

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Thursday, 10 July, 1980**

**Time — 10:00 a.m.**

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Resources. Can the Minister of Resources confirm that indeed President Carter has signed the bill, including the 9.-some million appropriation for further work on the Garrison?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that but that is rumoured to be the case and that was expected to have been the case over the course of the past couple of days.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, by further supplementary to the Minister, can he advise what steps the Manitoba government is undertaking to ensure that further appropriations may not be added in a similar manner within the next number of months, prior to the end of this year?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, we will continue to monitor the situation closely and take action as we think that it's appropriate, as we have done in the past. I don't regard it as being likely that there would be further efforts at funding the project before or prior to the elections in the United States this fall. But if our information indicates that further action might be beneficial, then we will do so.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health. In view of the revelation yesterday that the Minister of Health's department, in fact, did have the report, the unpublished federal government report pertaining to asbestos in the city water supply, can the Minister of Health advise whether or not, as the chief person responsible for health in the province of Manitoba, there may be other similar types of reports within his department or within other departments of government that ought to be made available to him and to the public of Manitoba?

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

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, I would say on speculation that no doubt there are additional reports of that kind. There are

continual exchanges of information, reports or requests for information and opinion that take place at the public service level, at the executive director or ADM level of individual government departments and the Honourable, the Leader of the Opposition is well aware of that from his own experience in the Executive Council. The vast majority of those never reach the Minister's desk.

In the case of the survey on asbestos fibres of Canadian drinking water supplies, that's precisely what happened. I told the House that I had no knowledge of the report, and I had no knowledge of it until yesterday, but there had been an exchange between officials of the Department of the Environment and officials of my department at the ADM level some months ago and my department had responded with medical opinion to questions which they had been asked.

Now the answer to my honourable friend's question is, whether there are other reports like that around, I can only propose to him that I would be very surprised if there weren't. But these are often times working documents, speculative documents, conjectural documents, they're not necessarily conclusive. They lead to examination and ultimate conclusion by, in most cases, the Department of the Environment.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked me the other day whether a date had been set for an inquest into the death of a patient at the Selkirk Mental Hospital, Rita Robins. that inquest date has been set for Monday, August 18th, at 10:00 a.m. in Selkirk Provincial Judges Court.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Minister of Health. The Minister of Health has indicated that he would only be surprised if there weren't other such reports, indicating they might be inconclusive, etc. The question to the Minister of Health is, what steps, what action is he undertaking to ascertain whether or not there are other reports that ought to be made available to him that are not being made available to him?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I'd have to tell the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not taking any such steps. My officials — and in this case, we're talking about the Executive Director of the Medical Public Health Directorate, who is himself a medical doctor — would advise me of anything that he felt should require my involvement. In this case, he was asked four specific questions by his counterpart in the Department of the Environment. He responded to those questions, and he said, if you have any further questions, get in touch with me. That was the end of the exchange. Presumably, the Department of the Environment was satisfied with the answers. Now, my Medical Public Health Director does not then convey the essence of that kind of

ordinary routine traffic in public business to the Minister, and I'm quite sure that has never been the practice in the Public Service. If it is an issue that requires the attention of the Minister, it is forwarded to me, but this was a matter of an enquiry at the ADM level.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs and the Rent Stabilization Board, yesterday a question was put to the Minister pertaining to the method of data collection pertaining to the first report and to the second report, can the Minister advise at this point whether or not the approach is identical in data collection in both reports?

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** I referred this matter to my officials for a definite determination. I have not yet received the answer to that. I'll give that information to my honourable friend as soon as I receive it.

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

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question the other day concerning the Holiday Inn fire, and I've had the following information from the Attorney-General's Department. That department is considering the Chief Medical Examiner's recommendation that an inquest be held into the Holiday Inn fire. The department is presently awaiting investigative reports from the Fire Commissioner's Office and from the Fire Department. Upon receipt of these reports and their consideration, a decision will then be made concerning the inquiry into the fire. It will also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that criminal charges have been laid with respect to this unfortunate fire.

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

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. His predecessor announced, with some fanfare and with some bending of the facts, the appointment of a Deputy Minister to northern Manitoba and I wonder if the Minister of Northern Affairs could indicate to us what date that Deputy Minister will now be officially located in Winnipeg.

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

**HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River):** Mr. Speaker, for several months now the Deputy Minister out at Thompson has been working with me in Winnipeg on a temporary basis, primarily because of the new agreement that we are trying to achieve on the Northlands and also with the Special ARDA, which comes up a year later. Although the Deputy Minister will be coming in permanently, an official date hasn't been yet established and, at the same time, before that happens, as I indicated to the House earlier, I'd like to have a senior staff member

replace him at Thompson. When that is accomplished, I'll make the announcement.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, another question to the same Minister. Whereas in the past there were three people of ADM status in northern Manitoba within that department, I wonder if the Minister has made a decision yet or has found someone of a senior level that's able to replace the Deputy Minister that is being transferred back to Winnipeg.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I would say that it's looking very promising and I would include that in the same announcement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas with a final supplementary.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could also confirm that his senior administrator located in the north is also trying to bid out of Thompson and move south.

**MR. GOURLAY:** Well, from time to time there are bulletins posted for various job classifications and I would expect that this will continue to happen, and I would expect that people will bid on these classifications.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour concerning the Holiday Inn fire and ask him whether he's going to do any reassessment of the application of the fire code, especially in view of the fact that there was a 30-minute delay in regard to the time that the fire department was notified because of the fact that the alarm systems in the hotel were not connected to a central fire warning system. Apparently, this is because of the fact that the code doesn't retroactively apply. So I'm simply saying to the Minister, is he going to reassess this question of requiring all such major public facilities to be directly linked to a central warning system?

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

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Elmwood might appreciate that the responsible thing for me to do at this particular time is wait for the Fire Commissioner's report in conjunction with the city Fire Department's report. They are both investigating all the circumstances. The allegations that the Honourable Member for Elmwood has made could or could not be correct. I'm not in a position to say whether they are, but the report of the Fire Commissioner's department, which I'm responsible for, and the city Fire Department, will be forthcoming shortly and at that time I think it would be the appropriate time to assess whether any reviews of the fire code should be undertaken.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I again ask the Minister whether he intends to review. In addition to this specific case it has broader implications and, even

holding this case aside, another example is the heat detection. Apparently, there are heat detectors on the floor of this particular hotel, whereas the new code requires heat detectors in each individual room. There again, if the fire code had been applied to this particular hotel, then they would have had this type of equipment and perhaps they could have averted the tragedy and a lot of the damage. So I ask him again whether he will reassess the entire code in terms of possibly making a wider application than it now has.

**MR. MacMASTER:** I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether the member meant a wider application or a retroactive application and that certainly could be considered. You find yourself in a position with fire codes, the same as building standards, that they're continuously being upgraded with new ideas and new philosophies and, in fact, new policies and procedures that are established across the country and put in place. You live with that thought of whether everything should be retroactive or to what stage that will be taken into consideration. I am looking forward to the findings of the enquiry, itself, just to see what that has to say.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a final supplementary.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister whether he has any concern about existing code requirements concerning high-rise buildings, especially in view of the 9th floor maximum of most fire ladders, whether he thinks that the current code requirements pertaining to the limits of fire safety organizations to battle fires and the measures taken to protect the spreading of fires in such large buildings. So I ask him again, particularly in regard to the 100-foot maximum of ladders and the danger of a towering inferno.

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

**MR. MacMASTER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we certainly have concern about the precise circumstances that the member is talking about. That's why most new buildings above nine storeys have certain types of rating walls for their fire escape exit systems but that's always subject for review and when you have an unfortunate situation, such as we had recently with the Holiday Inn, those things are further reviewed. That may be a consideration for the enquiry. They may make reference to that particular fact.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood with a fourth question.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, a final question. There apparently was a report that the fire exit, in terms of at the top of the hotel, was locked and I assume that this is, in fact, illegal; that such fire exits are in fact supposedly kept open and that there is, in fact, a practice where some hotel owners and other building owners do lock these for security reasons, but I ask the Minister, is it a violation to lock such a fire exit?

**MR. MacMASTER:** I think you'll find, Mr. Speaker, that's one of the precise questions that's going to be asked and answered within the enquiry. I don't want to get into details or get too involved, because the enquiry is in fact taking place, but I understand, for what is considered to be good and valid reasons, that there is a minimum type of locking device that some facilities do put on because of the fear of people wandering into the . . . or wandering intentionally, going up to star-gaze on the roof, which may in fact create another hazard of some type. But that question, I am sure, will be answered in the enquiry.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. Can the Minister advise whether any of the appropriation that has been dealt with by the United States Congress and signed by the President of the United States, involves works, the construction of which would result in water entering into either the Souris, Red River, or other Canadian water basins?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM:** It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the construction items to be dealt with would, in themselves, not lead to the transfer of water into the Hudson's Bay Drainage. Our concern is that the portion of the project to be worked upon is part of the originally authorized 250,000-acre project.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that United States authorities, in the same way as Canadian authorities, have a perfect right to build projects which don't encroach on other jurisdictions of water, and in view of the fact that the construction of the works that is being dealt with, despite what the original plan was, does not violate any treaty, does not violate any injunction of the International Joint Commission, does not harm the credibility of the Canadian position if they try to prevent such construction as against dealing with the construction which we are protected for, namely construction which would result in pollution of waters flowing into Canada.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the position that our government has taken is in reference to the originally authorized 250,000-acre project. The United States has in effect said that we have an irrigation project that will irrigate 250,000 acres of crop land. That project will involve the transfer of water from the Missouri Drainage into the Hudson's Bay Drainage. By appropriating 9.7 million to proceed with the portion of that project, simply indicates that the project may in fact at one stage be completed, and we are simply saying to the United States government, don't complete the project until the concerns of Canada and Manitoba have been taken care of. That has not to date, happened.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly sympathize with the position, which is the same position as was

previously being pursued, but is it not scientifically possible for the work that is presently being done to be done without affecting Red River or Souris waters, which is what we have the undertaking of the United States not to do, if it's in violation of the Boundary Waters Treaty, and is not the present work possible with a project which would recycle the water back into the United States?

**MR. RANSOM:** I have stated a number of times, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion, the expenditure of this 9.7 million will not irrevocably mean the transfer of water into the Hudson Bay drainage.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he can assure the House that he has turned down no applications for hay permits in Libau/Netley Marsh area, both sides of the lake?

**HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, at this particular time I can't give that assurance that that has happened.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that some people have been allocated huge tracts of marsh area for hay-cutting purposes, I ask the Minister whether he can take under advisement and report back as to whether anyone has been denied a hay claim in that particular marsh area?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I will check into that and I would have to find out further for the member if that is in fact taking place and will report back.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a final supplementary.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the Minister has spoken clearly one way or the other, I simply asked him if he would take the matter under advisement and report back whether or not there are unsatisfied applicants in the area and to what extent the allocations were made to a very few people in the area?

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

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Government Services responsible for the MTS and it's with regard to a question he took as notice a few days ago. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could now advise the House whether the government of Manitoba is prepared to support the efforts of citizens in western Manitoba to attempt to get the CKND television signal in that part of the province?

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

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to respond to that question and indicate to the honourable member that the CKND station

has had, for some time, an application before CRTC for expansion of services to Brandon. The position of the government of Manitoba is that we certainly support the expansion of the service, additional service to other communities, but do not directly intervene in these matters. This is a matter that the station involved places the application before the appropriate regulatory body, in this case the federal authority, CRTC, and they will have to make that adjudication as to the validity of their application.

**MR. EVANS:** I thank the Minister for that information and I would ask him by not intervening does this mean that the government of Manitoba, or he as the responsible Minister, would not, therefore, wish to write even a letter to the CRTC indicating some moral support, or what have you, for the extension of this third Canadian television network to the citizens of western Manitoba? Would he consider at least writing a letter, if not filing a formal intervention?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, what the Honourable Member for Brandon East is asking is that the government of Manitoba intervene in favour of one particular station as opposed to the station that is currently serving that area. That's a position, not for any ideological reasons, that we choose not to intervene directly. We have encouraged the station, CKND. They have had contact since the member first asked that question some time ago with the Department of Communications, with the Associate Deputy Minister of Communications, Mr. Doug Smith, and have been helpful in terms of the procedure that is required to make the application before the federal regulatory body. But I repeat, we do not wish to be put in a position of intervening on behalf of one private station over a station, CTV, which is already providing service to that area. We wish CKND good luck, but we do not, as a government, intend to put ourselves on record as favouring one private operator over another private operator.

Brandon is served with the national signal, CBC. It is also served with the other private signal, CTV, and if CKND is successful, then I'm pleased that the Brandon viewers will have that additional channel selection. But I do not wish to evade the question that the honourable member is asking of me, but we believe it is not good policy in this case in an area that we have no jurisdiction and where there is a service. It is not a question of where we intervene on behalf of the Brandon people, for instance, to get air service where there is no air service. There is currently both the CBC and private cable service in Brandon.

Now, I can quite understand and appreciate that there are many residents of Brandon who would wish to have the further choice of selection by the services that the station, CKND, can offer that community. We have been helpful, I'm told by staff, in the past, in terms of making that application, but we will not directly intervene, as the member is suggesting.

**MR. EVANS:** I thank the Minister for that information. To ask now another question with regard to having CKND carried over the cable system as opposed to transmitting over the air or

through the air, whatever the expression is, has the Minister the same reservations with respect to CKND being allowed to be carried on the cable system inasmuch as now cable operators do obtain, I think, half a dozen or so stations, including American stations and particularly in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that CKND does offer certain NHL hockey broadcasts, which apparently are not available to certain viewers in the Brandon area from the other media presently available? So does he have a different position with respect to having CKND on the cable as opposed to being broadcast through the air?

**MR. ENNS:** I would have to take that question as notice. The Member for Brandon East is aware that it may well be within the jurisdiction of the province to have to make those kind of decisions within a relatively short time, but I would ask the honourable member to allow me to take that question as notice.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Environment and I would ask the Minister if he has been advised of the contents of a report that has been outlined in the media in regard to bacterial contamination in the Winnipeg waterways.

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, that is a subject that has been an ongoing concern for at least 12 years. It is nothing new. There is such a report which simply adds to the information that was already known.

**MR. COWAN:** I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, then what action his government is taking in regard to this longstanding problem and, indeed, the Minister is absolutely correct when he outlines it in those terms. But I would ask him what specific action he is taking right now and if he would be kind enough to table this particular report so that the members of the opposition can have an opportunity to peruse it, as to understand its significance as well.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, the report is not a report from this department. It is a federal government report and I'm not sure, since it was sent to us as a working document, whether that report can be tabled. But he asked what specific action has been taken. There have been ongoing discussions with the city of Winnipeg on this particular matter and there have been efforts to attempt to improve the sewage disposal system within the city of Winnipeg to meet the particular problem that is outlined in the report.

This fall the Clean Environment Commission, in the second of a series of studies that are being held throughout the province on about 19 different watersheds, will be holding hearings on the Red River. We would be inclined to want to wait until the Clean Environment Commission have held those hearings and submitted a report on the Red River

watershed before any firm action is taken with regard to this particular problem.

I might point out to my honourable friend that the costs of cleaning up the problem are fairly substantial, I would suggest perhaps beyond the capacity of both the municipal and the provincial levels of government and we hope we can involve the federal government in sharing the costs of cleaning up the Red River. But those are the steps that are being taken; those are the hopes that we have in meeting this particular problem.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

**MR. COWAN:** Pursuant to the answer from the Minister, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister indicates that, indeed, the costs may be very high and it may be necessary to involve the federal government. I'd ask the Minister if negotiations are ongoing now between his government, the municipality and the federal government in regard to cost-sharing any cleanup of the Red River which would, by the specifics of this report, seem to be necessary and immediate.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I can advise my honourable friend that there certainly have been ongoing discussions with the city of Winnipeg on this matter. I am not able to advise him just to what extent the discussions have been carried on with the federal government, although I know there have been some overtures made to the federal government with respect to this particular problem.

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

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for Natural Resources. Mr. Speaker, we would ask whether the Minister can report on what efforts his department is taking with respect to inspection and sanitation efforts with regard to the spread and control of Dutch Elm disease in the city of Winnipeg.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I think that is probably an item that would better have been dealt with during the estimates review in that sort of detailed. I think the honourable member is probably aware that there is an Act before the Legislature which will allow for a much more effective program to be implemented, both within the city and across the province as well, Mr. Speaker, and certainly it is the intention of this government and the city of Winnipeg that there will be effective programs implemented.

**MR. CORRIN:** Yes, I have a very specific concern, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the Minister whether he can confirm that a large cell of Dutch Elm disease was discovered in the St. Norbert area of Fort Garry last week and, in the light of that, we would ask whether he will instruct his staff to make that public knowledge in order that local area residents can

inspect their private property to determine whether the disease has affected their trees.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, we certainly would be in touch with the city authorities and confirm or reject the information that the honourable member has and I'm sure that the city authorities would make that information available and move to act on the problem as quickly as possible.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wellington with a final supplementary.

**MR. CORRIN:** We'd ask the Minister in this regard, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the fact that under this new legislation residents will be required to have their trees destroyed and removed immediately by the Minister's department, whether there's any intention on the part of the government, in these cases, to subsidize or provide grants to private property owners whose trees have been the subject of destruction in the course of sanitation proceedings; will there be any grant in order to afford those people moneys to replace the trees with new varieties?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member read the Act carefully he would see that it says "may be required to be removed". When programs are developed, Mr. Speaker, they will be commensurate with the problem that we face and the honourable member will see how we plan to deal with specific situations at that time.

The provision is in the Act to provide some assistance for the removal or, under some circumstances, individuals may be required to pay the expense, just as individuals are now required to pay the expenses of controlling noxious weeds, for example, in other areas of the province.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of the intended passage of Bill 100 involving the freezing of assessment and the workload reduction which will take place as a consequence of that passage leading up to December 31, 1982, can the Minister of Municipal Affairs indicate what the intended layoff of staff is in the Municipal Assessment Branch of his department?

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the Leader of the Opposition doesn't fully understand the legislation that's in the bill. Actually, the assessment will continue but at the same level of values. In other words, new values will not be brought in and that's what would be frozen. But the assessment will continue as it has in the past, so there'll be no layoff of staff.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that some aspects of assessing work will continue, the assessment of individual properties, etc., but I also realize that by this bill there will be no further

reassessing in any municipality up until December 31, 1982. Otherwise there is no purpose in what the Minister is proposing. Is the Minister indicating that there will be no workload reduction in the Assessment Branch, none whatsoever, as a consequence of the passage of Bill 100?

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, the Assessment Branch will be functioning as they are at the present time except they will be using current values; there'll be no introduction of new value levels, and so the assessment will continue. It will be business as usual.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, then very specifically to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the Minister of Municipal Affairs then indicating they will continue to be reassessing?

**MR. GOURLAY:** That's right, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, we now have, I guess, almost total confusion. The bill indicates that the assessments will be frozen. Is the Minister indicating that he will be reassessing, basis current value, but will be holding those new assessments in abeyance until 1983, or is he indicating that he is only going to be assessing new structures, new buildings, etc., and not reassessing existing ones?

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I indicated the assessment will continue business as usual but the freeze will affect the values that will be used. In other words, there will be no upgrading of values. We will be maintaining the values used in 1980.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is correct, then what purpose is there in continuing with reassessment if all we are going to do is confirm present values . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Order please. I suggest members are arguing now, rather than seeking information.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to simply ask the Minister what is the purpose; I know you have objected to the use of the word 'purpose' but it's a very specific question as to the purpose of the reassessment that would continue.

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

**MR. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I think it's generally known that the changes in land values have been dramatic in recent years and to change the values of the assessment would make tremendous shifts. We want to maintain the assessment process but using the values that have been used in the 1980 year. It will continue rather than a new value system being put in place during the review process.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, will you please call second readings of Bills 105, first, then 103 and 108.

**MR. SPEAKER:** 108?

**MR. JORGENSON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**SECOND READINGS — GOVERNMENT BILLS**

**BILL NO. 105**

**THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1980)**

**MR. LYON, on behalf of Hon. Gerald W.J. Mercier, Attorney-General (Osborne)** presented Bill No. 105, The Statute Law Amendment Act (1980), for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, very briefly, this is the traditional Statute Law Amendment compendium bill that is brought in annually containing a number of usually non-substantive amendments to various statutes that are brought forward for corrective or other reasons. This is the bill also, Mr. Speaker, traditionally on which the Legislative Counsel gives each member of the House a memorandum respecting each section and we are now in possession of that memorandum, running to some 6-1/3 pages. The memorandum is self-explanatory, and I would commend the bill to the House. When the bill reaches committee, I am sure the Attorney-General can answer any specific questions that may arise on it.

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

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**BILL NO. 103 - THE WILDLIFE ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 103 — The Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney):** presented Bill No. 103, The Wildlife Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the intention of this bill is, first of all, to combine The Predator Control Act and The Wildlife Act into one single Act, which will be known as The Wildlife Act. It's more convenient administratively to do that, and as well it

removes the connotation of predator that's attached to some wildlife, simply classifies all wildlife similarly and makes provision for the department to enter into agreements for the control of animals that may require control through causing damage to property.

The Act also makes a very important thrust in the area of endangered species, provides the authority for the Minister to designate a species or an aggregation of species as endangered and could pass specific regulations for the preservation and protection of endangered species. At the moment, we do not contemplate immediate action, but the provision is thus made available.

There is also an important thrust in the area of providing protection for land owners or lawful occupants of lands, rights, in that the bill will require that hunters and trappers will require permission from land owners to gain access to private property. It also will make provision for persons leasing Crown land to post some of that land for the protection of property or for livestock but not for the general closure or restriction of access to those lands.

Another important feature of the bill is the area of reporting to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, not only on a yearly basis, but on the basis of 5-year reports, which will deal with such things as the status of wildlife populations, the programs that have been implemented over the previous period of time, the effectiveness of those programs, and also some projection of what the demands might be upon the resource for the future, and what the capability of the resource would be to sustain those demands. I regard this as an important feature in the management of wildlife resource and in the accountability that the Minister and wildlife managers will have to the Legislature and to the people of the province.

There also is some division, I think a more rational division of powers between the Executive Council and the Minister. The regulations that will require approval of the Executive Council are basically those that deal with fees and royalties and with the designation of Crown lands for special purposes relating to wildlife. The powers of the Minister, with respect to regulations, will deal with more minor items of the day-to-day administration of seasons and some management programs as well.

Those, I believe, Mr. Speaker, are the major areas of change or principle in the bill. There are also many minor changes that have been brought about to clarify the intent and powers available under the Act and to make the administration of the Act more efficient. These have largely come about through approximately 17 years of experience with the previous Act. I have made the details of these changes available to the opposition so that they might be aware in detail of the changes that have been made.

I think also that the bill is important in some sense for those things that are not included in this bill and that were included in the previous one. There is, for example, no reference in this bill to Indians. The previous Act attempted to apply legislation to Indian people in, I suppose, what might be called a discriminatory fashion, and the present bill removes all those references and simply protects the rights that Indian people have under The Natural Resources Transfer Act.

Also, we have removed some powers that we regard as being unnecessary in the previous Act. For example, there was a particularly objectionable section in the previous Act which allowed officers to search dwelling houses if they were more than 10 miles removed from a Justice of the Peace or a Magistrate. Fortunately, that provision was very seldom used if used at all, Mr. Speaker, and it has been removed from the bill before us.

Similarly, there were a number of other situations in the old Act that tended to place people in violation, largely through a lack of knowledge and because it simply defied common sense that the regulations or the provisions of the Act should be as they were. We have been going through the Act and presenting the new bill, have attempted to eliminate as many of those situations as we possibly can.

One other deletion that I would draw the members' attention to is that we have removed the right of the Minister to restore hunting privileges, once those privileges are suspended. We have changed the classification of infractions for which the licence may be suspended to those that largely have a direct effect upon the resource itself, and others, such as offences for loaded firearms or being improperly dressed, do not result in the suspension of hunting privileges.

Mr. Speaker, having provided the opposition with a detailed description of changes, I think that these few comments are perhaps adequate to describe the general thrust of the bill, and I commend it to the House.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I just have one question for the Minister. The Minister has stated twice that he has sent some notes over to the Opposition. Oh, have they been sent over? Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Then I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL NO. 108 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE WATER POWER ACT**

**MR. RANSOM** presented Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Water Power Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the thrust of the bill that's before us, is to first of all delete a section from the present Act, an unused section of the present Act, which prohibits the export of hydro power across the border.

Secondly, that this bill before us will make provision for the establishment of rentals or royalties on water, by Order of the Executive Council, rather than through the present system in terms of the leases. This will make this Act consistent with other

Acts, whereby we establish rentals for forestry or royalties on fur, for example.

The third area in the bill, Mr. Speaker, is one that will allow the Minister to treat land that is within a water power reserve, under the general provisions of the Crown Lands Act, if the Minister is satisfied that the original purpose of designating the area as a water power reserve is protected. For example, it may be a situation where a lot, under natural conditions, falls below the level of the power reserve but is adequately protected through land fill, and this will allow provision for the Minister to deal with that under the Crown Lands Act.

Another provision is a housekeeping one which simply removes a term that is no longer in use, and the bill provides for a certain amount of retroactivity, but only for a period of six months, which allows it to date back to the end of May 1980; thereafter, any establishment of royalties or rentals must be done on a forward basis.

I commend the bill to the House, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Acting Government House Leader, can I have an indication? The Honourable Minister without Portfolio.

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West):** Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 107?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Second Reading on Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act and The Manitoba Telephone Act.  
The Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I may be able to assist the Acting Government House Leader. I believe our House Leader did give a list of bills, including Bill Nos. 56, and 78, that we were prepared to deal with this morning.

**MR. MCGILL:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, then if that is the arrangement and understanding, will you call Bill No. 56?

**MR. SPEAKER:** 56 and 78, was it?

### **BILL NO. 56 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE CHILD WELFARE ACT**

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

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



**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Speaker, this is indeed an important subject matter, and I refer to the contents of the bill that we, on this side, are now commencing the debate of. It deals, Mr. Speaker, of course, with the broad subject matter of child welfare in the province, and in doing so, Mr. Speaker, it is an attempt to address the needs of a very vulnerable and a very special category of citizen within our boundaries. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, one could argue and one, I think, can justifiably submit, that there is no higher responsibility vested in this House, than that that gives us the jurisdiction and authority to make provision for the welfare and protection of our children.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is, speaking very generally, initially, an obvious attempt to upgrade certain aspects of child welfare law. It deals with three main areas, the subject matter being the apprehension of children, that is to say, Mr. Speaker, it defines the situations and circumstances, where children can be apprehended by the state or by state authorized agencies, and those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, are obviously limited to situations where children are perceived to be in danger.

The second broad category deals with adoption and the right of adoptees to information, relative to their status and their parentage; and the third area deals with guardianship of children. In a broad and sweeping way, I suppose the areas we wish to address in that respect will be particularly the rights of common-law parents to apply on the dissolution of their relationship for custody of a child. And also, Mr. Speaker, dealing still with guardianship, it deals with the general area of access for the purpose of visitation of children.

Dealing with what I regard to be the primary aspect of the bill before us, Mr. Speaker, the question of apprehension rights, I want to say generally that there never will be a satisfactory law in this regard. This, Mr. Speaker, is an area that bespeaks an extraordinary intrusion by the state into very private areas, areas of course involving relationships within the family, parenting rights and of course, last but not least, children's rights.

Mr. Speaker, before I go into the provisions in any detail, I want to say that if anything is to be done with respect to the state's responsibility to neglected children, first it will be necessary that this province devise a mechanism for reviewing policies and programs which relate to child welfare.

There is in this province, Mr. Speaker, provision for the creation of a Child Welfare Review Board. The provision, I believe, came into being in the mid-1970s. You'll remember, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure many members of the House will remember participating in the debates, that in 1974 there was a fairly wholesale revision and reform of the former child welfare legislation. It completely revised that particular Act.

One of the things that emanated from that revision was the enabling legislation that provided for the appointment of a Child Welfare Review Board. Now the provision for the creation of the board has never, Mr. Speaker, actually been implemented. It's been on the books for these several years but no government, neither our government nor the present one, has seen fit to this point to actually make appointments to this particular body.

Some of the members, as a matter of fact, probably remember how it came to pass that the Child Welfare Review Board came to be designated and created. It was as a result of some controversy as to the role of what was then known as the Child Welfare Board. That board then had the responsibilities which are now currently vested in the Treatment Panel, as well as the responsibilities and jurisdiction which have been provided for the, what has now been defined as the Child Welfare Review Board. There was a great deal of concern because it was thought that when the board was sitting, as it were, as one body, that members were put in a conflict of interest situation because they were asked, on the one hand, to provide advice to the director of Child Welfare in their capacity as "Treatment Panel" and, on the other hand, they were asked to provide objective advice to government and the Legislature as a general child welfare review body. So it was thought that there was a conflict of interest and that it would be prudent and in the best interests of the system to divide that responsibility between two boards and now we have in this province, a Treatment Panel which reviews the cases of all children who are in the custody or are wards of the Director of Child Welfare, so all neglected children who are apprehended fall within that category, and they, of course, are charged with the responsibility for making treatment plans in order to afford those children the opportunity to gain certain social skills and become rehabilitated to such an extent that they can gainfully rejoin society. Also of course protection, in general, is within the area of responsibility of the panel.

But, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the Child Welfare Review Board, this committee has never been struck. It has not, of course, on that basis, ever been enabled to do its job and that job is very important because that, Mr. Speaker, is the body, as I said, that can provide external monitoring of all programming with respect to child welfare within the province. That is to say, Mr. Speaker, programming within the responsibility of all the Children's Aid agencies, programming with respect to corrections, if I can use that term. Generally, that is the body that assesses the efficiency, the ongoing viability and effectiveness of the entire province's child welfare system. So we've separated the functions, Mr. Speaker, but we didn't take that last vital step to implement the intention of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is evidence, in my opinion, that the child welfare system in the province requires a thorough investigation. In my submission and I think, with respect, Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of people who are much more qualified than I, there is good reason to, at this point, strike the board, make the appointments and set them about a thorough review in this regard.

Some of the things, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to see done are as follows: I would like to see the board review the planning processes that currently exist with respect to children who are near the age of 18 years and who are in custody. Mr. Speaker, I think this is very important. In the past, unfortunately and regrettably, Mr. Speaker, we have found that many children come out of the system on their 18th birthday and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, find nothing

awaiting them. We have maintained them. We have provided the necessities of life. In a sense, we've literally kept their bodies under control and under surveillance until their 18th birthday, but upon that event occurring, Mr. Speaker, it's often the case that there's very little for these children. It's not uncommon, Mr. Speaker, for children to literally be dumped from a group home or a correction of treatment or a facility onto the streets. It doesn't always happen, Mr. Speaker, but it happens often enough that we should be very concerned about those sorts of circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, very often, in my submission, that is why there is such a high rate of recidivism among children, or upon children becoming adults, and particularly in that category, 18 to 20. If you look at statistics, Mr. Speaker, you will be able to determine that, if you eliminated that group, you eliminated the 18 to 20-year old group and took them off the criminal records, that you would note quite a remarkable diminution in the incidence of adult crime.

Mr. Speaker, if you look more closely at the statistics, you would find that in that group, I think, just as a matter of record, you'd find that virtually all those young adults are graduates of the child corrections and welfare system. These are children who have been before the courts in their teens on delinquency charges.

Mr. Speaker, in my submission, it's very important that we have an adequate system in order to assure that children who graduate from the correctional system do not fall into the adult criminal court and correctional system, as well.

A secondary, I would like to see looked into, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's very important, is the question of monitoring services for children in foster homes and group homes. Mr. Speaker, in the years that I have, in the course of my practice of law, touched on the area of child welfare and delinquency, I have noted that there is a remarkable deficiency with respect to this area. This, Mr. Speaker, is very important. It is very important because in my submission, again, I don't think that there's any more appropriate milieu for the treatment of children than the foster home and group environment. In my submission, the prospects of reform and treatment are much enhanced when a child is placed in an understandable quasi-family resource.

I've always had qualms and I think, Mr. Speaker, it's fair to say that virtually all people within the system probably have these doubts about the efficiency and effectiveness of the highly-programmed disciplined institutional rehabilitation setting. I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary to provide those settings for children who are unmanageable and need what, we might term, intense treatment programming. But, Mr. Speaker, surely we should place a greater emphasis on the quasi-familial treatment setting and so, Mr. Speaker, I think it's incumbent on us to objectively review, through the provision of the Child Welfare Review Board, what sort of services are being provided for children in those settings.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that from time to time things get out of control. Not too long ago there was a case involving some children — I won't name the

home — who were in the custody of a particular group home, that caused considerable damage as a result of acts of vandalism to a public facility. Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to air dirty linen, but I'm suggesting that when that sort of thing happens, one has to have regard for the standard of care that is being provided to children within that sort of setting. One wonders whether the people who are responsible for that sort of setting are capable of managing the institution and the children within it. I know these things happen, Mr. Speaker. They happen even in quite ordinary family settings; you know, children who go out and break a window or commit an act of vandalism but, Mr. Speaker, there is reason when an event such as this, an occurrence such as this happens. The damage, I can assure you, was considerable and it was the subject of a lot of heated discussion in the press and within the city.

When this sort of thing happens, Mr. Speaker, one wonders whether there shouldn't be a thorough review by the board. I would submit that in itself probably is reason for the government to make appointments to the Child Welfare Review Board and look into this matter. The government can't do that, Mr. Speaker. I know that might well be the reason why the appointments haven't been made. The government may feel they can do that. Well, Mr. Speaker, in my submission they can't. They can't do that simply because there is essentially a conflict of interest between the government's operational policies and an objective review. The government does purport to inspect and monitor those sorts of facilities. The government does have a system by which they rate and inspect foster and group homes but, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it's questionable whether the system is adequate. As I said, when children can leave what is supposed to be a fairly secure institutional setting and commit acts of vandalism that result in hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of damage to a public facility, one wonders what the government has been doing.

I don't want to overstate, Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to understate this because, by and large, I'm satisfied that most of the services that are provided in that regard are of a fairly high standard. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether the government has adequate resources, though, to inspect regularly and adequately all the facilities within the province. This may be the shortfall, the shortcoming, Mr. Speaker, that I am talking about and I can't expect that the Director of Child Welfare, or even the Minister himself, can undertake a thorough objective review of his own department. I just can't expect that, Mr. Speaker, even though I can expect him to be honest and I can expect the Director to make fairly candid disclosure. I just think it puts the staff in too difficult a position. We can't ask the Director essentially to reveal shortcomings within his own department. So we need to implement the provisions of the Act and bring in the objective monitoring board.

Another area I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's very important, and I have touched on it already so I won't belabour it, is the balance of community and institutional service arrangements. From time to time, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of controversy as to which is more effective. I've already indicated that, by and large, I much prefer the community treatment approach. I

personally believe that it is better for children. I think it's much better in terms of the socializing process. I think that when children live within a familial group setting they inculcate certain standards and certain perceptions that are just simply not available to a child in a rigid, highly disciplined institutional setting.

It's not possible to run a tight correctional institution and have that sort of approach simultaneously, Mr. Speaker. I know that members of the Minister's staff make efforts in that regard and, frankly, I think some of the institutions do very well. Having met with many of the people who have custody of those children and have responsibility for that programming, I think they do a remarkable job in the circumstances. But even they will say, Mr. Speaker, that it's too much to ask within the confines of a closed setting that both sorts of approach, therapeutic approaches, be provided. It's simply the latitude isn't there.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the review board assess this situation and tell us whether or not there is a balance, whether or not we've gone too far with respect, for instance, to the institutional format; what we might do to address this problem within the institutions. Perhaps we can put a better face on it and make the institutions more humane. Perhaps we can enlarge the group facilities that are available, as well.

I would like then, Mr. Speaker, above all, to look into what the restraint program has done in this regard, because I would submit, Mr. Speaker — and again, I'm not pretending that my remarks are definitive, but I would submit — on the basis of common sense, that restraint has had a considerable impact with respect to the balance between the closed institutional and the community treatment. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's much more economical, when you're imposing general restraint, to move in the direction of the highly structured institutional facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I know, and the Minister responsible for the department well knows that in the years since 1977 there have been very few new group home facilities provided within our province. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I do so again with respect, that one of the reasons is because there is not adequate moneys available through government to fund those sorts of settings. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see a broad base review to see whether my theory is in fact true, whether I am correct in my perception of the problem.

Another area I would like to see studied, Mr. Speaker, and again, it's only a matter that can be done within the purview of the Child Welfare Review Board, is the question of children's rights in residential services. Mr. Speaker, we all know that most of the people who work within those sorts of settings are motivated only by the highest principles. They are concerned, they care. We all, I think, Mr. Speaker, laud them for that. We appreciate the difficulty that those sorts of jobs present. I've always felt, Mr. Speaker, that one of the most dangerous jobs in society — frankly, I would compare it to law enforcement — is child welfare, and every year the statistics bear out my concern. Every year more treatment workers are assaulted in this province than police personnel. It wasn't too long ago that a worker was killed by a child who had been in her

care. So it's a very dangerous line of work and the people who do it, Mr. Speaker, are very dedicated.

But, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I can also tell you that every year there are complaints. There are complaints from concerned citizens, as well as children, about the standard of treatment that they receive. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, again, that sometimes that is quite uneven, as between the various institutions. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that there are inspection staffs and there are standards that the Minister's department purports to set but I tell you again, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps this is again a result of fiscal restraints, that there are children falling in the cracks. I think it was about three years ago I remember hearing a 17-year-old tell a group of people that he had been subjected to corporal punishment in a city group home and he described being forced to walk around in his underwear for an entire day and not being allowed to put on his clothes. He told us of children who were kept in their rooms for days on end.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that everything he told us was taken as gospel but I am telling you that complaint went forward to the Director of Child Welfare. And I'm telling you that the people who were in that room who heard those complaints were concerned enough and felt that there was sufficient grounds to consider that matter that a letter was directed to the Director of Child Welfare. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the Director made some investigations. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the investigations were sufficient. I would have preferred, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the Director is in a conflict of interest situation, to have been able to direct that sort of concern to the Child Welfare Review Board. I would have liked to be able to do that because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Review Board would undertake to do an objective review. But, Mr. Speaker, right now, because the department has not constituted the Board, that recourse is not available.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, that I think is very important, is services to children with special needs. We need, Mr. Speaker, to investigate what we do in this regard. It is important, Mr. Speaker, because we spent a great deal of money on providing services for special needs children. Under our government, Mr. Speaker, we sent a lot of children, who could not otherwise be treated within the province, outside the boundaries of Manitoba. Many went to the United States and some went to other provinces within Canada. The costs associated with that sort of care, Mr. Speaker, are very high. I'm sure it will come as a shock to some to hear that some of those children cost the taxpayers of Manitoba in excess of 100 a day. Now on that basis, Mr. Speaker, if you multiply that times 365, you soon realize the fantastic operating expenses entailed in looking after those children.

Some people, Mr. Speaker, have said, and I think they make a good point, that it might be easier to look after some of those children within the province of Manitoba within our own institutional settings. Some of them have suggested that if we had appropriate settings within the community and institutional context of our province that we could save money, and also, Mr. Speaker — and this is very relevant I think — we could avoid the

dislocation that sending these children out of province always attends. It's very difficult, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure if any people here have been in these circumstances or have relatives or friends who have, it's very difficult to see a disturbed child go down to the United States or off to Alberta or Saskatchewan or Ontario and note that that will affect the removal of that child from his or her nuclear family, from its community and roots. It's very difficult, and frankly, Mr. Speaker, it's a very difficult decision for the Minister's department and the treatment panel to make. It's one that's not made lightly.

Mr. Speaker, one wonders why, in the 1980s, both Alberta and Saskatchewan have appropriate facilities for children who are highly disturbed and need close therapeutic settings of a psychologically oriented nature. One wonders why those provinces have facilities and why Manitoba still, in this day and age, has not been able to make provision for similar treatment opportunities. I don't understand it, Mr. Speaker, simply because both Alberta and Saskatchewan have made these arrangements long before their resource booms, and I can tell you that such facilities exist, Mr. Speaker, in Minnesota, in Iowa, in other northwestern and north central American states, very few of which, Mr. Speaker, are much more affluent than our province, and some of which, Mr. Speaker, have fewer residents.

Mr. Speaker, one wonders why we still have to send children off to places such as the William Roper Hull Home in Calgary, to Rancherlo in Saskatchewan, to Brown Schools in Texas, and I guess they're right across United States now, and still we have nothing in Manitoba. This, Mr. Speaker, has been a concern, not only in the child welfare community but in the medical community. I guess for the past six years, Mr. Speaker, numerous physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers have asked the government to put into place a treatment facility that will address the needs of this particular section of the child welfare community.

To this date, Mr. Speaker, the only thing I know that the government has done to address that problem . . . I guess there are two things that I know, Mr. Speaker, one, in 1977 as a result of restraint, the government withdrew from the capital budget of this province the provision that would have enabled the Health Sciences Centre to expand its facility and provide nearly two dozen beds, as I remember, for highly disturbed children. In 1979, Mr. Speaker, after two years of debate in this House and continual back pedaling by the Minister then responsible for the department, it was decided to move forward with respect to, I believe, it's an 8-bed facility at the St. Boniface Hospital.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, one wonders, firstly, and I presume there was good reason for it, why the plans for the Health Sciences Centre were scrapped as they were a result of interdisciplinary review for, I believe, for three or four years by the government of members on this side. One wonders, Mr. Speaker, why there was such a reduction in the number of spaces and in any event, Mr. Speaker, one wonders why there haven't been initiatives taken to, as I said, look into this whole problem and make appropriate reforms.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of work that could be done by the Child Welfare Review Board if it's members were appointed. They could also, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, do a thorough review of the economics of the entire child welfare system. They could do a cost accounting of all the program services that are provided by this Minister's department, and they could find out whether the people of this province are being well served by the provisions of this bill before us today and the policies of the government in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, there is no way that can be done without a review. I am the first one to appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that every four or five years there is a higher review in the sense of a general election and that the public is put in the position where they can make a decision as to which party's policies they prefer. But, Mr. Speaker, it's the responsibility of the government to inform the people what it's policies are and how these policies affect.

This is particularly difficult in the area of child welfare, Mr. Speaker, because who are you going to inform? There's no user bids in the sense that the people who receive the service are not capable of making those sorts of judgments and valuations. The children surely know, I suppose, whether they are being well served in the context of their treatment facility and within the context of their opportunities. But, Mr. Speaker, how does that get translated into broad public dissemination? I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that it usually does not. So if we use the provisions of the Child Welfare Review Board, or the provisions of the Act relative to that board, we would have a system where all the members of this Assembly would be made privy to the affects of the policies of that government. In so doing, Mr. Speaker, we then could have meaningful debate in this House, and then, Mr. Speaker, we would be put in the position, or rather perhaps we would put the public in the position, of being able to appreciate the significance of what the government does and what the opposition would prefer. There would be some critical context that would enable people to perceive things within some objective framework. They would at least be able to superficially distinguish as between what might be the best mechanism for providing child welfare and what exists.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is time and again we get to the question of fiscal restraint, and I suppose if a comprehensive review of the economics of the system were done by the board, one of the things they would look at is whether there was adequate funding provided to them to do a review. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is time that the board be constituted and that an adequate budget be allocated or appropriated for its purposes.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the Minister will think I'm being too harsh, but I think I'm just being a realist — I would submit that the reason that this board was never constituted was, not only to disguise the affairs of the department but also because it costs money. It costs money to make these appointments and pay some stipends and provide clerical support and secretarial staffing. It provides money to provide research funds for the contracting, perhaps, of professional services in order that studies can be undertaken. All that costs money, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, it's money

well spent. It's money well spent, because in spending that money you have an accountability mechanism that reviews the efficiency of the department and the adequacy of the services provided.

And it's important, Mr. Speaker. That government, as a matter of first priority when it took office, constituted a restraint — I can't remember any more what it was called, time has erased from my memory the actual title of the particular body — but it was a body created for the purpose of reviewing governmental expenditures and presumably to make recommendations, how government services could be structured in such a way as to make them more efficient from both the fiscal and programming point of view.

Why don't we do that, Mr. Speaker, now? One suggests that, in the context of time, appears to have been a bit of, perhaps a politically motivated sort of study because, Mr. Speaker, the principle has not been carried on. Having done it once and having reaped the benefits, Mr. Speaker, I suppose there probably, in the submission of members opposite, must have been some benefit to do that; whether it was political or practical, I don't know, maybe there's no way of distinguishing between the political and the practical in their mind.

Mr. Speaker, one wonders why they can't be consistent. It's only logical that if there was a need for that on coming into office, there should be an ongoing need in order that they can continue to do that sort of monitoring and evaluation. But, Mr. Speaker, they haven't done that, and in failing to do that, I think they're failing to fulfill their own mandate, because I think that was a fairly substantial plank in their particular platform at the last election.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member's time has expired.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MR. WILSON:** Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of these amendments, and at the same time to respond to some of the matters raised by the Member for Wellington.

A lot of what he says is absolutely factual, but I must say that during the term of his government's office, I suppose like ours, changes are slow in coming, and unfortunately priorities of government — and I refer to the former government as well as this one — seem to be that there has not been any particular real emphasis, other than the possible price that I had to pay as the member to take on the former Corrections Minister in a fight to have children under The Child Welfare Act separated from the toughs that were at the Manitoba Youth Centre; separated from the obvious wrongdoings that were going on there, and separated from being just a number in the system. An evaluation at that time proved that there was a disastrous shortage of forensic care, care for those that are mentally disturbed, and I had, particularly through that publicity, had parents of children from all constituencies approach me.

One in particular from Fort Rouge had his child heading for Texas because there was no one here who could particularly look after that particular boy. Twice he escaped to come and work in my

constituency office, and I regretfully had to turn him back to authorities in order to obey what is tragically, man-made laws. It seems to me there should be a law that allows for an examination or an appeal process where, if a disturbed child keeps escaping from a particular institution or half-way house, some credibility should be given to what that child may or may not say.

We have a tendency, unfortunately, to say, well, if this particular gentleman is holding this position with the government in a particular department, that his practices have been examined by the Minister, and I think it's about time that the Minister of a particular department becomes responsible for the actions of those that work under him. But I, as a member of this government, cannot excuse the fact of the lack of facilities for treatment of juveniles. We often talk about the savings to the taxpayers, and now the Member for Wolseley is going to stand up and tell us that we've got lots of money for these particular areas. Well, I say that we have if you examine the priorities of spending, because what you have here, you can go to these workers in the street, and certainly Wolseley is an area that has more group homes per capita than any other section of the city, and what we are doing is we are going in there as elected members and we are listening to the concerns of the workers.

These people tell you, and they can predict almost to the year and the day when these particular disturbed children are going to go out and commit a crime of violence. In many cases — and I refer to the case, I believe it's documented as the Lucas case, where finally he took an axe and killed one brother and put another one away; and where the woman murdered his teacher, who she had agreed to look after this disturbed child, I think over on McMillan Avenue somewhere. And the predictions are there from the particular workers, that these disturbed young juveniles are going to commit crimes of violence.

I had a particular gentleman on Edmonton Street work on my campaign, and this gentleman, whenever he touched alcohol, became a rapist. He's now sentenced to 14 years. His mother told me if he had have received any type of help at all between the ages of 12 to 16, the state would not have to feed this man for 25,000 a year for a period of 10 years — and what's going to happen when he gets out?

We have another one over on Eggerton Road that we grew up with, finally got 25 years for child molesting, and the same thing was there; the pattern was there. The workers in the particular child welfare area predicted and documented and pleaded with the authorities to do something, but unfortunately the governments, because there doesn't seem to be any votes in looking after the needs of disturbed children, ignore it or pay lip service to it, or lack of priorities. They would rather spend 600,000 attempting to bag an MLA than they would to look after the disturbed children of this province.

So I think it's absolutely incredible that at some point in time there has to be — I won't use the word 'management' committee — but there has to be some directions so that the old — it reminds you of a monopoly game where you own 12 properties and you try to put a hotel on each one. I see the

particular Treasury Bench, when each one of them has a particular need to increase their budget, there doesn't seem to be anyone, the First Minister or anyone, that says, hey, this year we've got to take from areas such as the Consumers Bureau and other areas, that really are not doing anything for people's health, are not doing anything for people's enjoyment, and the laws that are passed under that thing that are man-made are doing nothing but creating more jobs and really are not doing anything. I say that health is a right — I'm just drifting a bit, but under child welfare it seems to me no different than the lack of money spent on alcoholism and the facilities.

If you have to send people to Alberta, Saskatchewan and Texas, then maybe we have to say, why didn't the former government build a facility. I certainly went after them. Why did it take a threat of jail by the Corrections Minister of this member before they finally went in and proved that the homosexual rates were taking place; that the head games were being played by people that were there. Obviously I was right, because they transferred the man out of there. He was taking normal children and turning them into head cases. And this is the kind of thing . . . The Member for Wellington hit it right on the nose. The job of looking after those half-way houses is becoming a dangerous occupation — and the cost of child welfare, where you have a one-and-one situation, a worker making 18 to 24,000 a year only being able to look after one case. When you find out that the people running these group homes — and in the case of the Hawkins case over on Maryland — the guy had just got out on parole after spending 10 years in there for murder, and here he was, looking after these two people, and he's just been jailed again. But he fooled everybody. He paid 10.00 and put a Reverend in front of his name. He sent away for one of those instant minister certificates. So that meant that he was acceptable to run a group home, because if he wasn't a nurse, he was a minister.

Well, a further examination has to take place. The man's moral conduct and everything else has to be taken into account. Surely to God we are not going to throw these children — and I call them children — into the hands of a suspected person who is going to lead them — and certainly as parents we sit down.— and now I'm saying as a government we've got to be the parents of these particular welfare recipients and the children under The Child Welfare Act — because their parent would say, here is right and here is wrong and you make the choice. I'm saying, governments have to be able to say to the child that's taken away under The Child Welfare Act, the worker has to say, here's right and here's wrong. But if we put workers in there that are wrong from the beginning, they're going to teach the children in that facility wrong.

I was able to get 254 Sherburn closed down, because the person running that home encouraged those kids to drink; the yard was littered with beer bottles and the neighbour's yard was littered with beer bottles and naturally, as a member of the opposition, I had no credibility. The government of the day said, there's nothing to it. It took to bring a Catholic Priest and several other people in to examine and have meetings to find out that it was

the night watchman — it wasn't the supervisor — because it is a 24-hour a day job.

When you drift into the half-way homes, you find that because of the shortage of qualified people, that we have a tendency to help the private entrepreneur make this a money-making proposition; because if you have a registered nurse who can form a particular corporation, she then qualifies to run, not but one home, but a series of them, so she has 8, 10, 12 homes, and then she goes out to one of these particular employment agencies, or will go down to Memorial Park and find some guy with a beard — he looks like he's 'into the scene, man', and that's the guy that they've got running these places. And this is the problem, that the person we are appointing to run these particular half-way homes must be answerable to the government.

When I pointed out 252 Home Street, or was it 232, it turned out that they found out that the man was certainly, alleging he was feeding them filet mignon every day, and the food bills and the per diem rate and everything else, this man was doing that as a business. I suggest respectfully that at some point in time that is where the priorities of government should be going into spending, not giving an extra 26 percent and an extra 12 percent under the Attorney-General's estimates. Why should he be getting a 12 and 26 percent increase for his department when he hasn't even finished the review of his department to see if it is, in fact, being wasteful, if it's being managed properly? The other day I alluded to an efficiency expert. That's maybe what each Minister needs in his department is an efficiency expert, so that that money we can get out of there, and maybe we have to change the Act so that the lottery moneys, who are designed to go for development of sports, maybe it's time we should be developing some of these young people who are under The Child Welfare Act. Because if you read the success stories of many of the top fighters, boxers and people in sports that have come up the hard way, invariably they are members of a foster home. They don't even know who their parents are. They are kids that have turned around and have been given a baseball glove, have been given something and, unfortunately, the recreation program in some of these facilities is lacking. To see if any of these people have the physical ability to, rather than go out and fight, take on the world like Lucas did and eventually act somebody, that maybe he could have been a good track runner; maybe he could have been a good basketball player and maybe he could have been something else other than a murderer.

I had to respond because the Member for Wellington was right on in many of his observations, except that those problems that he mentioned were there under his government. His government did nothing, and now to say that our government should do the same is only partly correct because we are making changes. This bill is in the right direction and many of the extra fundings are in the right direction, and the examination is in the right direction, but the priorities of spending and, with all due respect to rural friends, when you could take 57 million for Highways and you haven't got 5 million for the children of this province and they have to send them to Alberta and Saskatchewan and Texas, and also you say here under this particular section that the

parents to contribute under 29(1), I say health has a right and if you are going to go under this percentage, then we've got to be able to pay a higher percentage, because the cost of sending them down to Texas, I believe, is 160 a day. We are willing to turn around and have our elite members of society go to Mayo Clinic and be able to pay 25 or 35, or a third, or 40 percent of their hospital bills for treatment down there. I think that we should turn around and pay a higher percentage; that if we have no facility here and we have to send them to Saskatchewan and Alberta, Mr. Speaker, or even down to Texas that the government pay a higher percentage. Because what it does is it takes the enjoyment and we, on the Conservative side, say we're for the work ethic.

The man I talked to in the Member for Fort Rouge's committee owns a grocery store. You're asking him to pay . . . I think at that particular time the child was still in Winnipeg and he was paying 120 a week; I stand to be corrected, it may have been 90, but I remember seeing the board and room bills coming in to him. This man, through no fault of his own, had a child that all of a sudden, through some accident, some emotional thing or some disease that set in, some unknown reason, was asked all of a sudden to accept a burden. If we turn around and give people, and rightfully so, if we pass legislation to give people hearing aids, if we pass legislation to give people wheelchairs, we should be able to pass legislation to pay for disturbed children because it also, like alcoholism, is a form of disease.

I concur with what the Member for Wellington said except he must accept some of the responsibility, because when his government was in office they paid even less lip service to this very serious problem than we are on this side of the House. I say the day may be fast approaching when in the private sector, if Eaton's can appoint efficiency experts, that maybe governments are going to have to appoint efficiency experts so that priorities in spending, that money, if there is a particular real problem, goes towards programs that are needed to bring Manitoba up to the level of at least other provinces in western Canada.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MRS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Before you call Bill No. 78, I wonder if I may announce that it is my intention to have Law Amendments Committee meet tonight to consider the bills that are currently available for decision by Law Amendments. If my honourable friends would like, I can read the list of the number of the bills for them so that they can take them

down. Bill Nos. 38, 47, 59, 76, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 94 and 99.

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

**MR. DOERN:** I wonder if I could just ask the House Leader whether he has rescheduled the Privileges and Elections Committee.

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

**MR. JORGENSEN:** I'm not sure what he means by rescheduling. I don't know whether it was intended that that committee would meet tonight or not. In any case, there's only the one bill that's before it and my understand is it is not a contentious bill and would only take a few minutes. So I would rather have Law Amendments meet tonight to deal with the larger number of bills that are before us. — (Interjection)— That's a possibility. If my honourable friends would agree to having the House sit here and let committee meet, we could do that. If that is agreeable, we can easily arrange that.

### BILL NO. 78 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE EXECUTIONS ACT, THE COUNTY COURTS ACT AND THE PROVINCIAL JUDGES ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** We'll now proceed with Bill No. 78, An Act to amend The Executions Act, The County Courts Act and The Provincial Judges Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for Wellington.

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

**MR. CORRIN:** I thank the Member for Logan for holding this particular bill for me, Mr. Speaker. If I might have a moment to get it out of its binder. Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation, as I believe the Attorney-General mentioned in his introductory remarks, is the by-product of a review and study done by the Manitoba Law Reform Commission. The commission tabled its report in this regard, I believe, almost a year ago. I think it was in the summer or fall of last year and, Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to attempt to deal with certain of the provisions in a general sense in order to express our point of view with respect to them.

Mr. Speaker, it's of some passing interest, of course — and I'm sure I'm not the only member that has taken note of this — that this bill deals with something that has been before the House in various forms for the past odd four or five weeks and that is the question of exempting debtors from liability with respect to responsibilities towards their creditors.

This bill sets out in its provisions, Mr. Speaker, itemized lists of certain properties that a judgment debtor can protect from a judgment credit. One wonders, Mr. Speaker, in view of the debates that have taken place in this House about debt

moratorium legislation and legislation of that sort, whether some general abatement consistent with this sort of legislation, perhaps even within the context of this legislation, should not be provided by the government. One wonders, Mr. Speaker, whether there shouldn't have been provision in this bill that would provide relief to debtors in some general fashion.

I note, Mr. Speaker, and it's not particularly novel to note that there are a lot of people in this province who are suffering considerable hardship as a result of, firstly, I suppose, drought conditions and also as a result of incipient recession within the broad general framework of our economy. Mr. Speaker, as a result of that, we have noted a high incidence of mortgage foreclosure, bailiff seizure, bankruptcy, garnishment and general attachment of property. Mr. Speaker, when you consider this, and perhaps I have to be a bit philosophical and perhaps in doing that I'm prone to become political, as well, because my philosophy is also my politics, one wonders what society is coming to and one certainly wonders whether there mightn't be a better way, a better way to structure and order society. One wonders, Mr. Speaker, why so many people find themselves in these sorts of circumstances.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that it is probably largely a by-product of the capitalist system. I would suggest that the capitalist system, in its need to precipitate production and consumption in order to retain its own vitality and to sustain itself as a functioning economic order, has necessitated all sorts of hybrid mutations to be grafted on to the free enterprise system. One of them, Mr. Speaker, one of the devices that have been invented, I suppose, generally is the whole area of credit, availability of credit. You know, and there is much law now that is being enacted with respect to credit and consumer protection. We're doing a great deal, Mr. Speaker, within our society to facilitate the proliferation of credit relations. In doing so, in making it easier for people to buy on credit, Mr. Speaker, indeed what we're doing is we're creating, in my submission — (Interjection)— Well, the member in front of me suggests employment. In the short term, Mr. Speaker, we're creating employment. That is partially true. In the long term, Mr. Speaker, I think we're creating a bubble, a vast fictional bubble that will ultimately burst and, when it does, I would predict that it will sweep the very foundation from the economic system which we have built.

Mr. Speaker, it won't be first time in the history of civilization that this has happened. It will not be remarkable that this system, devised as it has been to consume resources rather than husband precious resources, a system devised to artificially create wealth, not in order to maintain the members of the society but rather to simply maintain those who benefit the most from that sort of society. Because, by and large, Mr. Speaker, what we have done — and I said this was going to be of a very general and philosophical nature, but I want to discuss this and I think we should spend more time in this House talking of our respective philosophies — what we have done, Mr. Speaker, surely is to put people to work in many senses, in many respects, in uncreative, really very unproductive ways. We put people to work on assembly lines building cars that

are planned to be obsolescent. As we are now finding out somewhat ironically, Mr. Speaker, we're finding out that with respect to the auto industry as a good example, that the bubble is already bursting. We're told, Mr. Speaker, that the Chrysler Corporation can only exist if there is vast public support and subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I heard a notable economist saying that the Ford Motor Company of America was now manifesting exactly the same symptoms this year as Chrysler demonstrated three years ago, that it was starting to show the same sort of syndrome, that the same production areas that were perceived as deficient in the Chrysler case in 1976 and 1977 are now starting to show deficit and substantial loss at the Ford Company in 1980, and Ford is now starting to talk about the necessity of receiving some governmental assistance in order to sustain certain of its operations.

Mr. Speaker, one wonders why, in this rather artificial economy that we constructed, that it wasn't obvious; quite frankly, why it wasn't obvious to people who had responsibility for marshalling and controlling of the great levers of the economy, why it wasn't obvious to them, some time ago that what Chrysler and Ford have been doing for generations was, ultimately, falling. One wonders whether they really thought that an economy geared to consume gasoline and all sorts of resources in order to make these fantastic automobiles — and they are fantastic technical devices — one wonders whether people shouldn't have thought seriously and pondered what the consequences of that sort of action was ultimately to be.

Ironically, Mr. Speaker, and I find it again somewhat interesting to consider, another free enterprise system but one that relies heavily on the hand of governmental intervention, a state where government plays a key role in devising economic and industrial strategy, has literally beaten the great American auto giants into the dust, a nation, Mr. Speaker, that was virtually bankrupt some 35 years ago.

Tiny Japan, Mr. Speaker, has in the space of some 30-35 years managed virtually to completely dominate the automobile industry worldwide. And they have, Mr. Speaker; they're not being propped up, and they're not being propped up, Mr. Speaker, because some 25 years ago in Japan people involved in the national government of that particular state decided that the Japanese auto industry, if it was to receive any assistance whatsoever, if it was to receive the assistance of trade offices of that country across the world, around the world, if it was to do anything meaningful, had to have a two-purpose policy and approach to industrial development.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, they said, we will look after the citizens of our country and the wellbeing of Japan first, and they noted that Japan was not oil rich and was, in fact, energy dependent on the mid-East and North America. So they said, firstly if you're to get any of the benefit of government intervention of public money, you are going to build automobiles that will service our people; you're going to build automobiles that go a long way on a little bit of gas, so that we don't have to accumulate vast balance of payment deficits in order to fuel your particular sector of industry. They said, you're going to use less



iron; you're going to build cars that use less oil, less gas; you're going to innovate; you're going to be creative. They provided grants for that to happen and, ironically, a lot of the money came from the winners of the war; the United States literally spent hundreds of millions of dollars so that the Japanese government could do research into more productive and efficient ways to build automobiles, which are driven Chrysler to the front door of bankruptcy and are going to have Ford there, probably within the next half decade.

Mr. Speaker, that was the first thing they did. Mr. Speaker, they also had a view toward the competitive market and they made sure that what they were going to produce was going to have a world market and they had vision, Mr. Speaker, they looked ahead to the day when the foolish North American people would be searching the wilderness for this sort of transportation vehicle. So, Mr. Speaker, they required that those companies make inroads in the international markets. That was the second part of their mandate, that they go out and they establish a worldwide network.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the history of Chrysler, the first thing that comes to the observer's attention — and this is not a trained observer, this comes to general observation — is the fact that in all the years of their operation they never bothered to look to the world market. They built a fantastic infrastructure within north America. It was isolated and protected for years and years. They ploughed back incredible amounts of capital into continuing to proliferate and expand in size the big car energy-consumptive aspect of their operations.

Mr. Speaker, they scoffed; they sent dividends back to their shareholders and for decades they scoffed at the little Japanese. I'm talking now not in terms of physical properties of the Japanese but, of course, the industry. They scoffed that that was silliness and nonsense and it was only going to constitute but a very small aspect of the market because that was the second-car market, and initially wasn't even the second car market.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I've allowed the honourable member a very wide degree of latitude but I would ask the honourable member to try and address himself to the bill at some time.

**MR. CORRIN:** Actually, Mr. Speaker, I have to commend you because you have allowed me considerable latitude and I appreciate it. It didn't go without passing. So I thought it was pertinent, Mr. Speaker, because I think if we're going to talk about how it has come to pass that this country's economy has fallen on the straits that has. We're doing that, Mr. Speaker, in discussing all the exemptions that are being provided debtors in this legislation, and the reason, I presume, that we're providing all this extended latitude to judgment debtors is because we appreciate that there are a lot of them and that they're hard-pressed. That's why we're talking about this particular piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, and that is why members on both sides are now talking about debt abatement and moratorium legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, to get back to it, having found the economies of the west in such failing circumstances, we're forced to look at this sort of

alternative but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have to look at the system from a broader point of view. As I said earlier, we have to wonder whether we should be allowing the proliferation of credit as we have in order to support this economy, this wasteful economy. If we didn't, Mr. Speaker, if as an alternative to this sort of legislation we imposed restrictions on credit availability, we made it very difficult for the credit market to grow and develop and proliferate, I think we would be doing a service to mankind. I really do, Mr. Speaker. I think if we told people that they should work within their own personal budgets, if we instructed people, as a result of that sort of initiative, to eschew the more material aspects of life and look at other perhaps more worthwhile areas of concern and activity, I think, Mr. Speaker, we would be doing a service to the people we represent.

It's not necessary to have that second car, Mr. Speaker, if it requires a loan at 15 or 16 or, as we now know it, 17 to 18 percent, to buy it. It's just not necessary, Mr. Speaker. It's not necessary to have the second Japanese-made coloured television set, or the second Japanese-made car, or all the other sophisticated hardware that we import into this country and don't produce ourselves. I know, Mr. Speaker, that we have to import a lot of it because that's where a lot of our raw resources go. Again, it's somewhat ironic. It's some crazy sort of economy that we've developed in this country. We sell wholesale our natural resources, our steel and our wood, and we send it abroad to countries like Japan, where they process it and refine it technically through processing and manufacturing, and then they ship it back to us. That is what we talk about when we negotiate international treaties such as GATT. You know, this is what it's about and we say that it has to be done. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. We can only have one debate at a time in this Chamber. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** Mr. Speaker, this is what we do when we allow the economy to, as I perceive it, destabilize, as we have over the past several decades. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that rather than enacting this sort of legislation that will extend protection to creditors, we should do something by way of substantive reform to the structures of our economy. Because you know, Mr. Speaker, we wouldn't need this sort of legislation if we weren't in that dependent sort of cycle, if we didn't need to continuously fuel this madcap economy.

Mr. Speaker, it's not a simple problem, you know I'm not suggesting that we, as Manitobans, can do a great deal, but surely, Mr. Speaker, there are a few things we can do. For instance, Mr. Speaker, rather than infinitely extend credit and facilitate that infinite extension of credit within our province, why don't we, rather than doing that, fight with our federal counterparts in order to gain a greater share of the manufacturing economy of this country? Why shouldn't we put in a position where there is some reciprocity recognized? We're now, Mr. Speaker, in the throes of constitutional talks that bespeak these very issues. Why shouldn't we try and get a greater share? Why shouldn't we work within the

constitutional confines of our country and design a constitution that will facilitate that? So that it's recognized, Mr. Speaker, that Alberta has to provide some sort of sharing of its resources with Manitoba, whether that be by way of revenue sharing on the sales of its petroleum products, or whether, Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— Well, the Honourable Minister of Highways, Mr. Speaker, says it makes no sense to do that. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest it makes a lot of sense to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we are allowing the situation to arise where we're having a disproportionate amount of wealth flow to one province. It's not in the best interest of Canadians, Mr. Speaker, to allow that to happen. It's not, Mr. Speaker, in the best interests of Canadians to have to go, hat in hand, to Alberta in order to negotiate loans. Mr. Speaker, ultimately we're going to fall into very precarious circumstances.

I remember a few years ago when I raised concerns about the PWA takeover, Mr. Speaker, and I spoke about how we were going to be over a barrel when we allowed PWA to move into Transair, take over the assets of Transair. Well, Mr. Speaker, again our government was recognizing that it had the sort of responsibility I've spoken of to provide an effective instrument to regulate the economy within its boundaries, the growth and development of the economy within its boundaries. And I lauded Premier Lougheed; I'm sure many people across the country did, when he had the foresight . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. Again, I would ask the honourable member to try and confine his remarks to the contents of the bill before us.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** Again, I thank you for your admonition because I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that I was led astray by the Minister of Highways critique. We've long ceased, Mr. Speaker, and I say it with some respect to other Ministers present, we've long ceased to hold the Minister of Highways in that sort of respect, so we'll go on.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Amateur Fitness speaks from his seat, and I note that a short while ago, Mr. Speaker, the Premier took steps to make sure that we didn't have to listen to that sort of nonsense from that sort of Minister any more, and he effectively quieted and silenced him, presumably in the short . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, no, on a point of order, I would ask you to rule whether the last few comments that the gentleman opposite has made has any relationship to the bill that he's supposed to be speaking on.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I am sure the honourable member will be able to get back to the subject matter of the bill if he is not interrupted by other members of the Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** Again for coming to my defence, Mr. Speaker, it's much appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I want, as I said, to deal with the specific provisions of the bill too, and since we're five minutes from recess, I will attempt to do so.

With respect to the provisions I've spoken of regarding exemption, Mr. Speaker, I want to address one concern that the Law Reform Commission had that the bill doesn't really deal with, and that is the fact, that while we're providing extensions of exemptions to judgement creditors, who are the subject of attachment proceedings, we have done nothing to provide similar exemptions for debtors who are being attached by secured credit. The Member for Wolseley, I am sure, is probably the resident expert on this subject, Mr. Speaker, and I presume that he will be able to impart some information in this respect as well.

Mr. Speaker, there is quite a common practice in this province among lenders to require borrowers to sign credit agreements that provide that the lender can attach all the property, and not just the property that is the subject of the agreement, Mr. Chairman, but all the property of the borrower in favour of the lender. So you have a situation, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — no, you mean if the borrower allows it. If, Mr. Speaker, the lender wishes on default to attach all the property that is owned by the borrower, it can do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is an incredible situation, and as the Member for Wolseley will attest, bailiffs are quite commonly called upon to execute these sorts of writs and seize all the worldly goods of these sorts of people.

Now in the United States, Mr. Speaker, the government, I believe it's the federal government, has enacted legislation called The Uniform Exemptions Act — this has passed Congress, Mr. Speaker — which provides that there are similar exemptions afforded creditors with respect to all sorts of proceedings. So the Act essentially does not distinguish between a person who is a judgement creditor or a person who is simply a default creditor as a result of a default under a security agreement.

So, Mr. Speaker, from my point of view anyway, I think we have reason to consider what the Law Reform Commission has told us in this regard. The Law Reform Commission has suggested that we initially move to at least uniform exemption within the context of Manitoba law. They suggested that we work toward interprovincial agreement through the mechanism of intergovernmental relations in order to afford common legislation to all the people of Canada, but in the interim, as a short-term measure, they've suggested the uniform exemption legislation be passed in Manitoba. Now nowhere, Mr. Speaker, was that provided for in this bill. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that's a very important matter, because it's not much use protecting people if creditors are going to have the capacity to exact seizure prior to judgement. I mean, what good is it? There is effectively, a loophole big enough to drive a truck through.

So you know, it's, I suppose, a reasonable measure — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways may feel that creditors should have this sort of blanket power, but I can tell him that there are some of his constituents who suffer a great deal as a result of it. I presume, Mr. Speaker,

that the Minister will rise in order to put this all on the record because, you know, that sort of thing is what we have said that the Conservative government has espoused. It's only because certain members of that side have not the courage of their convictions to rise in their place and speak publicly that the public is unaware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps he, having had his way around the Cabinet table, and that is why I presume these reforms didn't appear on the bill — having had his way at the Cabinet table, he then comes in and speaks from his seat. Now that's very convenient and comfortable, Mr. Speaker, but he should justify that. Mr. Speaker, one only hopes that in the course of the Honourable Minister's enterprises, that one day, he too knows what it feels like to be a debtor, because you know —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, he's obviously come from a very affluent background, and I would like him to taste a dose of his own medicine for a short period in his life, not a long one, because that would be very difficult. But he, Mr. Speaker, perhaps like so many others who are unable to appreciate what it's like to be in that situation, because it's not a part of their background, Mr. Speaker, it never happened to their father or their grandfather.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. The hour being 12:30, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock this afternoon. (Thursday)