting the full utilization of the Port of Churchill this year?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, we have always maintained that position. It's a historic position on the part of this government, during the eight years prior and currently. So our position on that question is well-known, Mr. Speaker, but that doesn't mean there isn't ongoing discussion on the subject matter.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of

Highways and Transportation appears unwilling to directly communicate with either members in the Federal Government responsible for grain movement through the Port of Churchill. In view of the fact that he made reference to an upcoming meeting with the Federal Minister of Transportation, would the Minister assure the House that during this meeting with Mr. Pepin that he will press that Federal Minister to follow through on some of the very valid recommendations that were developed at a transportation meeting concerning the Port of Churchill held in Dauphin last June and attended by the three Prairie Provinces plus the Federal Government in which for the first time some very definitive recommendations were made to the Federal Government? Will this Minister be carrying those recommendations to Mr. Pepin to assure Mr. Pepin that with a change of government the attitude towards Churchill has not changed and press the Federal Minister for those kinds of very positive changes to the operation of the Port of Churchill?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I merely want to suggest to the members opposite that the track record of this government on the question of Churchill is well-known and is credible on that question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the track record of our government last year was even more definitive in which, as a result of that Dauphin meeting, there was roughly 50 percent more grain put through the Port of Churchill. Can the Minister assure us that his continued efforts to utilize the Port of Churchill will see a 50-percent increase in utilization of the Port of Churchill this year? I would ask the Minister, will he press the Federal Minister, his federal counterpart, to increase the utilization of the Port of Churchill by having the MV Arctic used by having an ice barrier put in place as was suggested last June in Dauphin, upgrading the last leg of the rail line into Churchill and to encourage more Soviet shipments via the Canadian Wheat Board through Churchill? Will he press the Federal Minister for those kinds of recommendations?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the Member for Pembina that our job would be much more easily carried out with respect to the interests of Manitoba and the Port of Churchill if we didn't have to deal with the windfalls that are falling in front of our canoe put forward by the Conservative Members of Parliament from Manitoba who have suggested that the Port of Churchill is not a viable operation.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Transportation once again knows not what of he's talking. He mentioned Members of Parliament. There's only been one reference that I'm aware of by one Member of Parliament ever on the future of Churchill and it was not to close down the Port of Churchill as the current Minister of Transportation is trying to suggest. He by no means suggested that. It is his job now, as it was our job, which we successfully undertook, to encourage the use of the Port of Churchill and he hasn't told us this morning whether he intends to do that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for

Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, following on that line of incisive questioning by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Pembina, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health and ask him of the 85 — (Interjection) — It doesn't involve the Port of Churchill, it may involve the Churchill Health Centre. Of the 85 budget hospitals in Manitoba, some 77 or 78 of which would be regarded as rural hospitals and some seven or eight of which would be regarded as major urban hospitals, how many have come in off the 1981-82 fiscal year with a budgetary deficit?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information at this time.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Could I ask the Minister to explore that question and provide the information to me, Mr. Speaker? Could I also ask him with respect to the 1982-83 fiscal year, how many of those hospitals have indicated to the Commission that the budgets that have been struck for them are not going to be, in their view, sufficient?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, yes, I'll take this under consideration. Apparently we'll be here for a few days anyway, so I might have time to give the information.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Although I appreciate the Minister's co-operation, it's not predicated on our being here for several days however. I'd appreciate the information from him — (Interjection) — Well if he can provide it in the House, fine, but if not I'd appreciate the information from him anyway. I'll make sure that my colleagues know about it when we receive it. Thank you.

Could I ask the Minister if he can confirm that the Brandon General Hospital has appealed to the Commission against its 1982-83 budget on the grounds that it has a deficit for '81-82 and it's anticipating that if it has to conform to the '82-83 budget struck by the Commission that it will have to cut services?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't have any of this information. I'll try to get it all as soon as possible

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Community Services and ask him whether there is any reason why he should be less alert to the challenges of the Brandon General Hospital now that he's on that side of the House than he apparently was when he was on this side of the House?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that the Member for Brandon hasn't changed at all. He's bugging me for Brandon and the Hospital and trying to get something extra every day.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, can I direct my earlier question then to the Minister of Community

Services and ask him if he can confirm that the Brandon General Hospital has suggested that it's going to have to cut services if it has to conform to the 1982-83 Commission budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, obviously that question is totally out of order, but at any rate I can assure you that I've had extensive discussions with the Minister of Health.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's rather presumptuous of the Minister to suggest that the question is out of order. I would then ask him whether he is out of touch with the main urban General Hospital in his constituency?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Previously I was in possession of a Written Question respecting one Mr. Rod MacKenzie and his employment with the Department of Northern Affairs. I'd like to provide the information at this time.

Mr. Rod MacKenzie has been under contract to undertake a feasibility study of the continuing operation of the Pi-Mi-Chi-Ka-Mac Development Corporation in Cross Lake. Of course, as the member is aware, the Pi-Mi-Chi-Ka-Mac Development Corporation is a sawmill operation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the Minister is responding now to a Written Question. It is my understanding also, Mr. Speaker, that the correct procedure is to provide written answers to Written Questions and not take up the time of Oral Question period.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on the same point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, there may be a tradition that is done from time to time, but there's no rule which requires it and therefore there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. I believe I sent all members a memo sometime ago dealing with the matter of questions raised in Question Period and at Committees. It was designed to speed up the procedure at Question Period and I hope that the Minister of Northern Affairs will take that as a good indication.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly apologize if I have offended the members opposite by providing this information. I will provide it in written form to the member as is the tradition and if he has any questions perhaps he can ask them of me

today and I'll be glad to answer them in oral form.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Transport. I'll give it this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. In view of the fact that the Federal Department of Communications has made indications recently that they would move to close down satellite dishes receiving United States' television signals in Manitoba, my question to the Minister is will he be supporting, financially, efforts on behalf of affected citizens who now enjoy those U.S. television signals? Will he be providing financial assistance to them to fight the Federal Government for retention of those signals?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: For the information, Mr. Speaker, of the honourable member, that letter to which he refers is a form letter, a mimeographed form letter, that went out to various companies right across Canada. Manitoba was not singled out; it was a form letter which virtually went from coast to coast.

However, we've made a commitment and we'll stand by that commitment to back, in whichever way necessary and possible, the various operators in the Province of Manitoba to ensure that their interests are protected and the rights of Northern Manitobans are protected as well, that they have the opportunity to have a variety of television broadcasting or reception as we do in Southern Manitoba.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then can I assume from the Minister's answer that indeed, in this year's Estimate process, funds have been budgeted in his department or elsewhere to fund legal action against the Federal Government should they move to eliminate satellite reception to Manitobans?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm very optimistic that it will not come to that, but if it does come to that, the monies will be of course provided to give this backup that we promised earlier.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is the Minister now indicating that no such funds are formally budgeted at this time?

HON. L. EVANS: That is correct, Mr. Speaker, but that is not a problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. I understand that there have been repeated difficulties in Brandon with the

release of ammonia from the Simplot Chemical Plant and some difficulties in gaining co-ordination between the company and the city who has to deal with this problem. I wonder if the Minister of the Environment could advise us whether or not he has been involved in attempting to resolve this situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, I can inform the Member for Turtle Mountain that we have, indeed, been involved as a result of specific complaints from individuals as well as from the MLAs representing the area who have taken the opportunity to call me up personally, sometimes quite late at night, to inform me of a discharge being noticed by residents in the area. The Simplot operation is under a Clean Environment Commission order and we are attempting to review that order - I should say we are reviewing that order - to make certain that it in fact does take into consideration the problems which are being experienced now.

I can provide to the member a very detailed, perhaps outside of Question Period, answer as to what is being done in respect to that particular order and what we've done in respect to specific complaints. But I think to expedite the business of the House, it's sufficient to inform him that we are reviewing the order; we are quite concerned; we have had the mobile monitoring unit in the area over the past number of weeks on occasion to take monitoring tests to try to determine the extent of the problem from that perspective and we are also in the process of setting up continuous monitoring devices in the area to ensure that we have a better understanding of the actual levels which are being emitted. Those are technical things, we take this matter very seriously. We want to look at the Clean Environment Commission order to see if perhaps the Clean Environment Commission should not be directed to review that order once again to take into consideration new developments with the construction of a new operation there.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise when the Clean Environment Commission will have issued its order?

HON. J. COWAN: I can advise the member that they are now operating under an order and that the consideration that is being given now is whether or not to ask them to have another hearing on the Simplot operation and, if that is a decision which is to be taken, then I would suggest that in the near future we will be directing the Clean Environment Commission to review that situation in that way once again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, last year the First Minister and the Member for Brandon East were very concerned about record bankruptcies in the province. I note by a report in the paper that the record has been broken again, Mr. Speaker, and under this government there are 200 bankruptcies to date this year in the Province of Manitoba - up 117 percent. I wonder if

the Minister of Economic Development could tell us what she is doing to stop these bankruptcies and what is going to happen in the future in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we regret more than anything, I think, that is occurring in society today, that the economic downturn is still heading down and that all the indicators which are the result of that overall depression are of course increasing. They're even accelerating. Mr. Speaker, the government has put into place as stimulative and as supportive a program as we can manage within our resources. Mr. Speaker, the particular problems relating to bankruptcy are being dealt with again within our capacity to protect those industries which can survive in the difficult times with an outreach program that is giving advice that is helping if there is refinancing remedies that are available to it. At the same time we are working with the employees to see that if there are any options which they can collectively pursue or, if the worse comes to worse, to assist them should a full bankruptcy occur.

Mr. Speaker, we regret as much or more than the members opposite that we don't have a full range of remedies at hand at the provincial level.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would then ask the Minister, last year the Premier and the Member for Brandon East felt it was the fault of the government, could she now explain why it's now the fault of the economic situation internationally and the situation in Canada rather than the government?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure everyone recognizes that one statistic quoted in isolation from the context is meaningless. If the member opposite felt that questions raised last year put him at a disadvantage or his government's program at a disadvantage I regret that, but that's past history. Mr. Speaker, we are wrestling on this side with attempting to understand the causes and the structural weaknesses in the Manitoba and Canadian economy. We're doing our best within our range of action and within our range of influence to put in place a healthier and more stable economic system, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I wonder then if the Minister could inform the House if she's taken a look at the policies we were putting in place because manufacturing investment had dropped up until 1977, rose continually until 1981, and is now dropping again drastically. I wonder if the Minister could look at our programs and see what the previous government was doing.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the member opposite that some innovative measures were taken to encourage manufacturing during the previous regime. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the criticism that came from our group was ever focused on attacking the good things that were done by the members opposite. In some cases, Mr. Speaker, I think programs could have

been improved. I think the main gist of the attack had to do with things that were left undone. It was the total package of the policy, Mr. Speaker, that was under attack from members on our side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of house privilege. The Minister of Community Services responsible for Manitoba Telephone System this morning indicated that if necessary provision for legal funding would be made and he indicated that no such provision has been made. I would refer you, Mr. Speaker, to Hansard of Thursday the 11th of March, 1982, in which we were considering the Estimates of the Minister of Community Services and Corrections. We were considering the line in the Estimates to deal with his communications responsibilities. I asked the Minister, "Has there been any provision under Other Expenditures to undertake any legal support action that may be necessary to protect the television fare of Northern Manitobans?"

Mr. Evans said, "There is, if it is necessary to spend money for legal fees and so on, my understanding is it would be done through the Attorney-General's Department." My next question was, "Are you aware whether those provisions have been made because it is rather a hot issue?" Mr. Evans, "The answer is yes, we made some provisions three weeks ago, I am advised."

Would the Minister care to inform the House which of his answers is the correct one, the one this morning where he says there is no provision for funding or the one given during the perusal of his Estimates on Thursday, March 11? Which answer is the truth, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: On that question of privilege, which is not a question of privilege. Mr. Speaker, it is true, as the members opposite know and particularly those who have been on Treasury Bench, that the General Manual of Administration provides that departments may be provided legal services through the Department of the Attorney-General as required. That is always there. There is nothing new about that. There is nothing inconsistent between the two answers. (a) that the provision is there and (b) that it may be called upon if necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you might take the opportunity, when Hansard is available, to peruse the answer given today by the Minister of Community Services in which he said there was no provision for funding, it would be made available if necessary. That, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit is quite the contrary to the specific questioning as to whether provision was made for legal aid to be provided to citizens of Northern Manitoba on the issue of television reception by U.S. satellite.

I submit, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, that on perusal of Hansard of this morning and your reading

of Hansard of Thursday, March 11th, you will find that this Minister has given different answers to the same question and I submit respectfully that is indeed a question of privilege of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member did not have a matter of privilege. I will take the matter as a question directly to a Member of the Treasury Bench. If he wishes to answer it he may do so; if not, Oral Questions.

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Government Services. Yesterday I had a very unique experience in as much as I have a constituent that arrived in a wheelchair to visit the Legislature and the only opportunity he had to visit the Chamber was to be moved up into the gallery with some difficulty and with a great deal of co-operation from Mr. Speaker and his staff.

I was just wondering whether any facilities are being arranged for in the future, to the Honourable Minister of Government Services, to allow a more convenient manner in which people in wheelchairs can arrive and view the proceedings here in the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that is something that I'm open to as far as suggestion is concerned. The provision of ramps and things of that nature for access to this building, I believe has been provided. The question of elevator capacity to go up to the extreme top of this building, I'm not sure if it's logistically possible, but that's something I'm prepared to look at. There is nothing in the Estimates for that kind of a program, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I heard the Honourable Minister make some remark concerning the ramps. There is nothing wrong with the ramps, because I did assist this young gentleman down the ramp to get into the building. It's not the ramps that is the problem; it's the wall at the end of the ramps if you can't stop. But anyways, this was the remark that this young gentleman had made and it was a little embarrassing because I would hope that there would be something in the future that would allow the people of these circumstances to view the proceedings.

As a matter of fact, yesterday was a very good day for viewing the proceedings because there were so many unique things that had happened and it just doesn't happen that often. Would the Honourable Minister keep in mind in the future to make some provisions for these types of people?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, that's an ongoing process. I know that we've had a number of discussions with respect to how to make existing buildings feasible for use by handicapped people and that is not a simple matter; that does involve a considerable amount of expenditure. With respect to this particular building, I must again repeat there is no provision for it in this year's Estimates.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I think that I would direct this question now to the Honourable Attorney-General. If we were assisting these people up the stairs, either the staff or friends, and something happened - like I stumbled a little bit, not dangerously, but I did stumble - but what if we dropped these people and they were injured? Would the Honourable Attorney-General give us any advice as to whether there's any liability on the part of the persons who are assisting them, including the staff?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Beauchesne is quite clear that a member may not ask a Member of Treasury Bench for legal advice and a Member of Treasury Bench may not give legal advice. That way lies disaster, particularly if it's my legal advice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize the Attorney-General wasn't capable of giving legal advice.

I have one other question and I really don't know who to ask the question of, but I'll ask the question and maybe we can get an answer. I know who I'd like to ask the question of, but he's not able to answer. If a person of this handicap, coming in a wheelchair, wants to come into the Chamber, would he be allowed to come into the Chamber as an important visitor rather than as an elected member and view the proceedings from the loge on a temporary basis, at least until such time as ramps and facilities were made to get him up into the top? I don't know who to ask.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I see the Minister of Transport is in his place. Can the Minister advise what grains are in storage at Churchill at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. S. USKIW: I'll take that question as notice.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to revert back to Notice of Motions.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Minister have leave?
The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: May I ask the Minister, what for?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. COWAN: I'd be pleased to answer. I'd like to beg leave to give Notice of Motion that we will be bringing forward Bill No. 67, an Act to amend the

Legislative Assembly Act, at the 2 o'clock sitting this afternoon if leave is granted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, are there some unusual circumstances that the government has just now learned that they're going to be introducing a change to The Legislative Assembly Act? My understanding is that it could have been placed on the Order Paper and dealt with in the usual fashion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: If the Opposition House Leader will reflect, he may recall that there was an agreement in the late hours of last night with respect to one particular item that falls under The Legislative Assembly Act. If he thinks about it for a moment, it's for that purpose that leave is being sought under Notices of Motion to place on the Order Paper for First Reading a bill to amend The Legislative Assembly Act

MR. B. RANSOM: Perhaps the Government House Leader could advise the House then of the nature of the business that the House is going to be dealing with, because perhaps it's unnecessary to be gaining leave for this type of bill at this time because there may be adequate time to put it on the Notice Paper.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Government House Leader, what is his intention with regard to Bill 30?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, it's clear from the way in which the question has been posed that the Opposition House Leader sees some inextricable connection between the two. I wouldn't have thought that was necessarily so.

Nevertheless, with respect to Bill 30, as I stated in the House yesterday, it was and continues to be my hope to this moment that some agreement can be arrived at. I haven't given up hope on that.

It's not my intention to call Bill 30 as the first order of business this morning until every avenue has been explored. That's the way we would like to operate if at all possible and time is clearly needed for that so that it would then, in light of the explanation which I've just given, be my intention to call Third Readings, as far as we can go; subsequently, to go into Committee of the Whole and by this afternoon see whether every avenue with respect to Bill 30 and related matters has been explored. If we've drawn a blank at that time, then an announcement will be made as to the government intention with respect to Bill 30 in the light of circumstances then pertaining.

In the meantime, as I said, we will call the other business on the Order Paper so that the business of government can be proceeded with.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, once again, the Opposition is being asked to assist the government out of a situation that has been created by their thoroughly inept handling of the business of government. I am, therefore, prepared to grant leave so that the

Minister may revert to Notices of Motion.

MR. SPEAKER: It would appear the Minister has his leave to revert back to Notices of Motion.

The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. J. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would then like to give notice that Bill No. 67, An Act to amend the Legislative Assembly Act, will be introduced for First Reading this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please call the Adjourned Debates on Third Readings as they appear on the Order Paper, Pages 3 through to 5, inclusive, in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON THIRD READING

BILL NO. 2 - THE RESIDENTIAL RENT REGULATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 2, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief comments with regards to this particular bill. As the Member for Tuxedo has indicated yesterday, I will be and the party will be supporting this particular piece of legislation. I would, however, want to put several things on the record.

First of all, I would like to say that with regard to rent controls, what has happened in the last number of years and particularly in the last provincial election, the hope that was held out by the members opposite by touting the rent controls, which they have introduced at this time, was that there would be no increases in rent in the Province of Manitoba. The average person on the street, I'm sure if you would talk to them after the type of literature that members opposite put out, is really under the impression that there will be no rent increases or they will be very minimal.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to say to you today that I think the Government's going to find out that people who are in this position will find that the rents, indeed, will be increasing by very virtue of the tax increases on property, by virtue of the cost of repairing, the cost of maintenance is going to be going up. So I think it's foolhardy for anybody to leave the impression or try to leave the impression that rent controls are going to solve the problems of housing in this particular country.

The problems of housing, Mr. Speaker - and especially when you're talking about rental accommodations - the biggest problems were started in the early '70s when certain tax reforms took place at the federal level which didn't allow people to write off the depreciated losses on their personal income tax. Mr.

Speaker, I would say that was one of the biggest blows that we have seen as far as the continuation of proper housing stock when it comes to rental housing in Canada as a whole. Instead of encouraging people to get into the housing in the rental market, successive different policies of different governments have made it virtually impossible for anybody, unless they received substantial government grants, to get into the rental accommodation field. I suggest that this bill will do nothing; as a matter of fact, will probably deter anybody from really having a closer look at that whole situation.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I realize there are many people that feel this is going to really help them out in their particular situation. I suggest to you that the increases will be coming on an annual basis to help the owners of the property to recoup the increased costs of doing business and that in the final analysis what will really happen with the different moves that all governments have made at all levels is you will see more pressure on the Provincial and Federal Governments to build public housing, which I think is a wrong-headed way of approaching the situation and is not my way of ensuring that there is a good housing stock available.

I think the best way of doing it, and it's been proven out time and time again, is for the landlord or the private owner to provide that particular shelter for the people who are in need. We've seen the problems that public housing has created and the problems that are related when governments are asked to evict people who aren't paying their bills properly and that. It just doesn't happen and those particular buildings have a tendency of being run down a little quicker, because there is nobody who is really watching them really close and has a particular investment in them.

So, having said those few words, Mr. Speaker, I once again reiterate that I will be voting for this particular piece of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Charleswood, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 19 - THE LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General, Bill No. 19, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had adjourned this debate earlier and in addition, as the Attorney-General reminds me, I had allowed it to stand so that it could be considered in Third Reading stage at the same time as The Residential Rent Regulation Act, which at that time was still in Committee. Now that we have them together I, having made my remarks on Bill 2 last evening, would also like to remark that this particular piece of legislation is companion because it does adjust references between the two Acts and allow for harmonization of the process

that is common in a variety of ways between The Landlord and Tenant Act and the new Residential Rent Rehabilitation Act. As well, Mr. Speaker, it provides for a number of opportunities for some equity and efficiency in treatment of certain circumstances that occur when tenants vacate suites and landlords are in a position to repossess suites for alternative rental to other tenants.

I might indicate that it appears to me, having seen the amendment to Bill 2, the amendment to Clause 16(1), I believe it was - which now permits for some partial freeing up of a suite when tenants voluntarily vacate, that the Section 116(1.1) of this Act is now either in contravention with that new provision in Bill 2 or indeed is superfluous. It is unfortunate that this could not have been addressed in Committee at the same time, but obviously that is the case.

Mr. Speaker, having made those few remarks I will again say that we on this side support this bill, as we have indicated our support for the amended Bill 2.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 20 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs Bill No. 26 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General Bill No. 40 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

Does someone wish to introduce a Third Reading of Bill No. 21?

THIRD READING - AMENDED BILLS BILL NO. 21 - THE COMMUNITY CHILD DAY CARE STANDARDS ACT

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 21, The Community Child Day Care Standards Act, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to make a few further comments on Bill 21, The Community Child Day Care Standards Act at this time.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that my colleagues and I in the Progressive Conservative Opposition in the Legislature are in favour of the concept of developing worthwhile standards for implementation in the day care field in such a way as to assure quality

day care for children and parents in Manitoba. We want accessible day care, we want reasonable fiscal responsibility where day care is concerned, we want day care that is affordable, and we want day care that is of high quality.

Further to that, insofar as it's possible, we want the day care spectrum and the day care opportunity in Manitoba extended as broadly as possible so that in conceptual terms we aim with our fellow citizens and with others in this Legislature for what could be described, Sir, as universal day care.

Flowing from that we derive our position with respect to Bill 21, which has been expressed by colleagues of mine in this debate earlier and certainly has been put by me and should be clear on the record, we have no difficulty with Bill 21 in terms of what it speaks to, the development and implementation of standards in the community child day care field that would provide the base and the framework that could be expected to lead to the kind of day care system that contains those ingredients to which I have referred in my remarks in the past two or three minutes.

As a consequence, Mr. Speaker, the government can be assured that we will not be opposing the passage of Bill 21 no more on Third Reading than we did on Second Reading and of course, Sir, we did not oppose it on Second Reading, we supported it, we encouraged its movement to Committee Stage, where it could be examined in fuller detail and where delegations and representations from the day care community and the public in general could convey their views, their thoughts and recommendations to the Committee, to both the Government and the Opposition, and we accepted passage of the bill at that stage with no substantive objections in terms of the goals contained in the legislation, but with, Sir, a number of suggestions for improvement of the approach which we felt were constructive and positive and would help to reinforce that objective of a fair, equitable or reasonable quality day care system.

Now, Sir, we come to Third Reading and again, we wish to make it clear that it's our intention to pass the legislation. However, before doing so, I think it's important to reinforce for the Minister's attention, the government's attention and indeed, Sir, for the public's attention, some of the points that we have attempted to make in the debate up to this date. In fact, where this legislation is concerned, I think it's perhaps more important to attempt to reinforce some of those points at Third Reading than would be the case with a great deal of legislation with which we deal in this Chamber.

The reason I say that is because the content of this legislation in terms of its substance differs very very greatly from the normal kind of bill that we are asked to address and debate in this House. Normally, one sees within the written content of a bill what it is the government intends to do and how it is the government intends to go about doing it. As a consequence, the House in total, the Opposition in particular and the delegations, who appear at Committee Stage additionally, have the opportunity to examine all the foreseeable ramifications of the legislation and its impact on the people of Manitoba.

Thus, when one comes to Third Reading on many pieces of legislation, the range of the effects of the legislation proposed has already been explored and

examined to some depth. In this case, Sir, it's quite a different situation, as has been pointed out in the debate earlier. The bill is merely enabling legislation and indeed says very very little, if indeed anything at all, Sir, about how this conception of a day care system is going to work, how it's going to operate, what it's going to cost and what its impact and ramifications are going to be, not only for the people of Manitoba in general, but for the system that's out there now for the day care community as it exists at this present time and for individual groups of parents and children who desire and deserve access to day care; so debate on Third Reading becomes more important in this legislation than perhaps would be the case in some other cases; than perhaps would be the case with respect to some other bills; some other pieces of legislation that come forward in Legislative Sessions.

The government has indicated by the bill in front of us that it wants to move to ensure implementation and establishment of the kind of day care system that I referred to a few moments ago. Then it has gone beyond that to say we are asking the Legislative Assembly, the elected representatives of the people, to agree with us on this and to buy this package so that it can be put into place and then it has gone on to say all the details, all the mechanics will be worked out, formulated, determined at some later date and they will be done so in a process that will actually be outside the technical process of the Legislature. They will be done through the formulation of regulations determined by the government and will not be done through debate and cross-debate in the Legislative Assembly.

That, Sir, is where we have our primary difficulty with Bill 21 and although it's been expressed before, I believe it's important that it be expressed and recorded again at Third Reading stage in the hope that the Minister and his colleagues in the government may take steps to ensure to a greater degree than they have ensured to date that the process of developing those regulations, the process of devising these mechanics of Bill 21 will be a fully democratic one, a fully responsive one and will be one that permits the widest possible legislative input, notwithstanding that it's being done outside the normal processes of a legislative sitting or a Legislative Session.

Mr. Speaker, this is not our only difficulty with Bill 21, but it's the main one. I wish to utilize a few moments of the time available to me this morning to emphasize or reemphasize some of our other difficulties with the bill, but I think it's important at this juncture in my contribution to this debate this morning to stress that this is our main difficulty with Bill 21, that it is merely enabling legislation. We don't know what we're buying when we pass this legislation and what's worse, we don't know what we're buying on behalf of the people of Manitoba, on behalf of the electorate, on behalf of the taxpayers, on behalf of the constituents and constituencies who have sent us here.

If we were to say we don't like this process and therefore we're not going to accept Bill 21, I think that would indeed be damaging. Certainly, it would be politically damaging, but quite apart from that consideration, I think that would be damaging for the day care community and the day care system. We do not want to do that and we do not want to be damaging to

the system. We want to be helpful and constructive to the system. We do not want to create difficulties in terms of the sense that the day care community and the day care system has of a united and cohesive will on the part of the Legislature and on the part of Manitoba's elected representatives for high-quality standards in day care and for a good day care system.

We don't want to create any seeds of doubt in that area because there should be no seeds of doubt in that area. There is no question of the cohesiveness and the unity of this Chamber as 57 representatives speaking for the Province of Manitoba and its citizens in totality when it comes to that objective, that quality day care system. That's the reason, Sir, why we would not consider for one moment implanting ourselves in the middle of the road in such a way as to obstruct the intent to move to that kind of a quality system with the standards that are desirable, but we would be less than responsible to the trust that is placed in us, Sir, if we didn't raise the objection that we have raised about the method and manner in which this legislation has been drafted and brought forward, the legislative approach that the Minister is taking.

There is absolutely no disputing the fact that the fair and responsible way to approach a subject of this kind would have been for the Minister to bring in a piece of legislation that told the House and told the public of Manitoba what the government hoped to do and what the legislation would provide if it were passed. To turn the equation the other way around, to stand the process on its ear, and to come in with legislation that merely says, "This is what we're dreaming about, now let us do it; give us the authority to go into a room somewhere and work out the details," flies directly in the face of the responsible, traditional, conventional process that we are sent here to observe. We would be less than responsible, as I say, Mr. Speaker, if we did not cite that very serious flaw in this legislation. And it is a very serious flaw and it's a very serious indictment of the government's approach and the Minister's approach to this subject. It's also a serious indictment of the government's attitude and the Minister's attitude towards the role of the Legislative Assembly and the role of the Opposition where legislation is concerned. In this case it's doubly worrisome because this is legislation that will have enormous social impact that speaks to a subject that's been described by the Honourable Member for Wolseley correctly and other colleagues of the Minister as one that is of major priority importance to people and that addresses one of the most valuable resources in our society, our children and their parents, and it therefore deserves the most intensive scrutiny by the Legislature and the fairest examination by the Legislature that could be brought to it. It's not going to receive that kind of scrutiny and that kind of evaluation in the full legislative sense, because of the manner in which the Minister has proceeded.

However, Mr. Speaker, we would hope that by reemphasizing this weakness and this serious flaw that the Minister and his colleagues will conscientiously take into consideration now the unconventionality of the position that they've taken, the approach that they've taken, the irresponsibility involved in it where proper legislative scrutiny is concerned, and that they will open up the process of development of

those regulations as I've said to the fullest examination and the fullest legislative input that is humanly possible.

Going beyond that, Mr. Speaker, the basic difficulty with the bill to which I've referred, I believe that there are at least two other realities about this legislation with which the Minister must come to grips and with which the public is going to be extremely disappointed, pending some satisfactory resolution of the problems contained.

The first is that the government, by laying out its hopes and dreams for a quality day care system based on standards, has raised the expectations in the day care community and certainly among the public that they are going to be able to deliver to Manitoba a day care system that will be the best in North America, if not the world, that will be a model for all other jurisdictions to follow and that will contain the highest ingredients of training qualifications, of support systems for families and children, of opportunities for families and children, to be found in any social program or any health delivery program anywhere in the world. They are not going to be able to do that, Mr. Speaker, without hurdling some extremely difficult obstacles that lie in the path of not only of this society, but every society today as a result of the economic circumstances in which we find ourselves.

The government is talking about an increase in the day care budget in 1982-83 of \$2.4 million over the budgeted figure for 1981-82. It's an increase of \$2.4 million on a base of \$9.3 million, which translates into an increase of 26 percent. In percentage terms that's a pretty good increase. Mr. Speaker, if one were just simply to stand up and say that a certain program was enjoying a 26 percent increase, one would be very impressed by that, but when you look at what the Minister and the government are contemplating or hoping for in the day care system to which they aspire and then consider, that 26 percent translated into dollars comes to \$2.4 million, the bloom comes quickly off the rose. At the same time as they talk about a day care system based on implementation of standards, and substantial standards, they've talked, Sir, about increasing the number of spaces in our day care spectrum in 1982-83 by 750. Well, there's absolutely no possibility that they can do both. In fact, there's absolutely no possibility that they could implement standards of the type not only as the government envisages but that many delegations appearing before the Committee envisage for the kind of money that is included in the budget.

First of all, they're going to have to make the choice as to whether they have to go standards or have to go spaces, they're going to have to make the choice as to whether they can provide the 750 new spaces and put the drive for standards aside for the time being, or decide to move ahead with the implementation of the standards, all of which are going to cost an enormous amount of money, and forget about the increase in the spaces in the existing day care spectrum for a while. But that's only decision number one, Mr. Speaker. If they should decide that they're going to put the emphasis on the system that they've talked about and the standards that they've talked about, they're then going to have to decide how they can implement meaningful standards for \$2.4 million. It is no exaggeration

to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that to implement meaningful standards that would bring the level of day care up to the quality that the Minister is thinking about in this legislation and up to the minimum level that some delegations appearing before the Committee described, would constitute a staggering fiscal challenge and financial problem for this province.

I think it's no exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that to achieve that level would require a budgetary expenditure of at least \$30 million on day care, for starters. If the province wants to move to I suppose what could be described as the total objective implicit in the government's legislation, that is a quality day care system operating on a 24-hour basis, one is looking easily at a \$100 million annual bill. The current budget for day care is \$9.3 million, so those figures put the problem and the challenge into its perspective, Mr. Speaker. To go from \$9.3 million to \$100 million is unthinkable in today's economic conditions. To go from \$9.3 million to \$30 million is impossible in terms of the budget, the fiscal situation and the deficit situation in which the government is locked at the present time. To go from \$9.3 million to \$11.7 million is what the government intends to do according to the Estimates for '82-83, but that, Sir, as I say will not pay for a fraction of the system envisioned by and implied in the legislation brought forward by the Minister.

Unfortunately, Manitoba and Manitobans cannot contemplate a \$100 million day care budget. Unfortunately, the deficit position this year in the Province of Manitoba will not permit a \$30 million day care program. We're facing a \$353 million predicted deficit in print. We are facing an additional borrowing initiative, at least an intended borrowing initiative of \$900 million in this province. We're facing Supplementary Spending Estimates of some \$46 million, which the House has just addressed and passed in very recent days. We're facing in Canada and we're all part and parcel of the same family, a \$20 billion deficit revealed by the Federal Minister of Finance on Monday night and it is absolutely impossible. It would border on insanity, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that this government or any government in Manitoba can move very much beyond the limits of the appropriations that it has requested for 1982-83 in the Estimates relative to the individual departments that we have already dealt with during this Session. In fact it's our position that the Estimates, the spending program, brought forward in this Session on which the government has sought and is receiving critical approval, exceed the capacity of the Manitoba taxpayer to a very dangerous degree and that the direction of the government for '82-83, where spending is concerned, should have been much more prudent, should have been carefully tailored constraint on public spending, rather than expansionary public spending.

Certainly the bottom line, Sir, is that the expansionary spending that they're talking about is potentially highly dangerous in terms of the health of the Manitoba economy and the health of the Manitoba taxpayer and once one takes into consideration the supplementary spending of \$46 million or more which has been approved and to which I've referred, one cannot, in all conscience condone or endorse the spending, the appropriation of one additional dollar in 1982-83, and it's likely to be much the same for '83-84 and

'84-85, while we work our way out of this economic difficulty. So that when we're looking at a \$2.4 million increase for day care, we're looking at the top limit. That's all the taxpayers of Manitoba can afford.

In fact, overall, the taxpayers of Manitoba cannot afford the spending estimates that have been proposed in this House by this government for 1982-83. It's going to be a struggle to meet those, so that the figures then fall into perspective in terms of what they mean and a 26 percent increase is not much of an increase when it's measured against that kind of a scenario. The 26 percent means nothing. It's \$2.4 million in a conceptual program that would cost a minimum of \$30 million to do it up to a reasonable level in the eyes of the government and would cost \$100 million to reach the overall goal of 24-hour high quality day care, which is unquestionably at the horizon of the government's objectives.

In addressing the subject in the way the government has addressed it, in making the promises about day care and day care standards and a much improved day care system and a day care bill that they did during the 1981 election campaign, Mr. Speaker, the members of the New Democratic Party and the New Democratic Government caused Manitobans and the Manitoba day care community to expect some real action, something truly meaningful in this field. Real action and something truly meaningful means much more than simply the rhetorical concept of standards. What it means is the actual development and implementation of standards and to develop and implement the kinds of standards that would be required, is going to cost the kind of money that I've just described, Sir. It is impossible and therefore the expectations of the day care community have been raised to a point beyond all reason and to a point beyond all logic. The government cannot meet those expectations and the first thing they've got on their hands now is an insipient wave of disappointment in the day care community. So, that is the other challenge, the other problem that they're going to have to address. How they're going to deal with that, I do not know, but they cannot deal with it by bankrupting the Province of Manitoba.

Therefore, what's going to emerge from this if they make the decision to go for standards rather than spaces are a minimum set of standards that will not produce the abstract day care quality, which I think is at the heart of their legislative objective. Of course, minimum standards that don't produce that quality are going to be an enormous disappointment to the day care community and the advocates of standards, who have had their enthusiasm whipped up to a very high level and a very high degree by the government's promises in the day care field.

So, Sir, as I've said, first of all they've got to make the choice between spaces and standards and then if they make the choice for standards, they're going to have to deal with the disappointment of the day care community in respect to what those standards will mean and what those standards will do, because on the dollars that they've got and the capacity of the taxpayers of Manitoba to pay for programs of this kind, the standards cannot, Sir, be very meaningful.

Going beyond that, if and when that problem is hurdled and resolved and that will take I think some considerable time, Sir, we've got the whole question

of what the ultimate standards in day care for Manitoba are going to be. There is the problem to which many of my colleagues alluded earlier of the existing system and the differences in society across the province that require a very sensitive approach on the government's part.

I spoke earlier in Second Reading about the error and the problem that would be presented if the government approached this subject with a view to making the day care system and its standards homogenous across the province. I would hope there has been and will continue to be recognition by the government of the fact that there are vast differences in Manitoba society, insofar as its capacities and its needs in the day care field are concerned, insofar as its requirements and its resources in the day care community are concerned and insofar as the actual makeup of the social tapestry of the province are concerned.

It is urgently to be hoped, Sir, that the regulations finally to be developed and promulgated and the standards ultimately to be implemented will take all those differences into accounts very sensitively. If they don't, there will be localities, communities, regions, in Manitoba being served by day care today which will lose their day care services tomorrow, which will be deprived of their day care services in the future because of their inability to compete in economic terms for the kinds of personnel, the kinds of facilities and the kinds of programming that rigid homogenous universal standards would demand.

The final problem is the one that I addressed through a proposed amendment that we attempted to receive support for, both at the Committee Stage and then at the Report Stage on Third Reading, Mr. Speaker. That was the amendment that spoke to the individual problem of shift workers and persons in professional capacities such as nurses, many persons in the teaching field and others who are deprived of the opportunity to make use of day care facilities in their neighbourhoods and in their communities because their hours of work do not coincide with the hours of the day care facilities operation. The difficulty that we have with the bill, where this problem is concerned, is the same difficulty that we have with the Bill where the total legislative approach to the government is concerned on this subject, Mr. Speaker.

The bill is a piece of legislation designed to satisfy the government's ambitions to create a highly structured day care system. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with an ambition to create a highly-structured system, depending on one's philosophy of society and the way society should operate, but leaving the philosophical debate aside, there is nothing intrinsically wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. The problem is that when the government speaks about a day care bill and day care legislation, one logically expects that they are speaking about addressing the problems of people, of parents and of children. It's disappointing to find that not only the bill, but the Minister and his colleagues are much more interested in the concept of that system and in the development of that structure than in dealing with the specific individual problems of people.

That came through very clearly, Mr. Speaker, when the Progressive Conservative Opposition attempted to win support at Committee Stage and again at

Report Stage for an amendment that would make some accommodation; go some small step towards helping those working people in our society who would normally have access to day care, but are denied that access because of the hours of day or night in which they work and I fail to see why, when the government is dealing with a subject that is purportedly aimed at helping people because that's what day care is all about, it cannot shift itself one degree or two off that rigid route on which it's got itself moving, off that rigid adherence to the idea of structure and system to make some provisions, deserved provisions, for individual people with individual problems.

The Minister has suggested that our amendment, which would provide support for shift workers who are single parents, who have children in need of day care, who would be taking advantage of day care in their neighbourhoods if they worked on daytime hours, is merely a paid babysitting service, would cost too much money and would deny the government the opportunity to do the job that it thinks needs to be done in the conventional day care field.

Mr. Speaker, when one considers that the government hasn't got enough money to do the job it wants to do in the conventional day care field, when one considers that the government is pumping \$2.4 million into a concept that would cost a minimum of \$30 million and that could cost \$100 million, I think the logical question arises, why scatter that \$2.4 million on the wind? Why not do something meaningful with that \$2.4 million? Something meaningful that could be done was represented in the amendment proposed by our party. There, there could be some dollars specifically directed to specific individual people's problems and those dollars would be helping people who are taxpayers, who are helping to pay for the conventional system and who are helping to provide that additional \$2.4 million that the Minister is talking about. So that is the other obstacle and the other difficulty that we face, Mr. Speaker, as we move the bill through this stage of the process.

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

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, the Minister of Transportation, that Bill No. 36, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, be now read a third time and passed.

We'll hold on that motion, Mr. Speaker, and have another.

**BILL NO. 23
THE LEGAL AID SERVICES SOCIETY
OF MANITOBA LTD.**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of

Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS presented Bill No. 23, An Act to amend The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Act, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not too sure that the arguments that have been put forward by members of this side of the House or the arguments that were put forward in Committee were listened to by the Attorney-General. I think he listened, but I don't think he was the least bit convinced of the validity of the argument and for that we have to probably give him credit that he is firm and steadfast, that his beliefs do not change, that his philosophy does not change and he will stand, no matter what, on the philosophical grounds that he has staked out before he brought this legislation in, or philosophical grounds that he has had for many many years. But, Mr. Speaker, I happen to respect the Attorney-General because he has been first and foremost in the field of legal aid, being the first chairman of the Legal Aid Society when it was first set up; he has seen the whole concept of legal aid progress right from its beginnings.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I think that even with his vast knowledge of the operation of Legal Aid, I would hope that he would listen at some time or another to the opinions that are being expressed by other members of society with respect to the direction that legal aid is going. I know that he can very well stand up and say, well they are the government, they were elected with the support of 47 percent of the people of Manitoba and quite properly form the government; but the views expressed by members of this side of the House represent 44 percent of the population of Manitoba, so there's really only three percentage difference between the support that they have and the support that we have on this side of the House. Legal aid, may I suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, encompasses not just 47 percent of the people; it's supposed to embrace the entire population where the need can be demonstrated.

I think it's fairly important that one basic philosophy of legal aid should always remain, that there should be no legal aid except in cases where the need can be demonstrated. That is a fundamental, that if it remains the basic of legal aid, then we can support legal aid on all sides of the House without any undue concern as long as the criteria for need is clearly spelled out; but, Mr. Speaker, I think we are slipping away a little bit from that basic philosophy.

We are now finding that changes are being proposed that do deviate from that philosophy to some degree and the amount of deviation is one that is not clearly defined. It's a deviation that is left in the hands of the Legal Aid Society to determine and that can be variable, it can be flexible and it can also deviate from that basic premise where need must be demonstrated. So it leaves itself open to subjective criticism because we are now getting into a field where you're getting into the public advocacy role and that has been addressed quite well, I think, by several

members on this side of the House. It has been addressed also by delegations that appeared before committee when this bill went to committee.

I think the arguments that were put forward were good arguments, they were logical and in the public interest. Having said that, it was my sincere hope that the Attorney-General would see clear to remove the offending parts of this legislation before we passed it for third reading. So far, Mr. Speaker, I have seen no evidence of that and it causes me personally a great deal of concern. The second thing that causes me even more concern is the attitude of the Attorney-General and I know it's very improper, Mr. Speaker, for me to make reference to the absence or presence of the Attorney-General in the House, so I will not make any reference to that at all. It is disappointing to me though that when a member, who has the responsibility to pilot legislation through this Chamber and indeed makes the arrangements to do so, is unwilling to listen to the constructive advice given to him.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have to indicate that I am not the least bit pleased with this legislation nor with the actions of the person who is responsible for the bill. I would hope that if this passes against my objections, that we will have the opportunity within the next 12 months to review the legislation with the possibility of removing those offending clauses from the legislation.

Those are the comments that I want to make at this time, Mr. Speaker. So it's with regret that I note that the Attorney-General would not be listening to it. I would only hope that other members would pass those comments on to him.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, H. Harapiak: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 27 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the Government House Leader.

HON. L. EVANS presented Bill No. 27, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're dealing with Bill No. 27, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act. It's an Act, Mr. Speaker, which to me flies in the face of the system of justice that has been firmly established in this country. In fact, it was only a few short months ago, Mr. Speaker, that we had a great fanfare with the Canadian Constitution and the Charter that went with it. It is one of the fundamental principles of British justice, and the whole system that we base our laws and our courts on in this country is

the very simple philosophy that a man is innocent until proven guilty.

But over the last several years, Mr. Speaker, we have seen various Acts of Legislatures, House of Commons, that have brought the reverse onus amendments to our judicial system and that is where a man is guilty until he proves his own innocence. I find that system somewhat abhorrent. I know it is a system. At least, I've been told it is a system that is used in other jurisdictions but, Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the countries where that system is used. Perhaps the Attorney-General is, but I know that I do not know too much about that type of government nor, Mr. Speaker, do I have too much respect for it. I believe very strongly that a man should be innocent until proven guilty. The onus of proof must always rest with the state but we find these convenience clauses which serve the administration of justice or so we're told that is the intent. These clauses keep creeping in which, in my estimation, destroy the very fundamental of justice in our country. When you start handing out tickets which have an effect of saying unless you pay it by such and such a date, you will automatically be guilty. I find that somewhat abhorrent. I would sincerely hope that our system of justice should be the paramount factor in the administration of justice rather than the inconvenience that may be caused to a few bureaucrats that have problems with the collection of fines and fees.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to register my own personal objection to this bill not because of the parking tickets or anything else, but because it offends the basic principle of justice that our whole country is built on.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 31 - THE CHILD CUSTODY ENFORCEMENT ACT

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Government House Leader.

HON. L. EVANS presented Bill No. 31, The Child Custody Enforcement Act, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this bill, as members have noted, deals with one of the most traumatic experiences that, I think, parents and children can experience in our society and they are experiencing it in growing and greater numbers every day as the rate of separation and divorce increases steadily, not only in this jurisdiction, but in other jurisdictions in Canada and certainly North America. Com-

bined with that. Mr. Speaker, are statistics that indicate quite clearly that where separations or divorces occur there are greater and greater difficulties as people move from one province to another. People in those situations, single or divorced, return perhaps to provinces in which they were born or raised or move for the purposes of education or move for the purposes of finding employment and the heretofore happily married spouses are separated and, of course, custody becomes in many many cases the most serious matter outstanding between the spouses.

Although, Mr. Speaker, we have passed legislation in this House with respect to maintenance and with respect to the division of marital assets upon separation and divorce that, except in very extraordinary circumstances, provide that a spouse shall receive maintenance where required or that the marital assets shall be divided 50-50 as a first presumption. Mr. Speaker, we have not eliminated and cannot eliminate the difficulties of contested applications for custody where it has been said that all of the dirty linen that may have gone on in a marriage comes out as the spouses fight each other for custody of their children; sometimes with a true belief that they sincerely believe that they are the one to whom the child should be awarded custody because they think that they are the best spouse to look after that child or alternatively, perhaps out of some vindictiveness for the separation or the divorce, the children are used as pawns in a battle between the spouses. So, Mr. Speaker, we see these types of battles and fights go on in cases of separation and divorces for custody of the children.

We find in many cases where the one spouse will leave another and will leave without notice and without warning and will take the children perhaps somewhere else in the province or in many cases to another jurisdiction. Then, Mr. Speaker, the legal battles start. As the person who has taken the children to another jurisdiction applies for a custody order in that jurisdiction, the spouse remaining here applies for an order for custody in this jurisdiction, then the battle is enjoined in the other jurisdiction as to which court has jurisdiction to grant a custody order.

Although, of course, in many cases the spouses, one or other, will receive legal aid in this or in other jurisdictions, the cost of these legal disputes are tremendous and that's not saying, Mr. Speaker, in any way being critical of the lawyers who are involved because the time involved in these types of cases is very heavy because, generally speaking, the lawyer involved must virtually review the whole life history of the parties, the conditions under which they're living, the conditions under which they propose to have custody and, as a result of which, a great deal of time has to be spent by counsel for the parties involved in these proceedings and the expenses do become very very heavy.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated previously, was under consideration by our government and, I think in fact, last September before the election was called I asked Legislative Counsel to begin the drafting of this legislation for what I optimistically thought would be, if an election were called, another term for our government. So we would have proceeded with this legislation had we remained in government and I, Mr. Speaker, commend the Attorney-General for bringing

forward this legislation and any other legislation with respect to these family law issues with which this Legislature is very familiar, whether it be with respect to custody, whether it be with respect to enforcement of Maintenance Orders because these are the real problems. We can have the finest Family Maintenance Act that's possible or the finest Child Welfare Act that's possible, but one of the most serious practical problems in all of these cases, Mr. Speaker, is the enforcement of the Maintenance Order and the enforcement of the Custody Order. Mr. Speaker, this bill which has been considered for a number of years by the Uniformity Law Conference and was again considered, I believe, a year or two ago in which they have recommended for adoption in all provinces is one which I think should go some way to helping people caught in this very emotional situation to have the matter resolved.

There is in the bill an attempt to define the basis upon which a court should consider a variation of a Custody Order, Mr. Speaker, which is important because we have found in the past that some courts in some provinces tend to very quickly and easily assume jurisdiction and vary an order, making it very difficult, for example, for a spouse from Manitoba to enforce that Order. I ask members to contemplate the situation, Mr. Speaker, where perhaps two spouses are residing in the Province of Manitoba and one spouse leaves, him or her, taking the children to another province. The remaining spouse in Manitoba obtains an Order for Custody in Manitoba and then attempts to enforce that Order in another province; let's say, it's B.C. or let's say, Mr. Speaker, it's in the Maritimes. Now, if the court in one of those other provinces very quickly and easily assumes jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, and varies the Custody Order that was obtained in Manitoba or assumes jurisdiction too easily, then the spouse who remains in Manitoba is in a very difficult position because he or she is then faced with the extraordinary expense of travelling to another jurisdiction which, as I say, may be far on the east coast or the west coast of retaining a solicitor there to again deal with the whole detailed question of custody, to provide counsel in one of those far off provinces with information from the witnesses. So, Mr. Speaker, it can become very unfair to the spouse who remained in Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, this Act attempts to define the basis on which the court here or a court in another province would assume jurisdiction to deal with an application to vary a Custody Order which has already been obtained and stipulates that the court may vary a Custody Order if the court is satisfied that (a) the child does not have a real and substantial connection with the province, etc., in which the Custody Order was made or was last enforced and that the child has a real and substantial connection with Manitoba or all the parties affected by the Custody Order are resident in Manitoba. I think that goes some way, Mr. Speaker, to codifying the existing case law with respect to that principle, sometimes all of which may not be followed.

I do point out that, although I think that is a codification of the existing precedents dealing with that question, you can get involved in another situation, Mr. Speaker, where for example, a spouse has left the province and applies for a Custody Order in another

jurisdiction and a judge, perhaps may in error, allow a Custody Order to be granted in that other jurisdiction and assume jurisdiction and then the applicant is in another difficult position. Does he, the person from Manitoba, appeal that decision of the lower court in another jurisdiction or does he agree to simply that court taking jurisdiction in dealing with the real issue? In both cases, Mr. Speaker, the person resident in Manitoba is in the difficult position I described before of having to assume the burden and expense of dealing with this custody issue in another province with counsel there.

Mr. Speaker, this bill goes on to deal with the matters to which the court should give consideration in dealing with a variation of a Custody Order and states that the court shall give first consideration to the welfare of the child, regardless of the wishes or interests of any persons seeking or opposing the variation, and treat the question of custody as of paramount importance and the question of access or visitation as of secondary importance.

In dealing with that principle, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the questions in the past that I've placed to the Minister of Community Services, I would use this opportunity to impress upon him those principles in dealing with custody of children, which is appropriate also to the question of adoption. He should read that Section very clearly and very carefully, Mr. Speaker, that first consideration must be given to the welfare of the child, regardless of the wishes or interests of any person seeking or opposing the variation.

So, Mr. Speaker, when he talks about two sides to the question of adoption, I tell him again there is only one side and this is what must be given first consideration. When you have as of three weeks ago some 60 children being placed in institutions or foster homes and moved from one institution or foster home to another when there are people available who could provide those children with as some of the people have indicated and described as loving and caring homes, Mr. Speaker, I think this is the principle the Minister must operate on.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that he would use this principle in dealing with this whole question of the moratorium and in view of the delay that is taking place with respect to Judge Kimelman's Report, that he would seriously consider this principle, deal with the whole question of these at least 60 children, deal with them on this basis and ensure that they are in a happy, caring, loving home and that they are given first consideration and not the wishes or interests of persons who are seeking or opposing that.

I would urge him to do that, Mr. Speaker, and in doing so I want to make it clear again for the record if there are proposals that can be developed that will allow for an increase in the number of Native persons to come forward to adopt Native children, then I support that. I support anything that can be done to deal with that problem. In the interim, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that these children can be, as the Executive Director of the Children's Aid Society said, placed on a shelf waiting for the Minister to make a decision.

Mr. Speaker, I must point out that the principle on which a variation must be dealt with is somewhat amended and I'm not saying that critically, but an exception is allowed where a court is satisfied that a

child would suffer serious harm if the child remained in or was restored to the custody of the person named in a Custody Order. The court may vary the Order so that there is adequate discretion, Mr. Speaker, to allow the court to act in the best interest of the child, even if there is no real and substantial connection with the Province of Manitoba by the child. Where the applicant can show serious harm, then the court will have that discretion to deal with a variation. Again, I think that is a codification of the case law on this subject matter and I think is a very accurate reflection of it and a good provision to have in this Act.

Mr. Speaker, there are given to the court some powers and some additional powers, as the Attorney-General indicated previously, which I think will help the court to a great degree in enforcing the orders of the court. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, for example in Section 6(e) and I stand to be corrected by the Attorney-General, certainly I haven't seen a case where the court ordered payment of the cost of reasonable travel and other expenses. It may be the case, but in any event, Mr. Speaker, I think that's a good provision because of the impecunious circumstances that one of the spouses in these situations can find themselves in. Even if a person had Legal Aid, for example, I'm not sure that Legal Aid would cover that kind of expense. I commend the bill for having that additional power in it, Mr. Speaker.

As the Attorney-General indicated, I think in a question I asked of him after he introduced the bill with respect to Section 9, there are Orders made at this time which allow or under which the court orders police officers to assist the applicant who has obtained the Court Order in enforcing that Order and going with the applicant to locate, apprehend and deliver the child to a person named in the Order. I think quite correctly as the Attorney-General indicated, it's not always done, it's not always included and certainly I think he's right on this point, that the police do not particularly like to involve themselves in these family situations, Mr. Speaker.

I think this kind of direction is needed because they have to get involved in these situations. They can be very dangerous situations, Mr. Speaker. I certainly have seen situations where one of the spouses has arranged for so-called friends to be available or on the premises and the party with the Order has been threatened and has been literally afraid of his or her own life to attempt to go and take the children.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the power to direct the police officers in that jurisdiction to assist the applicant in enforcing that Order is a good one and the Act imposes a duty upon a peace officer to do all things reasonably able to be done. It may very well be in something the Attorney-General may want to consider in his discussions with the RCMP and with, perhaps, the Chief of the City of Winnipeg Police Force, those being the two main police forces in Manitoba to have some discussion with them on this question.

I believe that the police forces have tried over the last few years to give special training to some of their constables to deal with these difficult family situations. Mr. Speaker, it might be worthwhile for the Attorney-General or his department to have some discussion with them to particularly bring this matter to their attention and to the attention of all other police

forces in Manitoba. They might, indeed, give some consideration to some special training for constables to deal with this situation, because maybe it's not special training that's necessary but certainly patience and understanding of the difficult emotional situation is necessary for policeman to adequately deal with this situation.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the power of entry and search in this situation, given the seriousness of the situation, is one which is necessary. In some of the situations, Mr. Speaker, there are parties involved who will go to almost any extreme to keep custody of the children which they have and in those situations this may very well be a power that will be necessary to be used in some of these extreme situations.

I just want to make a comment, I'm not being critical, Mr. Speaker, in the following Sections 9(5) there is a limitation on the time of entry, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. unless the court, in the Order, authorized entry and search at another time. So we have a situation, Mr. Speaker, where under Section 9(4), a peace officer on reasonable and probable grounds may enter and search a place where he has reasonable and probable grounds for believing a child may be, then we have a limitation on that entry and search to be between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. unless the court, in the Order, authorized entry and search at another time.

Mr. Speaker, this points out, I think, the justification for the program which we have in Manitoba where the Attorney-General's Department will provide counsel, Crown Attorneys, to assist in enforcement of Custody Orders, because we might very well have a situation where there is an Order for Custody made, but at the time of making there was no concern about obtaining custody, so the court may not have ordered or allowed in the Order police to enter the premises at other than hours between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. But I think with our program in Manitoba by providing Crown Attorneys to assist in enforcement and virtually having them available almost on a 24-hour basis, I certainly don't think it's required, but they are the kind of loyal, aggressive and eager Crown Attorneys involved in this matter that time would not be a particular problem. I don't think, with them. It's crucial, Mr. Speaker, that happen because I have seen many situations during the past four years where in other provinces a person from Manitoba was trying to enforce a Custody Order and none of the other provinces follow our system of providing Crown Counsel, Mr. Speaker. I know of one particular instance, and it may have been brought to the attention of the Attorney-General, where a spouse had the knowledge of where the child was for a very limited period of time. Because the Attorney-General's Department in that other province would not assist that spouse in the enforcement of the Custody Order, there wasn't sufficient time to react and retain private counsel to assist and by the time that was done, the child had been removed again from the jurisdiction. That particular case, I think, got some national publicity later on. It was another couple of years, I think, before that whole situation was resolved.

Mr. Speaker, we use that as an example in talking to other provinces because, if they had provided a Crown Attorney, custody would have been regained at that moment in time some two years prior to when it

was actually and eventually resolved. So, Mr. Speaker, with our program of providing a Crown Attorney, if it comes to the knowledge of the Crown Attorney, that this sort of an application will be necessary to a court to obtain authority to enter the premises at other than between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., which could very well happen, somebody who has taken the children may be driving through the city and stopped at a motel for the evening with the children, intending to move on the next morning, there has to be prompt action taken. With our program, Mr. Speaker, the Crown Attorney would be available immediately to assist the spouse who is attempting to enforce a Custody Order could make an application to the court to obtain permission for the police to enter and search and could obtain custody.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this provision in Manitoba will work satisfactorily. I think there may be some danger because of the lack of enforcement or lack of assistance from Attorney-General's Department in other provinces that this provision may impose some difficulty for someone trying to enforce a custody order. There are, in addition, Mr. Speaker, additional borders that the court may require where the court is satisfied that a person proposes to move a child from Manitoba, and I think those are good ones and certainly would make it much more difficult and provide at least some deterrent to a person who intends to take that action when the court can order that the property be held or order payments or post bonds without sureties or maintain the person's passport or children's passports. Those are good provisions, Mr. Speaker.

There are provisions with respect to obtaining information as to addresses which, again, deals with a very practical problem, Mr. Speaker, of trying to get information that is available in government regulatory bodies, but without specific access to it cannot be attained, and it's a difficult question to deal with, Mr. Speaker, because in society today we're very concerned that regulatory bodies, private agencies, have a great deal of information on people in our society. On the one hand we're very cautious and concerned that the information is not used recklessly and without due regard to the interest of the person about whom they have that information, but we do have some of these situations, Mr. Speaker, where people are deliberately flouting the law, whether it be in the area of trying to avoid payment of maintenance, Mr. Speaker, or in this case where they are trying to avoid agreeing to a Custody Order and flouting the court and the law of this land. These are situations, Mr. Speaker, where I support this kind of provision which would allow a party to obtain this information from any person or public body to attempt to deal with these very, very serious situations. It's only in these kinds of situations of course, Mr. Speaker, where we would agree to the use of this information in this way.

The Attorney-General, in closing debate later on, Mr. Speaker, might indicate the status of our request to the Federal Minister of Justice to pass legislation which might make some of the federal information available. Mr. Speaker, I know at one time I achieved a commitment from Senator Flynn, the Minister of Justice in the Clark Government, that he would bring forth that kind of legislation which would allow infor-

mation from federal regulatory bodies and departments to be made available for the purpose of enforcement of Custody Orders and Maintenance Orders and I'm not sure that has been passed. I think the present Minister of Justice, Mr. Chretien, was sympathetic to that request but I would be interested to know the status of that particular request and whether or not there's any intention of the Federal Government to pass legislation making that information available. I'm glad to see that the Section 13(4) of this Act binds the Crown, in the right of Manitoba, to provide this information, Mr. Speaker.

There are, in addition, powers of the court to punish, by fine or imprisonment, a person for contempt, for resistance, to the process or orders of the court and I think those again are required in these situations to enforce these important Custody Orders.

Mr. Speaker, the Act also goes on to deal with the Haig Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction and again, Manitoba is a leader, certainly in Canada, in having more agreements for more reciprocal arrangements with more other provinces, states and countries, and I think certainly more than any other province in Canada. I think that activity is continuing; I certainly hope it is, Mr. Speaker, as this province deals with this question as a very high priority and as a leader in this particular field.

I congratulate the Attorney-General in bringing forward this legislation which we had asked to be drafted last fall and we on this side certainly will support this legislation and will encourage and support the Attorney-General in any other steps that he may wish to take to help solve this most difficult and serious problem that so many people in our society are undergoing and find themselves in, Mr. Speaker, all of course with the objective of hoping that the courts in our society will act to protect the best interest of the children, the victims of these ever increasing number of separations and divorces that are taking place.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: I move, seconded by the Member for Emerson, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

HON. R. PENNER: It is 12:30, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 12:30, the House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. this afternoon.