



61836-25

Second Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

38 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan
Speaker*



VOL. XXXVIII No. 92 - 10 a.m., FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1989.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fourth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

| NAME | CONSTITUENCY | PARTY |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| ALCOCK, Reg | Osborne | LIBERAL |
| ANGUS, John | St. Norbert | LIBERAL |
| ASHTON, Steve | Thompson | NDP |
| BURRELL, Parker | Swan River | PC |
| CARR, James | Fort Rouge | LIBERAL |
| CARSTAIRS, Sharon | River Heights | LIBERAL |
| CHARLES, Gwen | Selkirk | LIBERAL |
| CHEEMA, Gulzar | Kildonan | LIBERAL |
| CHORNOPYSKI, William | Burrows | LIBERAL |
| CONNERY, Edward, Hon. | Portage la Prairie | PC |
| COWAN, Jay | Churchill | NDP |
| CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon. | Ste. Rose du Lac | PC |
| DERKACH, Leonard, Hon. | Roblin-Russell | PC |
| DOER, Gary | Concordia | NDP |
| DOWNEY, James, Hon. | Arthur | PC |
| DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon. | Emerson | PC |
| DRIEDGER, Herold L. | Niakwa | LIBERAL |
| DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon. | Riel | PC |
| EDWARDS, Paul | St. James | LIBERAL |
| ENNS, Harry, Hon. | Lakeside | PC |
| ERNST, Jim, Hon. | Charleswood | PC |
| EVANS, Laurie E. | Fort Garry | LIBERAL |
| EVANS, Leonard S. | Brandon East | NDP |
| FILMON, Gary, Hon. | Tuxedo | PC |
| FINDLAY, Glen, Hon. | Virten | PC |
| GAUDRY, Neil | St. Boniface | LIBERAL |
| GILLESHAMMER, Harold | Minnedosa | PC |
| GRAY, Avis | Ellice | LIBERAL |
| HAMMOND, Gerrie, Hon. | Kirkfield Park | PC |
| HARAPIAK, Harry | The Pas | NDP |
| HARPER, Elijah | Rupertsland | NDP |
| HELWER, Edward R. | Gimli | PC |
| HEMPHILL, Maureen | Logan | NDP |
| KOZAK, Richard J. | Transcona | LIBERAL |
| LAMOUREUX, Kevin M. | Inkster | LIBERAL |
| MALOWAY, Jim | Elmwood | NDP |
| MANDRAKE, Ed | Assiniboia | LIBERAL |
| MANNESSE, Clayton, Hon. | Morris | PC |
| McCRAE, James, Hon. | Brandon West | PC |
| MINENKO, Mark | Seven Oaks | LIBERAL |
| MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon. | River East | PC |
| NEUFELD, Harold, Hon. | Rossmere | PC |
| OLESON, Charlotte, Hon. | Gladstone | PC |
| ORCHARD, Donald, Hon. | Pembina | PC |
| PANKRATZ, Helmut | La Verendrye | PC |
| PATTERSON, Allan | Radisson | LIBERAL |
| PENNER, Jack, Hon. | Rhineland | PC |
| PLOHMAN, John | Dauphin | NDP |
| PRAZNIK, Darren | Lac du Bonnet | PC |
| ROCAN, Denis, Hon. | Turtle Mountain | PC |
| ROCH, Gilles | Springfield | LIBERAL |
| ROSE, Bob | St. Vital | LIBERAL |
| STORIE, Jerry | Flin Flon | NDP |
| TAYLOR, Harold | Wolseley | LIBERAL |
| URUSKI, Bill | Interlake | NDP |
| WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy | St. Johns | NDP |
| YEO, J. Iva | Sturgeon Creek | LIBERAL |

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, December 15, 1989.

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): I have the pleasure this morning of tabling the Annual Report 1987-88 for the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I stand to table the fourth Quarterly Financial Report, the year-end report of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. This is an unaudited statement.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BILL NO. 91—THE PUBLIC HEALTH AMENDMENT ACT

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns) introduced, by leave, Bill, No. 91, The Public Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé publique.

MOTION presented.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Speaker, if I could make just a few brief comments, as the Rules of the House permit on reading. Number one, I am pleased to introduce Bill No. 91, which is a Bill to prevent solvent abuse among young people, which we all know is a serious and widespread problem in many communities throughout Manitoba.

The results of sniffing solvents are often tragic, involving permanent injury or death. It is our view and the opinion of front-line community workers that every step be taken to limit the sale of toxic inhalants and to help prevent solvent abuse.

This Bill is by no means the complete answer to the problem, but it is a step, in our view, in the right direction. For too long action in this regard has been caught up in jurisdictional matters and it is time, we believe, for the province to take responsibility for a serious social ill and health problem in our society. We look forward to serious debate on this matter and to the support of all Members, in terms of dealing with solvent abuse among young people. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: On the motion of the Honourable Member for St. Johns, agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct Honourable Members' attention to the Speaker's gallery where we have with us this morning Mr. Kelsey McIlwain

from Pinawa, Manitoba, who won the worldwide international computer problem-solving contest.

* (1005)

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

Also with us this morning we have seated in the public gallery, from the Teulon Collegiate, thirty Grade 11 students. They are under the direction of John Shadalock. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer).

Avant de procéder à la période des questions, j'aimerais attirer l'attention de l'Assemblée à la galerie publique, où sont présents trente étudiants de la 6^{ième} année de L'école Sir William Osler, sous la direction de Tina Hellmuth et Paula MacPherson. Cette institution est située dans la circonscription du Premier Ministre (M. Filmon).

Au nom de l'Assemblée, j'aimerais vous souhaiter la bienvenue.

(Translation)

Before proceeding to Question Period, I would like to draw the attention of the Assembly to the public gallery where we have seated, from the Sir William Osler School, thirty Grade 6 students, under the direction of Tina Hellmuth and Paula MacPherson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

On behalf of the Assembly, I would like to welcome you.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Bank of Canada Interest Rate Impact Manitoba

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we saw the results of the Finance Minister's (Mr. Manness) trip to Ottawa. The Governor of the Bank of Canada, supported by the federal Finance Minister, has rejected western Canadian demands for a lower interest rate. He demonstrated that rejection by maintaining the extraordinarily high rate yesterday.

He also claimed that the provincial Finance Ministers were misguided. Mr. Speaker, given the extremely negative impact this made-in-Ontario rate is having on Manitoba, what support does Mr. Wilson offer to our Finance Minister to offset the negative impact of his Government's policies?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure all Members of this House that when Mr. Crow saw me yesterday, before he made his luncheon speech, that I reiterated this province's, indeed the prairie provinces', view on these high interest

rates and the severe impact they were having, not only in our farm sector, but also in our manufacturing sector, indeed all those that would tend to consume.

Mr. Speaker, I went through all the arguments again, and I pleaded with Mr. Crow to begin to reduce interest rates in this country. I did not receive the response that was satisfactory.

Mr. Alcock: Presumably no offsetting investment in this province.

* (1010)

Economic Growth Deficit Forecast

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, we learned this week that one effect of the high interest rate policy is a decrease in our ability to export to the U.S. despite free trade. For the first time in 13 years, Canada has recorded a merchandise trade deficit with the U.S. In Manitoba, we were already in deficit to the tune of some \$699 million. Now that the entire country is in deficit, can the Finance Minister tell us what his projections are for Manitoba's deficit this year?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if one would listen to the Member you would think the sky is falling. Again, I reiterate to him comments that have been made in this House over and over again that Manitoba's economy by all projections, not Government projections, by all objective reports, would indicate the economy in this province relative to other provinces is going to do extremely well this year and next year.

Let me say, with respect to forecast of year-end deficit, that number was presented to the Member on Wednesday. It was contained within the second quarterly report. That is increased to some \$160 million.

Mr. Alcock: Well, Mr. Speaker, the sky is indeed falling and falling faster since April 26 of '88.

Free Trade Agreement Adjustment Assistance

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, high interest rates mean lost opportunities, lost jobs, high levels of bankruptcy and forced migration, all of which we are seeing in Manitoba, despite this Finance Minister's protestations to the opposite. Mr. Speaker, this Finance Minister has supported the federal Minister on virtually every policy Mr. Wilson has announced. Will he now admit that the Free Trade Agreement is not working for Manitoba and demand adjustment help from the federal Government?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Member speaks the truth when he says that I have agreed with every measure of the federal Minister Wilson. Nothing is further from the truth. Let me also say, though, that the Liberals, in the context of this House, representing Manitobans in the fashion

that they do, have had two opportunities, two or three opportunities, to support the initiatives to try and help the economy as a whole.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, they had an opportunity to support tax decreases that would provide to Manitobans upwards of \$80 million of relief. They chose to vote against that. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, they have been over a course of many Question Periods berating the Government for not spending additional sums of money. We have chronicled that they have been asking us to spend upwards of \$700 million in the first year alone.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the Member would like to tell us how, through not granting additional taxation relief as we have, and how, demanding that we spend more, is ultimately going to help the economy. Nothing by my study of economics leads me to believe that will provide any relief for the economy whatsoever.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister needs to get a new speech writer. We voted for the tax Bill and the \$700 million figure was a fabrication that he created over a year ago. We did, however, vote to defeat this Government and we would vote that way again given the opportunity.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Unemployment Insurance Commission Manitoba Support Statistics

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I have a new question for the Finance Minister. Unemployment is an extremely destructive social as well as economic problem. In the past the federal unemployment insurance program has provided support for thousands of individuals and families while they seek opportunities in their home communities. The proposed changes to the UIC program will deprive many Manitobans of much needed support. Can the Minister of Finance tell us the amount of federal support for UIC which will be withdrawn from this province?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on balance I believe it is somewhere in the area of \$30 million.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of a working paper from the Senate committee that is currently studying this Bill, that suggests it will be between \$60 and \$70 million.

* (1015)

Replacement Support

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Finance, what replacement support was offered by the Minister of Finance, the federal Minister of Finance, when the Minister met with him last week?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this area has drawn, obviously, major criticism

from those provinces who are sensing that they are going to lose on balance because of the changes in UI regulations.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that has been addressed. It has been addressed in the Manitoba context with respect to all of the changes that are going to have impact on the Province of Manitoba. There was no commentary forthcoming from the federal Minister of Finance. He is still pushing hard. The federal Government is pushing hard with the regulations that are being proposed.

Mr. Alcock: No offsetting support for trade, no offsetting support for U.I.

Unemployed Help Centres Funding Re-instatement

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I have a final question to the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson). This is a question she has been asked many times in this House. Given the increasingly difficult circumstances that many Manitobans find themselves in, and given the federal withdrawal of UIC, will she agree to meet with the board of the Unemployed Help Centre and work to restore funding to that service?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): I have met with the board of the Unemployed Help Centre of Winnipeg and with the board of the Unemployed Help Centre of Brandon. At that time I indicated to them this was a federal responsibility, of which I will remind the Member at this time, and they should approach the federal Government for funding.

Goods and Services Tax Seniors Boycott

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): The New Democrats have been working with all Manitobans on the fight against the GST. We have had 10 public meetings. We have had upwards of 40,000 cards collected from Manitobans in terms of their opposition to the GST.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, the seniors of Manitoba announced a boycott on January 18 and 19 to tangibly demonstrate, to Ottawa, Manitobans' opposition to the GST. The New Democratic Caucus has voted to join the seniors boycott on January 18 and 19, and we will be urging all our Party to join the seniors with other Manitobans on the boycott of goods and services covered under the GST on January 18.

My question to the Premier is: is his Government willing to join the seniors of Manitoba in protesting this unfair tax against all consumers in this country? Will the Government join the seniors and boycott, on January 18 and 19, all goods and services covered, or proposed, under the tax of Wilson?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we have always been very supportive of the seniors of this province. We have always endeavoured to do whatever we can to make the lives of seniors more productive,

more enjoyable and more beneficial to them in every way within our power as Government.

Whether it be Government services directed to seniors; whether it be support of programs or ideas that they generate; whether it be involving them in decision-making in this province, Mr. Speaker, we have always co-operated with the seniors, because we believe they have invested their lives in building the strong, vibrant province that we have inherited, and we owe them a debt of gratitude. We will always be supportive and co-operative in working with them to achieve their goals and ideals.

Mr. Doer: We have another 10,000 cards. We have delivered 30,000 already to Michael Wilson. We have another 10,000 and it is over 40,000, it is going—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would like to remind the Honourable Member for Concordia of Beauchesne's 501, where it is improper to produce any sort of exhibit in the Chamber. The Honourable Member for Concordia kindly put his question, please.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. Given the fact that their Government would not support seniors on the whole issue of drug patent laws—they stood with the drug companies—they have not yet given a position whether they are going to support the seniors in their court case on clawbacks and pensions. There is a question in Manitobans' minds about whether this Government is sincere about their fight with GST or whether it is just public relations. Will the Premier commit his Government to joining other Manitobans and joining the seniors to boycott goods and services on January 18 and 19 to tangibly demonstrate to Ottawa our legitimate opposition and outrage at this proposed goods and services tax in this country?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, when we talk about people who are operating politically and just doing window dressing we know what that is when we look at the Member bringing in a sack of response coupons. That is what you call politicization and flaunting the process and trying to do it on the backs of seniors, using them for their own political purposes. We would not do that.

This Government has been consistent in its opposition to the GST. I have said that it is unacceptable. I went to the -(interjection)- Mr. Speaker, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) comes in here attempting to make light of a serious issue. The GST is a very serious issue to all Manitobans despite the fact that he wants to belittle the questions of his Leader.

The fact of the matter is, this Government is firmly opposed to the GST. I went to the Premiers' conference in Quebec City and convinced my colleagues that together we would fight the GST -(interjection)- we did issue a communique that indicated the total opposition of all 10 Premiers of this country to the GST. We told the federal Government to remove the GST, to withdraw it from the table, and to get back down to business to try and operate the federal Government in a much more effective and efficient way.

* (1020)

Mr. Doer: We make no apologies for allowing Manitobans to deliver their protest of this GST to Michael Wilson directly. We make no apologies at all for that, Mr. Speaker.

My question to the Premier is: given his communique from Premiers has not worked, and given the First Ministers' meeting has not worked, does he not think that his Government should escalate the fight against his federal brethren in Ottawa, the Tories, that are perpetrating this tax on all Canadians? Does he not think he should have some backbone and leadership, and join with the seniors, who I applaud in taking a leadership position on this tax?

Let us all join together with the seniors to boycott goods and services to tangibly show Brian Mulroney that we will not take this tax in Manitoba.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, given that the NDP's 10 meetings have not worked, given that the NDP's coupon clipping has not worked, we are indeed carrying on the fight as we should, Government to Government, making sure—(interjection)—the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) is making light of this. The entire NDP Caucus is making light of this. We will let them answer their own questions if that is their attitude.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, 93,000 corporations made \$28 billion in profit and did not pay a cent in taxes. Now surely we can join the seniors in this province and join other consumers in this province in a tangible, strong way against the Mulroney 9 percent or 7 percent tax—whatever it is going to be—and stand together in this Chamber with the seniors of this province.

The Premier has already mentioned that they built this province. Why can we not stand with them in this fight and join the seniors in this boycott to show Ottawa that we mean business in this province?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, we believe that every group in society has, indeed, the right and the responsibility to make their views known to their Government. They are the people who elect that Government. They are the most powerful voice that can be sent to give a message to Ottawa, far more powerful than politicians whose only interest is in getting re-elected at the next election. They are the kinds of people—(interjection)—again, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) wants to heckle and belittle the issue. If he thinks it is important enough he should be prepared to listen to the answer.

* (1025)

Livestock Industry Feeder Cattle Figures

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): My question is to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). In the Manitoba markets report, dated December 1, it states that of all the feeder cattle that were sold through auction marts in Manitoba this fall, one-third went west, one-third went to Ontario, one-sixth went to the United States and about one-sixth were retained here in Manitoba.

The figures from the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association for last year indicated that 215,000 feeders

left the province last year, and of those that were fed here, 117,000 were slaughtered elsewhere. Can the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) give us comparable figures for 1989? How many feeder cattle actually left the province this fall?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the Member the exact figures. I do not have them in front of me at the moment. Clearly there has been a number of calves which have left the province in all directions, east, west and south, but certainly the people who are selling those calves are very, very happy with the price they received. An average price of \$500 per heifer, \$600 for a steer calf was a very good income for the people selling those calves. It has been our desire to see them fed in this province to the greatest possible extent. I have talked to various feeders who are building new facilities and have some optimism in terms of that industry for the future, but I will get the exact figures for the Member when they are available for 1989.

Red Meat Stabilization Program Comparable Subsidization Levels

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I think the point is made. The value-added component of the beef industry has been lost to this province. To the Minister of Agriculture, the Tripartite Stabilization Program for red meats—(interjection)—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

Mr. Laurie Evans: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. The Tripartite Stabilization Program for red meats was supposed to provide the so-called level playing field. Can the Minister of Agriculture tell us the comparable levels of subsidization that are paid by the provincial Governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan, compared to the support that is given to the cattle industry here in Manitoba?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Certainly, comparing us with Saskatchewan first, Saskatchewan had some different programs in place and they backed off those programs in terms of joining tripartite here into 1988. Manitoba has the same programs as Saskatchewan, at this time, in terms of tripartite and the Crow offset payment.

With Alberta, they have technically the same programs in the livestock sector in terms of tripartite and Crow offset, but they have some additional programs in terms of fertilizer subsidies, fuel subsidies and interest rate reductions that have some impact on the livestock sector. Technically, there is a level playing field in western Canada. We hope that the livestock feeder can, in this particular environment, gain some competence and some capability to get back into the industry and recover from the devastating impact of the NDP Government of six and a half years.

Livestock Industry Subsidization Levels

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): The Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association were in, talking to the Minister about three weeks ago. They laid some proposals on the table. My question is to the Minister. Has he had an opportunity to look at these proposals and can the cattle industry in Manitoba expect any more support to attempt to revitalize that industry here in Manitoba?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand what the Member is talking about. We have talked in terms of reducing the amount of subsidies so we have a level playing field. We have achieved that, and now he is saying jump the subsidies back up, let us start the war again. We have stopped the war and now he wants to start the war. Does he think that we can compete in a war of money? All they want to do is throw money at the problem. The cattle industry does not want a war of subsidies. They told that to me over and over again, and we will work towards resolving that in terms of the red meat forum of bringing the producers, the livestock feeders, the cow/calf people and the industry together. There will be some resolutions come forward that will work for the industry that will not involve a continual war of subsidies.

Winnipeg Arena Proposal Site Preference

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): My question is to the Premier. Yesterday, we asked questions in the House of the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) about problems with The Forks, but how can we expect three levels of Government to come to an agreement when this Government speaks out of three sides of its mouth?

First we have the Premier saying he supports the existing arena. Then we have the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) in Estimates saying he is opposed to a downtown site, and now we have the Minister of Urban Affairs saying he wants an arena built on the adjacent lands to The Forks. My question to the Premier is: who are we to believe—the Premier, the Deputy Premier or the Minister of Urban Affairs?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I have indicated very clearly that this Government is not interested in putting money into an arena to be built, whether it be in The Forks, whether it be north of the Perimeter Highway, whether it be at Assiniboia Downs or anywhere else. We do not believe that this is a priority of expenditure for this province. We believe that areas such as health care, education, family services, community services, all of these areas are important priorities. We have scarce tax dollars that we have to collect from people.

The Liberals have advocated us collecting \$700 million a year more of taxes from the people of Manitoba to pay for their provinces. We are not interested in those kinds of priorities. We are interested in choosing the right priorities and we have been successful, and the people support that, and an arena is not one of our priorities.

* (1030)

The Forks Development Development Moratorium

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, with a supplementary question.

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): We have a worldwide computer expert in the gallery today. Perhaps the Government should put him on consignment and give him some advice on coming up with the right figures.

I have a supplementary question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Will the Premier agree to -(interjection)- Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) had wheaties this morning and is having a tough time controlling himself -(interjection)-

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

Mr. Carr: Will the Premier agree to a halt on all new developments at The Forks until there has been another round of public consultations?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Member for Fort Rouge is confusing the issue. The proposal, and I read the same article as he did, although I presume a little better than he did, the proposal is not for an arena at The Forks. It is on property that is not Forks property. It specifically says that -(interjection)- well, he does not even understand that the property that is owned and controlled by The Forks Development Corporation is different from CN property. That is private property; that is a private corporation.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I do not support with provincial finances an arena anywhere in this city. That is very simply what we have said and the Member may get it all confused in his mind for his own purposes, but the issue is very clear. The property that is being talked about is not Forks property. He is wrong on that count, and we have never said that we will support with provincial dollars an arena anywhere in the City of Winnipeg. He is wrong again on that.

Recreation Centre

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, with his final supplementary question.

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): When three Ministers of the same Government have three different opinions, no wonder the public is confused. With a final supplementary, how can the Premier justify the use of Manitoba tax dollars to send the chief executive officer of The Forks Corporation to track down an idea in Europe, that was denounced yesterday by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) in this House?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): We neither justify nor sanction it. Again, the Member is confused. He does not know the reporting relationship. When you set up a corporation the decisions are not made in the office of the Minister of Urban Affairs or anyone else. The decisions are made by the executive of the corporation and those decisions are made in their judgment as in their best interest. We may disagree with decisions, and we have on several occasions. We disagreed with decisions made by city council, we have disagreed with decisions made by the federal Government, we have disagreed with decisions made by tripartite corporations, but the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), never having been in a position of responsibility, does not understand any of those—(interjection)—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Manitoba Data Services Divestiture Concerns

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) knows, our Party is against the giveaway of the Manitoba Data Services Corporation to the private sector. We are now supported in our position by Manitoba computer dealers who oppose this sale because they are afraid of being squeezed out, and now the Manitoba Health Record Association has expressed concern about the integrity and security of patient information, should MDS be sold. They are also concerned about the financial impact this will have on health information systems in Manitoba.

My question to the Minister of Finance is: how does the Minister propose to address these legitimate concerns raised by the Manitoba Health Record Association?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, obviously it is Friday, for a number of reasons, but the least of which is that the Member for Brandon East is preparing for the Saturday commentary on this issue, because the Brandon Sun circulation must be much higher on Saturday because the question is always posed on a Friday.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, the question is one that I take seriously. I can indicate to the Member that we are reviewing all concerns as expressed to us with respect to the maintaining of the secrecy of any records, certainly health records. We take it as a serious issue, we have from Day One, and will continue to do so in our deliberations.

Legislative Library Act Violation

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): If the Minister would reverse his position we would be delighted. A short while ago I raised the matter of handling of public records by the private sector being in contravention of The Legislative Library Act. The Minister of Finance

said he would look into this matter. Has the Minister received a report on the matter? Can he tell the House now what advice he has received on this question?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have received various views. I can indicate—

An Honourable Member: Legal opinions.

Mr. Manness: —they are legal opinions—that they are not in agreement with each other. There still seems to be some considerable conflict as to the powers of that Act.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I would hope the Minister could table that for all Members of the House for our information, particularly those of us who are very concerned about this issue.

Manitoba Data Services Divestiture Concerns

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): It has been reported that the proposed federal takeover of regulation of provincially owned telephone systems has some bearing on the sale of MDS. Can the Minister explain what ramifications there may be for the proposed sale resulting from this federal move?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that the Government has not reached a point of decision as to whether or not Manitoba Data Services is going to be sold. That has not been reached, and ultimately it may decide not to dispose of Manitoba Data Services.

With respect to Manitoba Telephone System, we sense it is wise that Government keep its options open, and indeed if it enters into a divestiture of Manitoba Data Services, if the revenue stream provided to it now by Manitoba Telephone System should be able to be pulled back to Government for whatever reasons, so it is to maintain flexibility and options. That was the import of the comment that I made some several weeks ago with respect to this issue.

Smoking in Public Places By-law Administration

Mr. Harold Gilleshammer (Minnedosa): I have a question for the Premier that I know concerns all Manitobans. I wonder if he could clarify, for the benefit of this House, the laws and regulations governing smoking in public places.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I thank the Member for that question, because I know there is some confusion in the minds of some members of the public and maybe some Members of this House on that issue. I want to

comment on the application of the laws in Manitoba. They are quite straightforward—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Mr. Filmon: The municipal authority, in for instance the City of Winnipeg, administers by-laws that require a certain portion of public places such as restaurants to be set aside as non-smoking. Within these areas no person is permitted to smoke, and any violations are subject to fines—

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson, on a point of order.

Mr. Ashton: On a point of order, I believe the First Minister is way off base. We are dealing here in the Manitoba Legislature with matters within jurisdiction of the Government. I do not think it is appropriate for the First Minister to be describing City of Winnipeg by-laws.

If the Members of the Conservative Party had read an article by a Press Press columnist that affected a Liberal Member—quite frankly, why do they not just discuss it between themselves so the rest of us can ask real questions in this Legislature—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order.

* (1040)

Fine Imposition

Mr. Harold Gilleshammer (Minnedosa): Can the Premier further clarify whether fines are normally imposed on those who smoke within these areas? Can the restaurant owners, for instance, offer to—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Osborne, on a point of order.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It is cute, but I think it is time to get on with Question Period. I think this is clearly becoming an abuse of Question Period.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, may I answer the question?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable First Minister.

Mr. Filmon: I am going to answer the question. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is, again the question that the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) has asked is a very important question. Fines will be imposed only on those who are caught smoking in designated non-smoking areas, either those people or their party. Fines may not be paid or imposed on the owner of the establishment, Mr. Speaker. I think that is a very important point, and I am glad that the Member for Minnedosa raised that point for the clarification—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. An answer has been given.

Minister of Education Liberal Meeting Request

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): On a higher level, on behalf of all of us on this side of the House I would like to—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mrs. Yeo: —thank you for a delightful Christmas party last night. I would also like to thank you for not cancelling all meetings during the day yesterday, as well as for allowing this Session to continue this morning, despite the fact that the Departments of Rural Development, and Education and Training are holding open houses this afternoon.

Yesterday, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) told me it was inappropriate to hold a meeting because of his Christmas party.

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education and Training. Why did he insist—

An Honourable Member: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Acting Government House Leader, on a point of order.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): The Member has made a very serious allegation with respect to the operations of this House, with respect to a Member of the Treasury Bench. I ask her to substantiate her comments or to withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the Honourable Member was about to substantiate her comments now.

Mrs. Yeo: My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach). Why did he insist on denying the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), the Education Critic and interested caucus Members the opportunity to meet with the president of Keewatin Community College, one of his most faithful and dedicated civil servants? We wanted to meet with him this morning, three hours before the Minister of Education's department Christmas party.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Derkach: —it disappoints me greatly—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Education has the floor.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, it disappoints me greatly to see the level that the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) is stooping to. I can explain the entire matter to the House, and I am very happy to do so.

Over the past number of weeks the Leader of the Opposition Party (Mrs. Carstairs), the Liberal Party, has been sneaking around and asking questions—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Mr. Speaker: . The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, on a point of order.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Carstairs: Once again the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) would impute motives, and I would ask him to retract that word because it is an imputation of motive.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader, on the same point of order.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): The same point of order. The Minister did not call the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) a sneak. He said she was sneaking around, that is an adjective that is very much in order.- (interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An Honourable Member: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, and a further point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We will rule on this one first. On the point of order raised by the Honourable Member, the Leader of the Opposition, she does not have a point of order. The remarks by the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) do nothing for the decorum of this House.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, on a new point of order—she said. On a new point of order.

Mrs. Carstairs: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) has compounded the earlier statement of the Minister of Education by again putting on the record imputation of behaviour.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised by the Honourable Leader, I believe the Honourable Acting Government House Leader was clarifying a position.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Education, to answer the question now, please.

Mr. Derkach: Sometimes staff from my department have reported to me that Members from the Liberal Party have been calling, especially the Leader, to them directly and in a very intimidating way have been asking questions about the operations of their—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, on a point of order.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Again we have an imputation of motive. In this case I have not placed a call to the Department of Education directly since this gentleman became the Minister.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the Honourable Leader—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The remarks put on the record by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition—they are clearly a dispute over the facts.

Mr. Derkach: If in fact that offends the Leader of the Liberal Party I will withdraw that particular statement, but I will explain to the House that if the Members of the Liberal Party want information and want to meet my staff, a simple letter to the Minister would accommodate that.

Yesterday I received a handwritten note from the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) requesting that

the president of Keewatin Community College meet with her and her caucus today while my office open house was going on to explain the future activities and the activities of KCC. My response to the Member for Sturgeon Creek was that because today is a social event for members from Keewatin Community College who would only be here for a very short time, it would be inappropriate to try and meet with her. I indicated they would be prepared to meet with her at any time in the future—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mrs. Yeo: My next question to the Minister of Education and Training is this: is there a policy by this Government, or just with this Minister, to state, to list, who we can and cannot meet with? Is this what you call open Government?

Mr. Derkach: In a response—and I wish I had the letter with me, because I would read it in this Chamber—to the Member's handwritten note I indicated that she would indeed be given the opportunity to meet with the president of Keewatin Community College and my Deputy Minister to explain all the activities of KCC in The Pas. There was never any attempt to disallow her to meet with any of my staff. That is a false accusation.

Mrs. Yeo: My last question to the Minister of Education—and I did write a letter to him and he did say that we could meet with him—is this: why bring the president of Keewatin Community College down here on a second trip when he is already here? Why not utilize the opportunity to speak with him, meet with him today while he is here?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Education.—(interjection)— Order, please. Order.

Mr. Derkach: I spoke to the president of Keewatin Community College last night at about 9:30 in the evening, and he indicated to me that he was unable to attend the open house this afternoon and for that reason he would not be here. There was never any indication from him that he would be here and would be able to meet with them.— (interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

* (1050)

Farming Industry Safety Net Programs

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for the Interlake.— (interjection)— Order, please. Order.

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. In yesterday's Question Period, the Minister admitted that there are gaps in income stabilization programs like Western Grain and countervail implications from tripartite.

Given that his own department several years ago, for myself as Minister, showed that, from studies done

by the OECD, commodity-based support programs generally provided 70 percent of the support to about 30 percent of the farmers, many of whom really do not require that support. We now have an opportunity to turn around the disastrous situation in this province, thousands of farm families facing foreclosure and thousands of farm families in the western part of the province facing droughts for the second year in a row.

Is the Minister prepared to use this opportunity to bring about a general farm income stabilization program for this province, and press Ottawa for cost-sharing on that program, in light of the implications that this type of a program has been recommended throughout North America and western Europe and will not be countervailable in terms of the Free Trade Agreement?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): I would like to first correct the Member. There are not thousands of Manitoba farm families facing foreclosure. The number of applications in the last year under Part III, the foreclosure part of The Family Farm Protection Act, is less than 200. So he is way off base there.

I am also pleased, very pleased, to report to the House that as a result of the safety net issue session that was held in Ottawa on Monday and Tuesday of this week that by the end of today it is my understanding the safety net subcommittee, the task force, across the nation will be struck and will be in action. A recommendation is to be brought forward by the middle of January and it will be a national-based program in the initial stages. It may have to be broken down to regional, but we do not think that we can support a provincial plan and have the vulcanization of the safety net program across the country.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have —(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Derkach: May I have leave to make a non-political statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister have leave to make a non-political statement? Agreed. The Honourable Minister of Education.

Mr. Derkach: I am very pleased to rise today to recognize the achievements of a young grade 6 man from Pinawa by the name of Kelsey McIlwain. Kelsey competed in a worldwide computer problem solving contest and recorded a perfect score in the elementary open division.

This remarkable young man has outperformed 300 teams in winning the 1989 International Computer Problem Solving Contest. This competition included contestants from Canada, the United States, and other countries throughout the world. This young man has brought honour not only to his family, but to his

community and indeed to this province. I am honoured that he is in our presence this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all Members of this House join me in congratulating the achievements of this fine young man this morning.- (applause)-

Mr. Reg. Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Minister—

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member have leave to make a non-political statement? Agreed. The Honourable Member for Osborne.

Mr. Alcock: I would like to join with the Minister of Education and offer, from this side of the House, our congratulations to Kelsey also.

As someone who teaches computer-based problem solving, I know how great his accomplishment is. It is absolutely remarkable what has occurred in this country in the last very few number of years. Since 1981 when they first introduced computers, they have revolutionized the way in which we do business, and it is people like Kelsey who are on the cutting edge of a change, of a reform, in the use of technology that I think will astound us all as we move toward the year 2000.

I think the fact that a Manitoban has succeeded to this extent is absolutely wonderful, and we should all be very proud of him and hope that he leads a great many more into those kinds of competitions.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Thompson have leave to make a non-political statement? Agreed. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I would like to join in the very generous statements that have been made. I consider it a major achievement. I think it is very appropriate that we do recognize the achievement today. I think it is the wave of the future, and we ought to be very proud as Manitobans to have such an individual at such a young age who has done so well. I would extend my congratulations, and I am sure for all Members of the Legislature on his major achievement.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave for a non-political statement on another matter?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have leave to make a non-political statement? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, at night as we listen to the news we hear the sounds of democracy ringing out throughout the world. Most of that emphasis in recent days has been on East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, but last night the news came from another part of the globe. Chile, a nation with a once proud tradition of democracy, has had democracy restored.

The election of Patricio Aylwin has given great hope to the western world, as well as the eastern world, about the future of democracy in the world as a whole. The story is much more than the election of one person; it is the jubilant story of a people's struggle to get rid of a military dictator and to replace that with one duly elected by the people of that nation.

Mr. Speaker, there was great excitement here at the Legislature in the early evening and later on in the evening when Canadians of Chilean descent arrived to cast their symbolic ballots.

My caucus wishes to express our sincere congratulations to the new President, to the people of Chile and to the residents of Manitoba of Chilean descent. It is an accomplishment that is admired by all of us.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for St. Johns have leave to make a non-political statement? The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): I am pleased to join with other Members in this House also to express our happiness and pleasure at the results of yesterday's elections in Chile. After 16 years of living without democracy, of living under a military rule, the people of Chile have been able to exercise their democratic rights and freedoms.

They have chosen a progressive Government headed by a leader, Patricio Aylwin, and a Government that represents the people and is committed to respect for human rights, an end to repression, the preservation of democracy, liberty and community.

We join with Members of this House to congratulate the people of Chile, the Chilean community here in Manitoba and to wish the new President well in the difficult and challenging days ahead.

* (1100)

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister of Health have leave to make a non-political statement? The Honourable Minister of Health.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, yesterday's events in Chile are indeed ones that all of us in this Chamber, as free citizens of this country, can take a great deal of pride in, because we take for granted the privilege of electing a Government and we take for granted the privilege of defeating a Government if it does not suit what the citizens of this province and this nation believe is appropriate.

I think what is most appropriate, as we approach the season of the year of peace and of joy and of kindred spirit, that we take a look at the world and we find in countries who have been ruled by totalitarian regimes, whether they be of the right or of the left, that you cannot suppress forever the spirit of freedom and democracy and the desire of men and women, collectively, to govern their affairs in a way appropriate in meeting the goals and aspirations of individuals in nations throughout this world.

Ladies and Gentlemen and Members of the Legislature, if there is one event that is bringing joy to this Christmas season, it is that renewed spirit of freedom throughout the world, where men, women and children have been repressed by regimes which are out of touch with the aspirations, the desires and the wants of the people.

I offer congratulations to the people of Chile for being the most recent nation to express those views of freedom, hope, peace and prosperity on behalf of their people.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Rupertsland have leave to make a non-political statement? The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a non-political statement on a different matter. It is with great sadness that I rise to make a statement on the death of Andrei Sakharov, the Soviet Nobel Prize winning physicist and human rights activist.

Mr. Sakharov's campaign on behalf of disarmament and human rights for 20 years made him a worldwide legend, who almost single-handedly forced democratic changes in the Soviet Union.

A nuclear scientist, Sakharov was elected to the Soviet Parliament where he played a leading role in making that country more open and democratic.

He was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1975. In 1980, he was exiled to the City of Gorky, over 400 kilometres from Moscow. Fortunately, the Soviet President, Mikhail Gorbachev, cancelled that exile in December, 1986.

Earlier this year he came to Winnipeg to receive the St. Boniface Research Foundation Humanitarian Award. I was privileged to meet him on this occasion.

Truly, he was a remarkable humanitarian, who touched the lives of people struggling for democracy around the world. His understanding of the struggles of aboriginal people, both in this country and around the world, was very impressive and heartwarming. The world has lost a giant with the passing of this advocate of peace and democracy.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Kildonan have leave to make a non-political statement? The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I rise today with sadness because the world has lost a very special person.

Andrei Sakharov was a man who stood tall for the protection of human rights, a man with great courage who chose to remain in his own country to work for greater freedom for his people, a brilliant scientist who was willing to put aside his own academic career in order to fight for human dignity.

When Mr. Sakharov was in Winnipeg in 1988, he touched all who met with him. You knew you that you were in the presence of a special human being.

To his wife, Elanya, to the Russian people, and to all who desire to protect human rights, I and my fellow caucus Members offer our deepest sympathies.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister of Finance have leave to make a non-political statement? The Honourable Minister of Finance.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government, we would like to join others in this House who are paying tribute to Mr. Sakharov today.

Those of us who have had an opportunity to watch closely with respect to the growing revelations of a nation crying out for greater freedom, and as we have had an opportunity to watch Mr. Sakharov's role given a new dimension of openness that has projected back some of the internal dialogue that has taken place behind the Iron Curtain, it was very impressive to us to see the leading role that he took within that move.

Of course, given that he favoured Winnipeg and Manitoba with his visit here last year to receive an honorary award from the St. Boniface Cancer Research Foundation, I think we felt even closer as we saw him take the struggle back home to an opening of Russia and an opening of an attempt to try and embrace greater human rights and human rights freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, we too share in the sense of loss hopefully reformists in the Nation of U.S.S.R. feel today, and we are saddened by his loss.

* (1100)

ORDERS OF THE DAY HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, before I call the order of business, which is specifically dealing with Bills, I would like to make a formal announcement of two committees that will sit on Tuesday next at ten o'clock in the morning.

Firstly, Law Amendments to consider of Bill No. 67, and the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs to consider of Bill No. 79 at ten o'clock Tuesday morning. If there is additional time required specifically dealing with Bill No. 79, that committee will sit again in the evening, Tuesday evening at eight o'clock, Law Amendments will be situated in 254 and Municipal Affairs in 255.

Mr. Speaker, today we will call for second reading, Bills No. 60 and No. 75 in that order, and following that we will call Bills 62, 31, 83 and 84.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Thompson, on House Business.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): On a matter of House Business, I wish actually we had been able to come to some agreement in terms of the committee hearings. I know the Acting Government House Leader had

indicated his desire to have the committee hearing called Tuesday morning. We would have some concerns about the necessity for allowing all people to make presentations. We certainly would have preferred it to have been called strictly on Tuesday evening. We also believe there may be some organizations that will not be ready even on Tuesday, from our information.

I would hope the understanding would be that if it is the intention of the Government to go ahead with Tuesday morning, which we would have preferred not to have done, that there not only be the Tuesday morning hearing but there be the guarantee of the Tuesday evening hearing and further committee hearings, if necessary, early in the new year, so that we can deal very fairly with all members of the public and organizations who wish to make presentations on this matter—

An Honourable Member: I think you are on Bill 79.

Mr. Ashton: —on 79.

Mr. Maness: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not having shared this information. Certainly it is not our intention to withhold anybody from coming forward and making representation to that committee. Certainly there will be a guarantee in effect that committee will sit Tuesday night.

Indeed, if all presenters who can be available for Tuesday morning do not fill up the allotted two and a half hour time that committee will then rise and will sit again at eight o'clock. There will be a guarantee. As far as going beyond that I think the committee itself will make that decision Tuesday evening.

SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 60—THE EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training) presented Bill No. 60, The Education Administration Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'administration scolaire, for second reading, to be referred to a committee of this House.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Derkach: The Education Administration Act outlines, for the most part, the powers and duties of the Minister, which include responsibility for supervision, control and direction of all public schools, as well as all other schools established under the Act.

Under The Education Administration Act the Minister has the authority to inquire into qualifications of teachers and of the standard of education provided by independent schools.

It has become evident recently, Mr. Speaker, that matters into which a Minister could inquire in these schools needed to be expanded for two reasons: first of all, in order to promote greater accountability of independent schools to the Minister, and secondly, to investigate matters affecting the welfare of students

enrolled in these schools. The major amendments proposed in this Bill provide for such an expanded power.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend this Bill to the Members of this House for consideration and for their support. Thank you.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 75—THE INSURANCE AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs) presented Bill No. 75, The Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances, for second reading, to be referred to a committee of this House.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Connery: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce, for second reading, Bill No. 75, amendments to The Insurance Amendment Act.

Our proposed amendment will allow for the accommodation of four separate insurance councils in Manitoba. The councils will be responsible for regulating the educational qualifications and disciplinary actions for general insurance brokers, life insurance agents, and insurance adjusters.

The insurance council concept is presently being used across Canada. Amendments to allow the establishment of these councils here will bring Manitoba in line with councils established in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario and Quebec.

Manitoba will have direct input into the councils. Any action taken by the councils with respect to educational and other qualification standards will have to be approved by the superintendent of insurance. As well, all policies and procedures that are set in place by the council will require the approval of the superintendent. If a council rejects an application for a licence, or where a licence is revoked or suspended, an agent or a broker will have the right to appeal the action under the conditions presently in place under The Insurance Act.

Mr. Speaker, allowing for the accommodation of the insurance councils will ensure increased provincial input into matters involving licensed agents and brokers, while at the same time ensuring a system of checks and balances for monitoring the insurance industry for the Superintendent of Insurance and the insurance appeal board.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have some housekeeping matters. Basically, the changes to the Act involve inserting more appropriate wording into certain sections of The Insurance Act. It became evident during the life insurance compensation plan discussions with the insurance industry that the word "funds" is misleading

in certain instances. We are therefore taking the necessary steps to change references in certain sections of The Insurance Act from "funds" to "plan."

Mr. Speaker, I believe the amendments to The Insurance Act, that I have proposed here today, will be beneficial to the consumers of this province. Therefore, I recommend Bill No. 75, The Insurance Amendment Act, to the Honourable Members of this Legislature.

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to let the House know that I could possibly have a conflict of interest on this particular Bill. I will be withdrawing from participation.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona): I move that debate on Bill No. 75, The Insurance Amendment Act, be adjourned, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr).

MOTION presented and carried.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 62—THE CITY OF WINNIPEG AMENDMENT ACT (3)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), Bill No. 62, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), who has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): I am glad to continue the remarks that I began some weeks ago, on a Friday I believe it was, when it became 12:30 too quickly. At that moment I think I was in the midst of putting some thoughts on the record about the relationship between the City of Winnipeg and the rest of the province. It was timely actually, because there was some debate in this House and outside of the walls of the Legislature on policies of decentralization, policies which I hasten to add that are supported by the Liberal Party in Manitoba.

The essence of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, is to abolish the "additional zone." The additional zone is a name given to those rural municipalities which surround the City of Winnipeg, and the relationship has been stormy and controversial.

Ever since the additional zone was established rural municipalities have asked the Government of Manitoba, of various political stripes, to actually be taken out of the zone. More than half have asked the Government to be taken out of that relationship with the City of Winnipeg. What this Bill does is remove the rest of them by statute.

* (1110)

The reason for the tension is the City of Winnipeg has the authority to be an appeal mechanism for rural

municipalities which see themselves as autonomous and independent. They do not like to have to come to councillors, elected by the citizens of Winnipeg, for that kind of approval.

It is a relationship which is not seen as one of equality. It is seen as one of inferiority where the elected councillors of the City of Winnipeg sit in judgment in some superior way, many rural municipalities believe, on how zoning ought to be handled in those areas which are adjacent to the city.

It has not worked. The City of Winnipeg does not like the relationship very well, and certainly the municipal councillors who represent those R.M.s do not like it either because of the subservient relationship they find themselves in. So we do not have any objections in principle to abolishing the additional zone because it has been abolished in practice many years ago, and continues to be a source of ongoing tension between the City of Winnipeg and the R.M.s which surround.

The question though, what will the Government put in its place? That is an important question. It is a question that has not yet been answered by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). He has taken an interim step, and that step is to create a committee, a Winnipeg regional committee which, if I understand it correctly, will consist of three Ministers of the provincial Government, one representative from the City of Winnipeg and representatives from the rural municipalities which surround Winnipeg.

The idea, I gather, is to have some consultative mechanism in place so that representatives of all of those levels of Government can try to determine in a co-ordinated way what they wish to be the successor to the additional zone. We do not have any problems with that concept. We do, however, want to hear from the rural municipalities which are a part of the additional zone in advance of approving the abolition, so that we have some idea of what is in the minds of those councillors and those reeves.

I have had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to speak with them, and I must say I was astonished and shocked at the level of animosity and distrust between the councillors in those R.M.s and the City of Winnipeg. It was really something that I had never witnessed as a politician, that there would be that dramatic tension between people elected within a range of 20 or 25 miles from one another. It was not so much a territorial battle, although that is part of it, but it was a relationship that was rooted in distrust. There was not a generosity of spirit to give one or the other the benefit of the doubt.

(Mr. William Chornopyski, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

So what the Minister intends to replace the additional zone with is really at the heart of this debate. We know that the Minister has chosen, for his own reasons, not to give us an omnibus City of Winnipeg Act. We had some amendments to the Act last spring. We have more this fall—very important amendments—through Bill 32. We now have two other pieces of legislation that the Minister has dropped on our laps. That is Bill 61, which deals with administrative organization at City Hall, and

Bill 62 which we are discussing today, and he has promised more.

He has promised more for the next Session of the Legislature and on into 1994. So the timetable for municipal reform has been extended over a very long period of time, some four or five years, which makes it very difficult for Members of the Opposition to analyze and be constructive in its criticism of each particular piece of the puzzle. When you do not know what is coming down the road, when you do not know how the piece that you are analyzing now is going to fit with the piece down the road that you cannot see, nor are you able to see, it is difficult to be as responsible and as comprehensive in your comments on municipal reform as you would like to be.

Having said that, you have to deal with what you are given, you play with the cards you have. The card that the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) has given us in Bill 62 is to abolish the additional zone to create a committee consisting of representatives from the R.M.s, from the City of Winnipeg, and from the Cabinet for the Province of Manitoba to see what is the logical successor to the additional zone. As far as it goes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are prepared to put some remarks on the record. I know other critics, other Members of the Opposition side, want to say something about this Bill.

We are particularly anxious to hear from delegations from rural municipalities to see how they anticipate the abolition of the additional zone affecting their ability to plan their own futures, and what they intend to recommend as its replacement. With those few thoughts, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will conclude my debate on Bill 62. Thank you.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 31—THE LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), Bill No. 31, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail), standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns, the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): I rise today to speak on this Bill, Bill 31, The Labour Relations Amendment Act, and to speak strongly in opposition to it. Members on all sides of this House will know the strong feelings that the New Democratic Party Caucus Members have with respect to this extremely regressive action on the part of the Conservative Government of Manitoba, an action which takes them to the point of repealing a most enlightened, progressive labour relations tool, an Act which takes them to getting rid of a tool that not only preserves and recognizes the right to strike, but provides a working alternative to strike action.

It boggles the minds, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of us in the New Democratic Party how a Government, any Government of the Day can embark upon such right-wing regressive action, how any political Party in this day and age can oppose an enlightened labour relations tool that does much to ease labour management tensions in this province, that does much on behalf of greater benefits and improve situations for working people everywhere in this province. So we cannot fathom the reasons why the Government of the Day and Liberal Opposition today in this Chamber stand to oppose final offer selection, and stand to support the repeal of final offer selection.

It is hard to understand, given the fact that this legislation repeals something that is working, that is effective now and has been demonstrated to be effective, that is encouraging parties to bargain in good faith, that has the support of virtually the entire labour movement in this province, that is actually demonstrated to be reducing strikes in this province. I thought all political Parties in this province and in this country would be in support of looking for innovative and new enlightened tools to reduce labour management tensions, to try to avoid strikes if possible, to try to work together on behalf of the best interest of working people in this province.

Yet what we have before us is an action on the part of the Liberals and the Tories to do just the opposite, to in effect say to the people of Manitoba they are committed to accelerating the tension in this province, to adding to labour-management conflict in this province, to not addressing the very real and legitimate concerns of working people in this province. Mr. Deputy Speaker, either the Liberals and Conservatives are against change, period, against innovative ideas—that is certainly one possible answer to this dilemma that we face here in the New Democratic Party.

Certainly with respect to the Conservatives, who are philosophically generally opposed to change, progressive change, and looking at innovative solutions to serious problems in our society, it does not come as a really big surprise. But for the Liberals in this House, we thought they at least were open to innovative ideas, to change, and to addressing the concerns of working people in this province. Perhaps the answer to the position of the Liberals and Conservatives on this issue is in the fact that they just choose not to listen, to consult with, to hear the concerns of working people in this province.

As I have said, this idea, this concept, this legislation around final offer selection has widespread support throughout the province, supported by virtually the entire labour movement in this province, supported by over 200,000 women actively involved in seeking equality between women and men in our society and, I am sure, supported by Manitobans everywhere who feel very strongly about seeking creative solutions to strikes and strike action, who want to see peaceful settlements to very difficult issues, who want to maintain the tradition of this province toward co-operative, peaceful solutions to very serious problems.

The action of the Liberals and Conservatives on this Bill breaks that tradition entirely, puts an end to that

which has been with us over the decades, that which has characterized the people of Manitoba, that which has made this province strong. We will be doing everything in our power to ensure that the right-wing, regressive, uncaring, unlistening attitude of Liberals and Conservatives are not achieved, are not met, in terms of fruition with respect to the repeal of final offer selection.

A final, or at least a third perhaps, explanation for the actions of Conservatives and Liberals is that they would like to see the whole thing, the whole situation, around labour issues and labour management conflict, to explode. They want to see conflict in our society. That is actually a little closer to—some would say it is actually a little closer to Marxist philosophy in that respect in the sense that ultimately the result of such action, such conflict, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that some would even wonder whether or not the Conservative philosophy and the Liberal policy, of course - (interjection)-

* (1120)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Order. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

Ms. Waaylycia-Leis: Some would even wonder whether or not the goal and objective of the Conservative Government and the Liberal Opposition is, as I said, to heighten the tension in this province, to bring conflict to a head, and to create the inevitable crisis in our economy and start all over from that position.

As I said, that is a little closer to Marxist philosophy than to Conservative philosophy, but it is clearly one of the conclusions that must be drawn from the action of Conservatives and Liberals, no commitment to listening to, and acting on, the wishes of the people of Manitoba and striving to find meaningful, creative, peaceful solutions to some very difficult labour problems looming on the horizon.

It is an appalling response on the part of both the Conservatives and the Liberals, another example of how they are so similar when it comes to the real issues in our society, the critical bread and butter issues, when it comes to addressing equality, community and justice in our society. They are Tweedledee and Tweedledumner, as has been said many times in this House before.

I would hope that through the course of this debate that some Members on either side, from among the Conservatives and the Liberals, will see the light and will recognize the folly of their ways and will act with the people of Manitoba and not impose their extreme right-wing, regressive thinking on the people of Manitoba. Let us work with them on behalf of Manitobans if for no other reason consider supporting final offer selection and withdrawing this Bill to repeal final offer selection just on the basis of the statistics, which demonstrate that it is an effective labour relations tool.

Let me cite those statistics, which all Members in this House will be familiar with, because they were

enclosed in the brief by the Manitoba Federation of Labour presented to the Conservative Cabinet, and also to all Members in this Chamber.

Since its proclamation in January 1988 to the present, there have been 61 applications for the final offer selection procedure received by the Manitoba Labour Board. The status of these applications are as follows: five selector decisions have been filed, three for the union proposal, and two for the employer proposal. The number of agreements, which have been settled by the parties prior to the appointment of the selector, or the selector making the decision, or where the parties have withdrawn the application, is 45, or roughly 74 percent. There are four applications with selectors appointed and decisions pending, four applications have been dismissed and three applications pending with no order or dismissal issued to date.

Clearly, as the MFL has stated in their report, the above statistics point to the fact that the legislation is working and should be retained. We would appeal to Members in this House to listen to the people who are involved in this area, who work with it on a day-to-day basis, who understand the issues and are prepared to do something that Members in this Chamber, in the Conservative Government and among the Liberal Opposition benches, are not prepared to consider, an innovative new solution to a difficult problem.

Why not try it? Why not see if it works? What is it that keeps this Government from looking at something that might actually benefit our society, might be positive in the long run for working men and women everywhere in this province?

Final offer selection is clearly consistent with the basic principles of democracy, with the principles of freedom, with the principles of equality and community. It does not, as I have said, take away the right to strike, but it provides a working alternative to working people in this province, to both labour and management when it comes to difficult disputes and gives them a very effective tool for consideration in their difficult process of arriving at settlement around the many labour issues we face on a regular basis.

As the Manitoba Federation of Labour Report also states, with final offer selection everyone wins. It is a greater advantage for the parties to have a winner or a loser by a decision of a selector or arbitrator than having everyone being affected by a strike or lockout.

As the report says, for example, the grievance procedure in a collective agreement provides for arbitration if the dispute cannot be settled. The arbitrator's decision is not going to be liked by the party that loses, but it is a positive way to settle the matter. In the case of a selector, the same would apply. It is preferable to leaving disputes unresolved, and the long-term relationship of the parties will be better preserved without a strike or lockout. Who can argue, on the benches of the Conservatives and the Liberals, with that point? No one should be arguing, but they are maintaining this position, this right-wing extreme position, of repealing final offer selection.

A final consideration that should be, I would think not a final consideration, another consideration, which

the Members of the Government and the Liberal benches should be looking at when rethinking their position, which we hope they are doing at this very moment, is the fact that final offer selection prevents strikes.

Surely that is a worthy goal to be considered on the part of all Members of this House. It is certainly an objective of Manitobans everywhere. Manitobans from all communities in this province are most anxious to find harmonious, peaceful, solutions to some very difficult problems. They are in fact leading the way when it comes to this Government and the Liberal Opposition. They are ahead once again of those two Parties in terms of where this province must go around the economic situation in this province and the looming labour management difficulties that we will be facing as a province and as a country.

On that point the Federation of Labour brief also states it is ridiculous to suggest that final offer selection may encourage strikes as they would only last for 60 days. The majority of strikes in the past have not lasted for 60 days. Conversely it is ridiculous to think that a union would take strike action of 60 days so that they can use final offer selection. The reality is once strike action has been taken workers have been out for long periods of time.

Final offer selection is a tool to end prolonged strikes and resolve disputes of this nature. Since a strike is a last resort then employers have, including a collective agreement—without the use of final offer selection it is taken very seriously, and it should be noted, as the MFL points out, that trade unions everywhere in this province have wrestled with this issue, have sided with final offer selection and have become involved in the whole process. They recognized that had final offer selection not encouraged the parties to reach an agreement, a strike would have occurred in many instances.

So final offer selection is a tool to be used when parties fail to reach agreement. To date the legislation is working as it was envisioned, and is contributing to labour management harmony in Manitoba. As the MFL report concludes, final offer selection reduces strikes, thereby enhancing a stable labour relations climate in the province, thus enhancing business investment and growth.

Can Members of the Conservatives and Liberals disagree with that statement? Surely all opponents of final offer selection will consider their decision, in light of these kinds of statistics, in light of this kind of appeal, and support in the Manitoba population generally. There is another reason, a very important reason, why Members of the Conservative Government and the Liberal Opposition should be rethinking their position about repealing final offer selection.

Both the Conservative Government and the Liberal Opposition have espoused on a regular basis their concern about equality between women and men, have talked about the goals and objectives of achieving employment equity, have talked about the need for affirmative action programs, support programs, improved employment standards legislation and so on

and so forth, all supposedly in the interests of dealing with the barriers and inequities that women now face in our society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if that is the case then surely the Government and the Liberal Members will reconsider their position because they know that final offer selection is an important tool in achieving greater equality between women and men and is a concept that is favoured by over 200,000 women in this province in their capacity as members of official organizations of organized women's efforts in this province. Perhaps it is time to appeal to the pragmatism and the power-hungry tendencies of the Conservatives and the Liberals. Perhaps if they realize the widespread support, not only in the labour movement but in the women's movement, they will consider getting rid of this legislation, rescinding this legislation which repeals a concept that is supported by a vast number of women in this province.

* (1130)

Let me refer Members in this House to the resolution that has been presented to all of us by the Women's Agenda, supported by over 35 women's organizations representing over 200,000 women, a resolution that all Members should take very seriously. Let me read it:

WHEREAS many women work in the service sector and need alternatives to solving disputes with their employers; and

WHEREAS first contract legislation has helped women unionize without forcing strike action; and

WHEREAS most of the service sector employers would hire strikebreakers to replace striking employees, allowing those employers to continue business operations without incentive to bargain fairly and settle the dispute; and

WHEREAS final offer selection has proven to facilitate settlements as a bargaining tool by allowing employers and unions to reach an agreement that causes least strain on both parties and the public.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba live up to its commitment in the preamble of The Labour Relations Act to encourage collective bargaining between employers and unions as freely designated representatives of employees and withdraw the Bill repealing final offer selection.

I hope Members are taking heed of this incredibly significant organization in our society today and are considering the genuine feeling of women in this province around final offer selection and around measures that will move them towards equality rather than take them back in time.

An Honourable Member: It is only the NDP who care about these things.

Ms. Wasylicia-Leis: The Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) has said that only the NDP cares on issues like

this. That is true, but I wish it was not the case. I wish Members of the Liberal Party and Members of the Conservative Government would join with us in fighting for this progressive, innovative legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, on a point of order.

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): I want to keep the record straight, that it is only the NDP who think that they care about people. We know as Liberals that we care about people, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A dispute of the facts is not a point of order. The Honourable Member for St. Johns has the floor.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: I am pleased that the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) clarified his comments. I would simply ask him that if Members of the Liberal Party are concerned about women's equality and are concerned about progressive labour legislation and are concerned about peaceful, harmonious labour-management relations, then put their money where their mouth is and stand up and support final offer selection. Let us be clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the benefits of this concept, final offer selection, when it comes to women. Let us consider, first of all, the incredibly important role of the trade union movement when it has come to improving working conditions for women and moving step by step towards equality.

We all know that trade unions have a particularly important role to play in the march towards women's equality over the next decade, taking us through the 1990s. Many of the policies that have benefited women to date, like shorter working hours, like minimum wages, like paid parental leave, like occupational health and safety standards and many, many other significant changes, have been won first by unions through the collective bargaining process. They have provided leadership to governments on many issues. Their innovative approaches to collective bargaining have been the forerunner to many good, progressive changes on the legislative front.

Today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the trade union movement is providing that leadership to this Legislature and telling all of us to listen to their concerns and to understand why they are promoting the notion of final offer selection, particularly when it comes to greater success on the road to equality between women and men. They, members of the trade union movement, are committed to doing their own work on behalf of women and to finding ways to organize more and more women in the trade union movement. They realize that in many occupations, in many sectors of our economy where women are dominated, where women are the majority of workers in that particular sector or occupation, particularly the service sector, the retail trade end of things, banking and so on—women in those sectors are still unorganized and are still facing significant

barriers to their goal of equality and to making it possible to combine their work responsibilities and their family responsibilities.

Final offer selection helps on that road, helps in that effort to organize women, to ensure better benefits, to ensure pay equity, to ensure supports like day care, paid parental leave, family responsibility leave, better pensions, and benefits around part-time work. The list goes on and on.

First and foremost, we as legislators have to look at how final offer selection will actually assist in that process, a goal which surely all of us can support, a goal which is within our reach if this Government and the Members of the Liberal Party see fit to repeal this legislation which repeals final offer selection and to get on with providing working alternatives to peaceful, harmonious settlements of labour issues and indirectly assisting in the work that needs to be done to organize trade union women, to organize women into trade unions in our province.

The statistics, I think, speak for themselves, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but perhaps Members of the Conservative Government and the Liberal Opposition are not aware of just how big the gap is between men and women in our society today when it comes to union membership.

The most recent statistics we have are in fact through the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security, or at least her old department, and give us the breakdown for 1983, showing that only 38.9 percent of total union membership were female members. The statistics also show that in terms of all men in our society, 31 percent in 1983 were organized, whereas only 26 percent of women in the labour force were organized. That kind of gap has revealed itself in some very graphic ways. It has shown itself to us in terms of differences in wages, in working conditions, in benefits.

Let us consider that particularly in the service sector jobs are the least unionized and therefore the poorest paid, have the worst working conditions and very little job security. Only 34 percent of service workers in Manitoba are unionized. Let us be clear about the facts. In non-unionized jobs in this sector women earn 30 percent less than men.

* (1140)

Those are fairly striking, glaring statistics when it comes to the situation facing women in our labour force in Manitoba today. They point to the need for concerted action on the part of both labour and Government in our society. The trade union movement has committed itself to working with women in the labour force to help meet their needs through organized efforts, through support of better legislation. Now I think it is time for the Government of the Day to show its support for women in this province and their goals and objectives for improved working conditions, better pay, and more job security.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe those reasons together make a very good case to the Members of the

Conservative Government and the Liberal Opposition if they are listening, a very good case for rethinking their decision to repeal final offer selection, to reject Bill No. 31, to get on with working with a concept and a tool that has already proven to be successful, as I have said, whether one looks at it in terms of prevention of strikes, successful if one looks at it in terms of more harmony between labour and management, successful if one looks at it in terms of providing benefit, particularly to small unions and the unorganized situation facing women in our society.

Let me conclude by urging once again Members of the Conservative Government and the Liberal Opposition to seriously think about the issues that have been brought to their attention, not only by Members of the New Democratic Party Caucus, but by the trade union movement and by the women's movement in this province. I would ask them to listen to the voices of those thousands and thousands and thousands of working families in this province who have sent the message to this Legislature that they support final offer selection. They want to see it work. They want to see alternatives to strike action. They want to see peaceful co-existence in this province between labour and management.

Let them also listen to the thousands and thousands of women who have come forward asking, as I have indicated in this resolution from the women's agenda for this Legislature, to rescind Bill No. 31, to dump Bill No. 31, and get on with letting final offer selection. They know that it is one effective tool toward ensuring that we continue to make as a society and as a Government and as a Legislature and as a community greater and greater progress toward equality between women and men. Thank you.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for Concordia, on a point of order.

Mr. Doer: I think it has been taken care of.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), that debate be adjourned.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I wonder if the Honourable Member for Thompson would repeat what he said; I did not hear everything. Would you mind repeating?

Mr. Ashton: I had moved adjournment, seconded by the Member for The Pas.

MOTION presented and carried.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to have Bill No. 31 remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis)?

The Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) moved debate be adjourned. The Bill automatically stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Thompson.

BILL NO. 83—THE OZONE DEPLETING SUBSTANCES ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), Bill No. 83, The Ozone Depleting Substances Act; (Loi sur les substances appauvrissant la couche d'ozone), standing in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak). The Honourable Member has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): I am pleased to continue my comments on Bill No. 83, which deals with The Ozone Depleting Substances Act. I think it is an extremely important Bill because it is an extremely important subject.

As was mentioned by previous speakers, it is a subject that no one can escape because when the ozone layer is depleting, we are all going to be subjected to the ultraviolet rays of the sun to a much greater degree. We know many more people are going to be afflicted by cancer and other diseases which are caused by too strong radiation. I am pleased that the Minister brought this forward, and it very closely resembles a Bill that we had brought forward last year, Bill No. 18, which deals with the same subject.

We mentioned yesterday, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how important the use of CFCs is in our society. I think it is important that we continue to do research to come up with another substance that can replace the CFCs. Dupont has done an awful lot of research and is very close to having a substance that can replace it. I think it is important that we utilize the use of CFCs for many of our qualities of life, but at the same time, when we are using these substances because of the development of our country, we are able to utilize the air conditioning, the insulation for refrigeration. We use them in telephones and televisions, radios and computers.

The people who are suffering to the greatest degree because of the use of those CFCs are people from the Third World. We realize that contributes to the rising temperature of the world, and because of that some of the Third World countries, the coastal countries, are being flooded. I think that these people who have not realized the benefit of a developed world are being penalized to a much greater degree. It is important that we in the developed part of the world put money toward research to show ways that we can use other substances to combat the reduction of the ozone layer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in speaking to the Bill I see that they came up with penalties for corporations that break the contract. I think they are very strong penalties that are going to be subjected to the corporations. I think that this is good that the Minister had the courage to bring this forward. I think that in the case of a first offence there would be a \$500,000 fine. In the case of a second and third offence, it is a fine not exceeding \$1 million, and I think that with a fine of this significant

size, people will be taking seriously some of the effects of the Act. I am sure that they are going to be a little more aware of how they can be affected.

The one question that I have about the Bill is in the use of environmental officers. I know that during the last Speech from the Throne there was an announcement by this Government that they were going to be bringing on additional environment officers to enforce The Environment Act. Unfortunately, this has been 18 months ago and there are still no signs of them bringing on additional environmental officers. I would hope that the Government is serious in bringing on these additional environmental officers because they are required right now, even without the passage of this Bill.

I wonder how serious they were when they made that commitment during the Speech from the Throne that they were going to be bringing additional environmental officers on—(interjection)—Well, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) says it was very, very serious. They saw that they had some additional funding in place for bringing on some public relations people or communications officers. They brought two additional people on for communications, but they did not bring on any additional enforcement officers. That is an area where they are short of people right now for enforcement, and if they were serious about moving in that direction they would have appointed two enforcement officers earlier in the year, instead of bringing on communications officers.

* (1150)

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

They always accused us of hiring too many apple polishers and very clearly they are moving in that direction stronger than we ever were. We did not have any communications officer in this area, and they hire two additional people to try and polish the Minister's image.

There are some powers given to the environmental officers to enter into a place where they feel that regulations are not being followed. I think it is good that these officers have the ability to enter into a place where they feel some injustice has been done or else the Act has not been followed.

It is good that these officers have very wide—I guess one of the other areas is where the environment officers need to have entry. They are given quite strong mandate here to get into the buildings or to seize the vehicles where they suspect that justice is not being carried out according to the Act. I think it is a good way to move. I guess it also shows that where a refund would be provided, where a person is not aware that they were purchasing products that did not fall within the Act, there is a case where they can bring it back and they could have their money refunded. I think that is moving in the right direction.

I feel that this Bill is moving in the right direction and that it is extremely important that we all, as a society, make whatever contribution we can to make sure that the ozone layer is protected. I think that this

Bill will give our people the strength to follow-up on some of the concerns that exist within society.

I certainly look forward to some of the presentations that will be made during the committee hearing. I know that there is a lot of interest out in the public on this particular Bill. I know that there are going to be quite a few people coming forward to make presentations. I look forward to getting that input from the public because it is extremely important that we learn—some of the people out in the public have very strong views on this particular subject. I look forward to the opportunity of listening to the presentations that those people make.

I encourage other Members to get up and speak and show on which side of this issue they do stand. I think, in some cases, that there are people who feel that the Ontario legislation is superior to Bill No. 83. I think that this one at this stage goes far enough if we can put into place all of the people who are required to do the implementation of this Act. I think that we will be moving a long way to helping reduce erosion of the ozone layer. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 84—THE WASTE REDUCTION AND PREVENTION AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings), Bill No. 84, The Waste Reduction and Prevention and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur la réduction du volume et de la production des déchets et modifications corrélatives, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas, who has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): I am pleased to stand and speak on Bill No. 84, a Bill dealing with the reduction and prevention of wastes in our society. I think it is extremely important that we start dealing with this waste reduction. The public is very much in support of the move that has been going on in the last little while in some other jurisdictions, which shows that there are a lot of people who consider there is waste in our society. Really, there are a lot of materials that are being thrown away at this time and filling up our waste disposal sites but are really materials that can be used.

I know of one particular case where Abitibi-Price at this time is utilizing wastepaper from the Winnipeg Free Press. They have over the last couple of months been shipping wastepaper to their plant and utilizing up to 1 percent of the materials that they require for making paper by utilizing the waste material. I guess there have been about 15 transport loads of wastepaper that have gone from the Free Press offices of waste material that have gone to Abitibi-Price. I guess the first few truckloads of material were gathered from households

in The Pas during waste disposal days as many people had brought in wastepaper that they had gathered, or newspapers and other.

This had been gathered by Versatech Industries who have played a very leading role in the gathering of paper. I think that the whole recycling industry has been making quite an impact in this province. I think that they need to be commended for the work that they have carried out in taking a leadership role in dealing with this very important subject.

Versatech Industries have shipped a few truckloads of paper they had gathered during those days, and then later on they were able to receive the paper that was gathered by the Winnipeg Free Press and Winnipeg Real Estate News and they moved it. They are using up to 1 percent without de-inking. They are going to be experimenting to moving up to 2 percent, but they have to do it very cautiously because they cannot have the quality of their paper deteriorate, otherwise there would be some very dissatisfied customers. I think that most people now are more than willing to participate in utilizing recycled paper.

I know that a move made by the American Government over the last couple of months, when they stated that 25 percent of any paper they were going to purchase had to be made up of recycled material. I think that the pulp and paper industry moved very quickly to make the changes even though they were not very happy because the pulp and paper industry is a very cyclical industry, and they are at this time on a downside of that cycle so they do not want to be making the investment to be retooling or reinvesting to accommodate the recycled paper.

I guess when they saw a customer as big as the American Government when they were going to be calling for 25 percent recycled material, then they very quickly started moving in that direction. I know in speaking to the Abitibi-Price people to de-ink the paper that comes in, it would take that investment of several million dollars in order to have a plant that would accommodate the de-inking of the paper that comes in.

* (1200)

They could use the paper to a much greater degree than they do right now, but the fact that there is ink in it prevents them from moving to a much higher percentage until such time as de-inking processes are built in the Province of Manitoba. I am sure that of all the information that is coming out to the private sector that there will be somebody who will be moving in that direction to make that investment, because they know that when people are going into the recycled material there is going to be a call for that paper. I think it is important we get all that information out to the people who may be interested, and I am sure someone will be making that investment.

The recycling committee has certainly been doing a lot of work in educating the public on how the people can participate in the whole recycling process.

An Honourable Member: Is that a good idea?

Mr. Harapiak: The former Minister of Environment asks if it was a good idea, and it is certainly is. I am glad that the present Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) is moving in that direction. He is certainly a lot more progressive than the last Minister of Environment. I am pleased with some of the work that the present Minister of Environment is doing in the whole area of recycling activity—

An Honourable Member: Who appointed the committee?

Mr. Harapiak: He asks who appointed the committee. There was a previous Minister in our administration who started the whole recycling industry, that is Gerard Lecuyer for Radisson, who had played a big role in making the public a lot more aware of what was going on environmentally in this. Then we came into a little bit of a desert time when the Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) became the Minister responsible for the Environment. Those were sad days for the environment in Manitoba when that particular Member was in charge.

I am pleased the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is here today, and I once again want to tell the Premier it is good that he had the vision to remove the Member for Portage la Prairie from that very important post, because he was not being very co-operative with all the people who are interested in recycling in the Province of Manitoba. Recycling in all environmental issues were taking a step backward.

I guess even the labour—because you look at the Bill we were debating earlier today dealing with the FOS, it was just his right-wing rhetoric or right-wing beliefs that made it necessary to bring that forward, that piece of legislation which I think is going to be a step backward for the Province of Manitoba. I am pleased that he was removed from that position. Hopefully, the people will see the light of day and vote against that Bill, or withdraw that Bill that they have in place now.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with recycling I think it is good that the public is becoming more aware. It is necessary for them to become educated in how each one of them can make some little contribution to recycling. I know that there are many people who have started off becoming interested by collecting aluminum cans and plastic bottles. As they become aware, read more information, then they want to move to the next step and start saving their paper materials because paper causes about 50 percent of the product that is brought out to the landfill site.

We still at this time have a lot of landfill sites in the Province of Manitoba, but when you look at some of the landfill sites in heavier populated areas then they are having extreme difficulty in disposing of their materials. If they can reduce that by 50 percent, then I think it would be reasonable that when we start using recycled paper that the Government would start looking at giving some tax advantages to people who use recycled paper because when we use recycled material, not only are we saving on filling up our disposal sites, but we are also saving on one of our most precious

natural resources, that is, the trees that surround us. Trees play important roles other than just the economical impact they make in this province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, quite often the public overlooks the importance of having a healthy environment by having trees planted all around us. I know that there are several people in this Legislature who are extremely interested in that subject. Personally myself, for the last two years, have planted 1,500 trees a year on my farm, and I want to continue to carry out that important role. I enjoy doing it as well because I think it is something where there will be no return to myself personally, but I think there will be some investment there for not only the contribution it makes to working towards helping us to have cleaner air, but I think that down the road there will be a need for more forests in this province. I hope that my grandchildren are able to enjoy some of the fruits of my labour in later years.

There are several sessions that have been held on the importance of recycling in this country, and some of the leaders in this have come to Winnipeg to speak on the importance of it. I think one of the areas, when you look at recycling, is that people quite often do not see this as recyclable material. The Selkirk Rolling Mills, they use waste iron that is scattered all across the province. They gather it, they recycle it, and use it to a very positive way. I think that we can be looking at many other industries setting up in the next little while that will be using recycled material.

One other firm that has been front and centre in the whole area of recycling is the Manitoba Soft Drink Bottle Association. They have started off by utilizing all of the plastic bottles and aluminum cans, and they have set up depots right across the province. I think that they have served a very useful purpose. They have set up depots in Thompson, Dauphin, Swan River, The Pas, and I think it is important that we continue to support those industries.

They have also made it possible for people to dispose of these bottles in a very easy way. They have these depots set up on a rotating basis in the Safeway parking lots so when people who are going shopping can also at the same time take in their bottles. They are now accepting glass bottles as well. I think they are moving in the right direction.

One of the areas that is quite often overlooked is the whole area of the compost. I think people quite often when they are cutting their grass in their yards, the food waste, and some other organic materials, they haul them up to the garbage dump. I think there is more and more interest being generated in composting material so people can use that for their gardens and their yards. I think that also makes a very important impact on our society. I guess we have to be aware of all the things that are possible with recycling, and I think the public is becoming more and more aware.

The Blue Box Program that was started in Wolseley is extremely important as well. I know the Manitoba ECO network was very involved in getting that started. Mr. Barker spent many, many hours getting that program in place. From my understanding now it is working very well and I hope that the Minister would

look favourably at extending that beyond the Wolseley area. I think the people of the Manitoba Environmental Network need to be credited for moving in that direction. It shows that there are people who are extremely interested and they are making great progress in that area.

Mr. Speaker, in Ontario, which has moved into that blue box program at a much earlier period than we did in Manitoba here, because they are troubled with disposal sites, the costs are going up to \$200 a tonne in many places to get rid of that. Naturally they had a greater problem, so they were faced with putting in some pretty tough regulations to make people participate. They found later on that it was not necessary to put those regulations in, because people certainly are willing to participate in the program when it is available. That program has been extended to many, many other areas in which the recycling has really caught on. I am pleased that the area of Wolseley is moving in that direction, and I would hope they would continue to expand that throughout the whole city. I am sure that it will be expanded over the next couple of years.

* (1210)

The previous Minister of Environment put in place some small token environmental programs in the Legislature here. He put a box in the Legislative Building so people could throw their aluminum cans in the container. I think it is a step in the right direction, but certainly we can be going a lot further than that and putting those in all Government buildings and encouraging the private sector to also put those recycling containers in place, so people can put that waste that is considered waste into place right now. I think that people will move in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is extremely important that we continue to move in this direction. I give the Minister credit for coming forward with this Bill, with the paper they recently brought forward dealing with recycling material. It showed that there is a need for discussion, and he has brought forward a White Paper. If we move out and speak to the people of Manitoba you will find that most people are willing to move in this direction. I encourage other Members to support this Bill so we can move on with the problem we are presently faced with, and that is too much waste going into our disposal sites. It has been shown to us that there is a lot of value in those wastes that are being disposed of. The sooner we get the programs in place to allow people to use that, I think it is important that we do use it.

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): I am very pleased to rise today to address Bill No. 84, The Waste Reduction and Prevention and Consequential Amendments Act—quite a mouthful I must say for a title, but in any case a very important document in the life of this province. I can see we are going to have a good rousing debate here. I hear comments already from the Acting House Leader, and I would like to put on the record that we are very pleased with having to deal with the Honourable Member for Morris (Mr. Manness) over this last week. I will have to say, there has been more progress made in this last week in dealing with him as the Government

negotiator than we have seen this fall, and my compliments to him.

The matter before us here is, how do we reduce waste in the Province of Manitoba? The thrust of this Bill is towards waste by industry, a matter that is very, very important. The philosophy of this Bill is contained in the acronym WRAP, Waste Reduction and Prevention strategies. It has a complete section, Part 2 of the Act, it talks there of the powers of the Minister. It talks about the WRAP strategy report, and I will be talking to that as well. The Minister, in the first section of that, his powers are referred to as: consult with producers, consumers, Government, Government agencies, et cetera, with respect to improving waste reduction; encourage producers, consumers, Governments, Government agencies, and others, et cetera, in the same thing; monitoring, undertaking by means of grants and assistances, cause the preparation, publication of educational materials and enter into agreements. I think there are some very good things there.

However, it does not say anything else about actions that the Minister would take should none of these follow through, and that does give me some concern, in particular, Part 3 talks about enforcement and offences. I am going to be dealing with that in more detail, and then we have more detail again in Part 4, Regulations and General Provisions of Act No. 24.

The fact of the matter is, we have seen a philosophy if you will on the environment by the Progressive Conservatives at the provincial level. It is education and it is talking and it is consulting, but we have little to see before us, Mr. Speaker, in the way of compliance or enforcement towards compliance when those other softer methods do not work and that does bother me.

We have reference for example in this Act, as we have on a couple of other new environment Acts that are before this Session, to environment officers and the powers of environment officers. The problem, however, is not enough environment officers. The environment officers that we have are grossly overloaded with the duties that they are trying to attend to. - (interjection)- That is right. The Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) makes reference in jogging my memory, the point made by the Government that there would be more environment officers and we just saw that in Estimates that were just passed.

Here we are almost nine months into the fiscal year. Of the only 14 officers that were promised, not one has been hired. As far as I know, the advertising has not been done. The bulletins are not out for the staffing of these new positions. I do not believe that is the case for the two administrative positions that have been added to this department. I do not believe that is the case for the two apple polishers, the communications officers that are in place for this department, new positions in both cases. I believe those four are staffed. It is interesting that the 14 officers that are the working operational environment officers, none of those positions are staffed. I think the Minister of the Environment is going to have to do some answering for that.

The provision of fines is contained in this document, the people who are going to have to deal with this sort

of thing. It talks about penalties in Part 3: every person who is guilty of an offense under this Act is liable on summary conviction to a fine of not more than \$1,000 or to imprisonment for a term of not more than one year or to both, and where the person is a corporation a fine of not more than \$5,000.00. There are a few other clauses like that. If you have not got the officers there, if you have not got the environmental police to be out there and to do the reviewing and to do the monitoring and do the inspection to confirm whether or not there is a problem, and then to take further action as is necessary, first to try and get the corporation to comply, and if that does not work using stiffer methods to ensure compliance, then what happens? I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, nothing happens.

It is the same problem we have now under the present Environment Act. It is that we have an Act which has some fairly severe penalties, \$5,000, \$10,000, \$100,000, \$200,000 on the very serious offences, and what did we have with the major diesel oil spill up at Conawapa? We had four charges laid, two minor offences and two major ones, but what happened? The two major ones were stayed upon the recommendation of the Environment Department and that Minister. Through the Crown prosecutor, the magistrate was presented with those two charges stayed when she heard the case, and two summary convictions with prescribed fines of \$198 each presented to her to impose as a fait accompli.

That sort of track record, that sort of softness on the environment takes from the potential goodness, the potential to improve the environment, which one can see in this Act. When one sees no political will to enforce an existing Act and then one sees other Acts following, such as Bill 83 which I addressed yesterday, The Ozone Depleting Substances Act, and in Bill 84, The Waste Reduction and Prevention and Consequential Amendments Act, and the Bill 81 which is coming yet, which is The Environmental Amendment Act—which is putting stiffer fines on again of five to ten times that which is in the existing Act, why bother with these fines? Why bother with Bill 81 when there is no intention to enforce what is there today? It is hypocrisy. It cannot be anything less than that.

* (1220)

The environment is something which cannot stand that sort of treatment. The time has passed when people in this province will tolerate it. We on this side of the House will quite frankly be leading that fight, and saying enough is enough.

This Act should be a reflection of the three Rs of the environment. It does not deal, however, with one of them, and that is what my concern is. The three Rs of the environment, to refresh the memories of the Members of this House, are reduce first, then reuse, and thirdly, recycle. This Act, although it talks about reduction, when one reads the Act one does not see reduction as being a main thrust. We see re-use. We see recycle.

I was a party a few years ago to an energy reduction exercise with the federal department in which I worked.

Over a two-year period through this region, which extended from the 88th meridian on the east to the Alberta-Saskatchewan boundary on the west and from the U.S. boundary on south to the Pole, which is quite a large territory covering roughly one third of Canada, we were able to elicit reductions anywhere from 28 percent to 43 percent on electrical consumption.

That electrical consumption meant we were saving power. We were saving bills to the taxpayer, and very fortunately, because in the North we were operating on thermal power generated by small, remote generators. It meant less fuel being consumed, less carbon-based fuel. That meant less fuel which had to be shipped north, largely by ship but some by bladder bag in aircraft at an enormous expense, absolutely enormous expense, consuming more fuels again to get the fuel up there for power generation and the resulting saving, on not just the cost; but the fact is we were not polluting the air locally.

I think that is another thing to consider. On top of that, the life of the electrical systems was going to be extended because we were not consuming power in the same way. We were using the fixtures less. We rotated them out of use and into use, and we consumed bulbs and fluorescent tubes, et cetera, on a much reduced basis. All those things were to the benefit of the bottom line, but they were to the benefit of the society as well. That is the sort of example one can be proud to have been participating in, but it is just one example how waste reduction can be of benefit. It is the sort of thing which should become the watchword in the province.

We are not a rich province to begin with, so let us make the best use of those scarce resources, whether they be in the public sector or whether they be in the private sector, Mr. Speaker. We do need to reduce. That is the first of the three Rs, and it is not the first of the three Rs of the environmental movement without good reason. There are those who would say, in fact, that we can also get real benefits through the reduced consumption of electrical power, as an example, in this province in all walks of life, and thereby free up power for sales outside of the province to those who might be interested in power from Manitoba. Now, that is power which is freed up through savings. That is not power which is created by the building of another dam. That is power which is available out of the existing system that is there in place.

I do not think anybody can argue with the concept of maximizing the use of that which you produce now.

The more you can stretch, I think, the more there will be benefit, benefit through other dollars used in other ways, and benefits in the sense of lack of additional pollution and lack of additional garbage. Those sorts of things are very, very critical and until it becomes a watchword on the way we live and the way we consume things, Mr. Speaker, we will not have made the mark.

The reduction side can be, in so many ways. I, in fact, have a Private Members' Resolution before this House on reducing the use of non-biodegradable packaging for foodstuffs, be it at the grocery store or at the restaurant. There is no reason why packaging should be done in the way that it is. First of all, look that it is biodegradable, but secondly, say, do we need as much packaging at all? That sort of thing, I think, is very important.

I am going to, later in my address—obviously it will be another day—be dealing with the matter of private and public initiatives. I will also be dealing with the reporting to this Legislature of the WRAP strategy by the Minister. I will be talking more about how the waste reduction prevention strategies, the philosophy if you will, should become the modus operandi of this Government and this province in everything it does.

I would wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we should call it 12:30 at this point. The Speaker indicates I have another minute. That is just fine.

The matter of the private-public initiatives has got to be one of the most important aspects of any initiative of this nature. The expectation that all the answers to reducing, reusing, and recycling must come from the public sector is patently wrong. It cannot possibly be. Every firm in this province, every institution, every Government agency must have reduction, and reuse, and recycling as a watchword. Until we get there, we will not have moved in the direction we should have. My concern in this whole matter is that, while we see the philosophy in this Act, we do not have the budget which goes with this Act to make those sorts of things happen.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member will have 26 minutes remaining.

The hour being 12:30 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned till 1:30 p.m. Monday.